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INTRODUCTION.

Historians throughout the centuries since the death of John Hus, have expressed high admiration of the heroic qualities of his character, the purity of his life, the clarity of his thought and the zeal of his reforming purpose. He was the best product of the native reform movement and the chief inspiration of those later religious groups which became the glory of the Czech nation. We could go so far as to count him the first Protestant before Protestantism rather than, to use the phrase of Ullmann, a Reformer before the Reformation. It is not too much to say then, that John Hus — along with the United Brethren is the chief contribution of the Czech Reformation to the religious history of Western Christianity.

Hus was held in devoted reverence by the leaders of the Reformation, particularly by Martin Luther, who testified that the reading of the works of Hus had had a considerable influence on his conversion.

It may be affirmed at the outset that Hus was a product of the native reform movement. The ever-deepening knowledge of this phase of Czech religious history assures Hus a secure place and an influential rôle in the movement. Beginning with Conrad Waldhauser, an Austrian monk who had come to Prague in 1363, and the apocalyptic mystic, John Milic of Kroměříž, whose fervent reform activity had begun in 1363, when he had resigned all his honours and begun his passionate denunciation of clerical and lay corruption, the early Czech Reformation may be said to have culminated in the work of Hus and his party. The most important theological exponent of the earlier native movement before the days of Hus was Mathias of Janow. Denouncing vigorously and untiringly the moral depravity of the clergy, the excessive reverence paid to images, Saints and relics, he advocated as the means of reformation a daily participation in communion through which the believer
was to be brought into fellowship with God. Hus continued in these respects in the tradition of his predecessors.

The chief characteristic of the Czech reformation was its emphasis upon preaching in the vernacular and on the moral reform of the clergy and the people—not on theological speculation or anti-ecclesiastical revolt. It may be affirmed—although at the risk of over-simplification—that the Czechs were more interested in moral and ethical conduct, in purity of life, than they were in doctrine. For even the most advanced exponents of the movement did not side with contemporary theological radicalism which advocated—it is interesting to note—such measures as the observance of the Jewish Sabbath instead of Sunday, the denial of the necessity of the baptism of children, and the assertion of the rightfulness of adult baptism at the age of thirty. The leaders trusted rather in preaching, in transforming the springs of human action. Indeed it was in the pulpit at the Chapel of Bethlehem that Hus exercised his greatest influence as leader of the reform movement. He had a message, and like Paul he felt "Woe is me if I preach not!" His words ring true because his life is pure. Strongly ascetical in his emphasis upon the work of sanctification, he denounces unsparingly, and with almost monotonous reiteration, all carnality, avarice, money-grubbing, gluttony, drunkenness, rich apparel, pride, dice-playing, dancing, hunting, simony etc. His ideal is distinctly other-worldly, he stresses world-forsaking, self-discipline, the humble life of voluntary poverty. Hus took his religion seriously and practically. All his actions and thinking were always leading to God.

It was these qualities in Hus which accounted for his popularity among the people of Bohemia, troubled as they were in spirit by the corruption and evil living of the Catholic clergy. The swift
spread of his teaching through his own land and beyond where the church was equally degenerate, was also largely due to his purity of life and outlook as we shall see in the following pages, and to his emphasis on the virtues of the primitive church.
THE PERSONAL INFLUENCE OF HUS AT HOME.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF JOHN HUS.)

John Hus was the son of poor parents living at Hys/inec, a small town in the South of Bohemia. He was born on the 5th of July, 1373. (1) He received his early education partly in the School of his native place and partly at Prachatice, a large town three miles from Hys/inec. He afterwards proceeded to the University of Prague, where he took his B.A. degree in 1393.

But one anecdote of any interest is preserved of Hus's early life. The story is told by K. de Bonnechose, (2) who, however, does not mention his authority: there is certainly a remarkable apocryphal flavour about it. It is said that on a winter's evening the future martyr was sitting over the fire, reading the story of the sufferings of S. Laurence. Suddenly he thrust his hand into the flames; and was only prevented by the forcible interposition of his companions from "trying what part of the sufferings of that holy man he was capable of enduring." The only vice with which he afterwards had to reproach himself was a fondness for chess-playing, over which most philosophical game he had (as he thought) before his ordination wasted his time and lost his temper. That excessive chess-playing should have been the only folly of his youth, is a sufficient testimony to the general strictness of his life: and that he gave up excessive chess-playing, if not chess-playing altogether, upon his ordination, shows that he must have entered upon his sacred calling in a spirit rare indeed at a time when the Church was the only means of worldly advancement open to the poor man, and when the average morality of the clergy was lower than the average morality of the laity.

(1) This is the year given by L'Enfant. Other historians give 1369. L'Enfant enjoys a great reputation for accuracy, and as 20 appears a more natural age for a B.A. degree than 24, I have retained his statement.

(2) "Reformateurs avant la Reforme", Book I, chap. 1.
In 1396 Hus proceeded to the degree of M.A., and as was usual at a time when a degree was still mainly looked upon as a qualification to teach, began to give lectures, probably upon philosophy. He also became a Bachelor of Divinity, and in 1401 was Dean of that Faculty. Wyclif's philosophical works were then used as text-books in the Bohemian University; and Hus's tutor, Stanislaus of Znaim, was a prominent divine of the reforming party. He was thus brought up in an atmosphere favourable to the formation of liberal opinions. But at first he was hardly inclined to go so far as his seniors. When in 1402 Jerome brought with him from England the theological works of the great Oxford schoolman, Stanislaus of Znaim was more inclined than his pupil to look with favour upon the new doctrines, and especially upon the denial of Transubstantiation, which, in Wyclif's estimation, was a necessary deduction from metaphysical principles, with which the students of Prague were already familiar. It is alleged that Hus was at one time so much disgusted with the heresies of Wyclif, that he said that his books ought to be cast into the Moldau. If this statement be true, the disgust soon wore off. He afterwards had the very highest reverence for the English Reformer; and although the clear moral insight which inspired his protests against Sacerdotalism was essentially his own, every one of his distinct doctrinal opinions may be traced either to Wyclif or to Matthias of Janow. Even if (as some have contended) his opinions never crossed the line of orthodoxy, his obligations to Wyclif were great. Matthias of Janow and the Bohemian preachers of the fourteenth century had quarrelled with various ecclesiastical authorities; but they were not open rebels against the Church. The most advanced of them, Matthias of Janow, had retracted his heresies as soon as he was required to do so by his ecclesiastical superior. But in Wyclif's writings Hus was brought face to face with heresy, with doctrines which had been solemnly condemned by the Church, and which had not been retracted. After the study of Wyclif's works, although his timid and cautious intellect recoiled from some of his opinions, his moral nature w
longer shrank from heresy as from a contamination. His chivalrous temper prompted him to go to far greater lengths in defence of one whom he considered unjustly condemned, than was required by the strict exigences of his own theological position. The prevalent opinion was that a heretic was worse than a bad man. Hus had satisfied himself that a heretic might be a good man; and that books which the Church called heretical might contain more genuinely Christian teaching than books which the Church called orthodox. In the fifteenth century this was much.

John Hus soon became known as a prominent member of the national party in the University. The King was angry with the Pope of the Teutonic Provinces because his predecessor, Boniface IX, had consented to his deposition from the Imperial throne; and, consequently, any movement of an anti-hierarchical tendency was likely to meet with some favour at Court. Hus was appointed Confessor to the Queen, who afterwards became an avowed Hussite. To his position as one of the Royal Chaplains he no doubt owed not a little of the security which he enjoyed throughout the troubles of succeeding years.

In John Hus the liberal movement to which the study of Matthias of Janov and Wyclif had given rise in the University formed a junction with the stream of popular religious life which had sprung from the teaching of Milicié and Conrad. A Bohemian knight, John of Mühlheim, and a merchant named Kroutz, had built a Chapel which was to be specially devoted to regular preaching in Bohemian on Sundays and holydays. Up to this time, in the words of the deed of foundation, "preachers, particularly preachers in the vulgar tongue, were compelled to wander about from one house or corner to another." The new Chapel was dedicated to the Holy Innocents in Bethlehem. Its foundation was authorised by "the

---

confirmation of the Lord Archbishop John, who laid the first stones of it with his own hands, by the King's Charter (Libertatio), and by a grant of Privilege from Pope Gregory (Privilegatio)."

The Chapel was thus possessed of a perfectly regular ecclesiastical status; but it was no doubt looked upon by the parochial clergy of Prague with the same kind of suspicion which the Proprietary Chapels of the early Evangelicals excited among the "high and dry" Churchmen of the last 12th century. Two years after he had held the office of Rector of the University, Hus became one of the "preachers and rectors" of this chapel. The mantle of Milic and Conrad had fallen upon Hus. The Chapel was crowded Sunday after Sunday with persons of every class of society. The Queen was often among his auditors: there were nobles, priests, students, as well asburghers and artisans. The chapel is said to have held at times as many as three thousand people. Universities have been in all ages the homes of great religious movements. They supply the preacher not only with congregations composed to a large extent of men of culture and education; but with congregations, a large part of which will in a few years be scattered over the length and breadth of the land. Luther at Wittenberg; Ridley, Latimer and Simeon at Cambridge; Newman at Oxford; Hus at Prague, have thus taught the hundreds who should hereafter be the teachers of hundreds of thousands.

The popularity of Wyclif's writings and the consequent diffusion of his doctrines among the students now began to excite the alarm of the clergy. In 1403, the Archbishop's official and the Chapter of the Cathedral requested the University to examine forty-five propositions extracted from his books. The debate was a contest between

(4) Palacky's "Documenta Mag. Jo. Hus Vitan, etc., illustrantia," p.169 (This work will be cited as "Doc'.")

(5) "Articles of Michael de Causis", Doc. 169.
the German and the Bohemian parties. The voting was by nations. Two of the four nations, the Bavarian and Saxon, were wholly German; while of the Polish nation more than half were Germans. The Bohemians were consequently outvoted; and the forty-five propositions were condemned. This condemnation of the great Realist raised the antagonism between German and Bohemian into a deadly feud. The clergy of Prague sided with the orthodox Germans; the King favoured the Bohemians from motives of policy, the nation at large from feelings of patriotism. The contest raged furiously for six years. Theological, national, and philosophical differences were each of them held a sufficient excuse for a free use of bow and arrows in the streets of a mediaeval University. In the present contest all these motives were combined: it was a struggle between German and Bohemian, between Nominalist and Realist, between a Church party and a Reforming party. At last, in 1409, the Bohemians succeeded in persuading the King to issue an edict, (G) which gave the combined Bavarian, Saxon and Polish nations one vote, while the Bohemians were to enjoy three. The Germans had taken a solemn oath that if they were deprived of their privileges, they would leave Prague in a body. They kept their word.

The inhabitants of the once flourishing town soon found that they had been gratifying their patriotic instincts at the expense of their commercial interests. For a time Hus, who was elected their Rector a second time by the victorious minority, incurred some odium, even among his countrymen, on account of the part which he had taken in obtaining the edict; and in the Universities which were founded or largely augmented by the five thousand or more ejected Germans, hatred of Hus must have become a tradition. The national insult was wiped out at Constance.

(6) Doc. 347.
During the first part of the struggle which ended in the withdrawal of the Germans, the personal orthodoxy of Hus does not appear to have been assailed. Zbyněk of Nasenbourg, the new Archbishop of Prague, showed as much reforming zeal as could be expected in an ecclesiastic in whose mind the interests of religion were subordinated to the interests of his order. At the beginning of his episcopate, he requested the reforming preacher to call his attention to any abuse in the diocese which fell under his notice. Shortly afterwards, Hus was one of a commission of three Masters appointed by the Archbishop to examine into the truth of one of those miracles for which the popular mind of the Middle Ages had an insatiable appetite. The church of Wilsnack had been destroyed by a robber knight in the preceding century; in a cavity of its ruined altar were found three wafers covered with a kind of red mould which often forms upon bread long exposed to the air. This redness was at once attributed to a miraculous manifestation of that blood, the "substance" of which was, according to the theology of the time, already present in the consecrated host. From far and near, from the most northern countries of Europe, as well as from all parts of Bohemia, crowds of pilgrims flocked to Wilsnack to adore the blood of their Redeemer: marvellous cures were said to have been effected. The Commission reported unfavourably to the alleged miracles; and an archiepiscopal mandate forbade the pilgrimage under pain of excommunication. Hus supported his opinions in a pamphlet, in which he expresses pretty plainly his opinion that miracles had long ceased in the Church. He goes to the root of the matter by questioning the spiritual utility of such portents, even if real, and condemns the unbelief which sought after signs no less than the avarice which invented them.

Hus enjoyed other proofs of his Diocesan's favour. Three times he preached before the Diocesan Synod assembled in the Archbishop's
palace. In these discourses (7) he attacked in strong language the worldliness and immorality of the Clergy; but language as strong was used by his judges at the Council of Constance. From Latin invectives the clergy had little to fear; and it was not till Hus began to transfer his denunciations of his brethren to the pulpit of Bethlehem Chapel that any attempt was made to silence the daring preacher. At a later period heresies were discovered in the last of these sermons, but not until offence had been given by his Bohemian discourses.

In the year after the date of this sermon (1407), the good understanding between Hus and Zbyněk came to an end. In 1405 Innocent VII had addressed a bull to the Archbishop, directing him to suppress the heresies alleged to be rife in Bohemia. In a Synod held by him in the following year, ecclesiastical penalties were denounced against all who should presume to teach the doctrines of Eyclif. The part which Hus had taken in defending those doctrines could hardly have been regarded in a favourable light by the Archbishop. His generous interference in the trial of an heretical priest, Nicholas of Valešnovic, before the Archbishop's Vicar-General, must have been still less acceptable to that prelate. When required to make answer upon oath, Nicholas refused to swear upon the crucifix or any other created thing. Hus defended his refusal on the authority of S. Chrysostom. The Vicar-General's reply was, "Ha, Master; you came here to listen, not to argue." Hus repeated his protest. "Is it just," he asked, "that you should condemn this priest, saying that he holds the errors of the Waldensians when he has sworn to you by God?" The priest was condemned, and after a short imprisonment, banished from the diocese. Hus sent an

(7) L'Enfant notices that the last of those Sermons, unlike the former ones, had no Invocation of the Virgin and no Ave Maria. If this omission was really made in the Sermons as delivered, and if the custom of introducing them on occasions was a universal one, the circumstance could hardly have escaped the observation of his accusers. L'Enfant, "Council of Constance", I, p.28.
indignant remonstrance to the Archbishop (8). The letter is characteristic. He declines altogether to enter into the merits of the theological question at issue, and confines himself to complaining that a good priest should be banished for preaching the gospel, while priests guilty of every imaginable crime went unpunished.

At a Synod held in June, 1403, decrees were published against persons propagating erroneous opinions touching the Sacrament of the Altar, against preaching "tending to the confusion of the Clergy", and against the use of all new Bohemian hymns (Cantilenæ) with four specified exceptions. (9) These last prohibitions were obviously directed against the vernacular preaching and the popular services of Bethlehem Chapel, which were emptying the parish churches and destroying the influence and the profits of the parochial clergy. This proceeding was followed by a direct attack upon the preacher. The articles of charge and Hus's answers to them are preserved. (10) They are three in number. The first alleges that he had taught that all "who received money from their parishioners, especially from the poor, for confession, by way of offertory, and for the sacraments of the Church, were guilty of heresy, not making any distinction whether the fees were taken before or after the administration of the said sacraments." In justification of this language Hus triumphantly quotes, among other authorities, a Papal bull in which the words "before or after" are expressly added to the prohibition of this kind of Simony. The second article alleges that after the death of a certain well-beneficed Master Peter Vórub. Hus had said in the pulpit, "I would not for all the world die in the possession of so many and such rich benefices," and also that he had wished that his soul might be where Eyelífa's soul was. Both these charges are substantially admitted, although the words had, of course, been separated

(8) Doc. 3.
(9) Doc. 333.
(10) Doc. 153.
from their context. To the third charge of "excessive" preaching against the clergy, Hus pleaded that his preaching had been by no means excessive. It will be observed that the charges really brought home to the accused only amounted to breaches of ecclesiastical discipline, with the exception, perhaps, of the expression touching Uyclif's soul. It is characteristic of the man that as yet his only heresy is sympathy with heretics.

The prosecution of 1408 appears to have been dropped, but...
10.

and again, "No prelate can excommunicate any one unless God excommunicate him first." Moreover now began a long series of unfounded attacks upon the orthodoxy of his Sacramental teaching. He is charged with having maintained that "a priest in mortal sin cannot make the true body of Christ." The important qualification "worthily" had been omitted: the fact that the unworthy priest effected the miraculous transformation was never, either now or at any later period, denied by John Hus.

From the Court of the Archbishop Hus appealed to the Pope, apparently before any trial had taken place: and before the close of the year (Dec. 1400) Zbyněk was cited to Rome. Pending the appeal, proceedings were stayed. But events had now taken place which gave the Archbishop a fresh pretext for silencing the dangerous preacher.

The long Schism was gradually sapping the foundations of the Papal supremacy. For thirty years it had been uncertain which half of Christendom was ruled by the Vicar of Christ; nor was the spiritual vitality of either such as to warrant an experimental determination of question. Under these circumstances there was no small ground for fearing that men might begin to ask themselves whether after all an earthly Head was necessary to the Church's well-being. But in the meantime all the abuses of the Roman Court flourished in two places at once: Christendom was preyed upon by two Pontiffs instead of one. The Schism was injurious alike to the material interests of Churchmen, and to the spiritual efficiency of the Church. On all hands it began to be felt that some amendments were required in a theory of Church Unity which unchurched one half - no man could say which half - of the Western commonwealth of nations. Under such circumstances the eyes of Europe were naturally turned to the theologians of that University which had long been known as the sworn foe of the sworn champions of the Papacy,
the Mendicant Priests, if not of the Papacy itself. As far back as
the year 1391 the University of Paris had resolved that they would
use their utmost endeavours to induce the Princes and Prelates of
Europe to consent to submit the claims of the rival Popes to the
arbitration of a General Council, which the theologians of Paris had,
even in the most flourishing days of the Papacy, maintained to be the
sovereign power of the Catholic Church. Their efforts were at last so
far successful that in 1403 the Church and realm of France definitely
renounced its allegiance to Benedict XIII. It was fortunate that at
such a crisis the College of Cardinals numbered among its members at
least one avowed Gallican. Cardinal d’Ailly of Fierro served as a
connecting link between the Cardinals and the University of Paris.
The Cardinals on either side were aroused to make a serious effort for
the termination of the Schism. But each Pope preferred the certainty
of the spoils of half Christendom to the chance of unquestioned
sovereignty. Disgusted with the obstinacy of their masters, the
Cardinals were at length driven to act for themselves. A majority of
either section of the Sacred College determined to convene a General
Council at Pisa.

In March, 1403, there assembled in obedience to the summons
of the Cardinals, besides twenty-two members of their own order, "four
titular patriarchs, with archbishops, bishops, abbots (including the
heads of the chief religious orders), envoys of many sovereign princes,
proctors from Cathedral chapters, and a host of Masters and Doctors who
represented the new and powerful influence of the universities."(13)
The Council cited the rival Popes, and on their non-appearance declared
them contumacious. Evidence was then taken, upon which Angelo Corario
and Peter de Luna were condemned as "notorious schismatics, obstinate and

(13) Robertson, VII, p.253.
incorrigible heretics, porjurors, and vow-breakers," and were solemnly declared to be deprived from the Pontificate and cut off from the Church. The Sacred College proceeded to a new election. Their choice fell upon the learned Franciscan theologian Peter Philargi, Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, who took the title of Alexander V.

Among the secular princes who had sent envoys to the Council, and who now recognised the Pope of its election, was the King of Bohemia. The sympathies of the Bohemian Party in the University were on the same side. Hus in particular had from the first warmly supported the attempt of the Cardinals to restore unity to the Church. But the Germans, the Archbishop and the clergy of the diocese refused all compliance with the King's wishes. It was mainly to secure the assent of the University to his submission to Alexander V (14) that Václav (Wenzel) was prevailed upon to issue the Edict which transferred to the Bohemians the three votes formerly enjoyed by the Germans. Four days after the date of that Edict (22nd Jan. 1409), a Royal proclamation prohibited all obedience to Gregory XII. (15) The Archbishop immediately suspended all the Masters of the University who recognised the new Pope from the exercise of priestly functions within his diocese; and with many of his clergy fled the country. The confiscation of the property of the exiles, and the almost universal acknowledgment of Alexander V, soon brought the Archbishop to reason. A sort of concordat was arranged. Žyneck and his obedient clergy abandoned Gregory XII, and were restored to their benefices. The suspension of the Masters was removed, and the disobedience of Hus and some others overlooked. In July, a Diocesan Synod gave further effect to the wishes of the King, who was anxious for the removal of suspicions which might be injurious to the success of his political schemes, (16) by determining that no heresy existed in

---

(14) See Robertson, VII, p.316, note V.
(16) Václav had not given up his pretensions to the Imperial Crown; he still called himself "Romanorum rex sempex Augustus." He sent ambassadors to Pisa only on condition of their being received as the ambassadors of "the true King of the Romans." Doc. 343.
Bohemia. The reconciliation of the spiritual and temporal powers was solemnly proclaimed at a great assembly of the spiritual and temporal lords of the realm.

No sooner was Zbynek restored to his temporalities than he transferred his complaints against Hus to the court of the new Pontiff. It appears that an order for the surrender of Wyclif's books for examination had already been promulgated, and that certain students of the University had appealed against the order on the ground that it was contrary to the privileges of the University. Zbynek now, in the year following that in which he had solemnly pronounced the realm free from heresy procured a bull from Alexander V., by which the heresies of Wyclif, particularly his denial of Transubstantiation, were declared to be on the increase. It was, therefore, ordered that all the heresiarch's writings should be surrendered for examination by a Commission of four Doctors of Divinity and two of Canon Law, to be appointed by the Archbishop, who, after receiving the report of the Commission, was to proceed to a definitive sentence upon the matter, all appeals to the Apostolical See then pending, or hereafter to be made being referred absolutely to his decision. Moreover, all preaching in private Chapels was to cease.

The Archbishop proceeded to execute the bull, and on the 16th of June, 1410, all the writings of Wyclif which had been surrendered to the Commission, many of them works of a purely philosophical character were condemned to the flames. On the 21st the University solemnly declared its dissent from the Archbishop's judgment. Indignant at an order which violated their privileges and destroyed their property,

(17) Doc. 374.
(18) Doc. 373.
(19) Doc. 386.
the Masters solicited and obtained the interference of the King. Zbynek promised that the sentence should not be executed without the royal permission: but on the 16th of the following month this promise was broken. The Archbishop surrounded his palace with an armed guard; and in its court-yard two hundred volumes of Wyclif's writings, as well as works of Milic and others, were solemnly committed to the flames. A great assembly of dignitaries and clergy shouted Te Deums round the bonfire; and the bells of the churches tolled "as if for the dead." This ridiculous proceeding excited the greatest indignation. Once more the popular feeling against the clergy sought expression in satire, ribald songs, threats, insults, and actual violence. The Archbishop found it expedient to retire to Rudnic; whence two days after the burning of the books, he fulminated his excommunication against Hus and his adherents. (20) The news of the excommunication increased both the popular excitement and the royal displeasure. The King ordered the magistrates of the city to sequestrate the temporalities of the Archbishop and of those of his priests who published the excommunication in their churches. Some of the clergy were imprisoned. The Primate retaliated with a wholesale excommunication (21) of all the magistrates and officers who had been directly or indirectly concerned in executing the royal commands.

The Archbishop's exile lasted about a year. He was fond of affecting to pose as a St. Thomas of Canterbury; but he was not equal to the part, and could never sustain it for long together. He agreed that the questions in dispute between himself and the University should be referred to the arbitration of the King and his Council. The

(20) Doc. 397.

(21) Doc. 429, where there is nothing whatever to warrant the "atque interdicti contra civitatem Pragensem ambitumque duorum milliariorum" inserted by Palacky in the heading. The document contains nothing about an Interdict. Surely the Interdict spoken of in Doc. 432, and in the decision of the arbitration, p. 439 ("eos D. Archipresbipos excommunicatione liberare atque interdictum tollere debet"), is that of Doc. 378, where the Archbishop "interdictum ne verbum Dei in locis privatis civitatis Pragensis praedicetur."
arbitrators determined (22) that there should be, to use diplomatic language, a return to the status quo ante bellum. The Archbishop was to take off all ecclesiastical censures pronounced by himself, and to procure the cancelling of those imposed by the Pope; he was to report to the Pope that no heresy existed in Bohemia, and to request that all proceedings pending in the Papal Courts might be stopped. On these conditions the Archbishop and those who had obeyed him were to be restored to their benefices, and the imprisoned clerks released. Neither side fulfilled its part of the agreement. The letter which the Archbishop was to have written to the Pope, was never despatched; while on his part, he complained that the clerical revenues were still intercepted, and the popular violence still unchecked. Again he left Prague; and proceeded to the Court of the King's brother Sigismund, where he died before he could obtain an opportunity of laying his grievances before the Emperor.(23)

The Pope had referred Hus's appeal to the Cardinal Oddo of Colonna; and with it a further complaint which had been received from Bohemia, alleging that Hus had continued preaching in spite of the prohibition and had used language disrespectful to the Holy See. The Cardinal dismissed the appeal, and enjoined the Archbishop to "proceed to further measures to the bull of Alexander V.", and to excommunicate Hus and his adherents. This, as we have seen, he had already done, the appeal being treated as ab initio null and void in accordance with the terms of the bull. Moreover, Hus was cited to appear personally before the Cardinal.(24)

Alexander V. had now been succeeded by a Pope who was generally believed to have procured by bribery his election to the throne which he had rendered vacant by poison. The official letter (25) of John XXIII

(22) Doc.437. The Archbishop afterwards pretended that he did not know that the King had authorised the sequestration.

(23) It is convenient to use this term, although Sigismund was legally only King of the Romans. (24) Doc.401. (25) Doc.470.
notifying his election, must have been received in Prague about the time of the Archbishop's sentence upon Eykifl's books. Against that sentence (26) Hus, together with one Master and five Bachelors of Arts, had, a month before the excommunication, made his appeal from the Pope "male informato" to the Pope "melius informato," from the delegate of Alexander V. to John XXIII in person.

Meanwhile, the Preacher of Bethlehem Chapel remained excommunicated; but the services and sermons were continued as before.

In the life of every reformer there comes a time when some of his disciples are offended at him, and walk no more with him. Hitherto, the quarrel of Hus had been the quarrel of the University. His old tutor Stanislaus of Znaim, and his intimate friend Palec had been on his side throughout; Palec had been one of the representatives of the University in the late arbitration. An occasional dispute with an ecclesiastical superior was no more incompatible with a mediaeval ecclesiastic’s notions of canonical obedience, than a "defience" of his feudal suzerain with a mediaeval lay-man's notions of feudal subordination. But now the affair was gradually drifting from the position of a dispute within the Church into that of a hostile movement from without. It was high time for those who did not intend to be heretics to beat a retreat.

Hus' next step separated him for ever from the leading theologians of Prague. Zbynek was succeeded by the King's physician, Albič of Unicov. The Legate entrusted with the pallium of the new Primate, was also the bearer of a bull proclaiming a crusade against the Pope's rebellious vassal, Ladislaus King of Naples, who was now ravaging the Papal territories. Plenary indulgence was promised as the reward of assistance, personal or pecuniary, against the enemy of the Church.

(26) Doc. 397. The University was exempt "in all causes from all ordinary judges, even legati nati, or even delegates or sub-delegates appointed or to be appointed by the Apostolic See."
From every pulpit the virtues of the parchments were extolled. Much was said of the potency and certainty of the charm; little of the "true penitence and confession" which were formally announced as the conditions upon which its benefits were to be obtained. Hus announced that he would hold a public disputation against the Indulgences. This was perhaps a more direct defiance of ecclesiastical authority than any of which he had hitherto been guilty. Yet the difference between this step and his former proceedings is not sufficiently marked to account for a change so sudden and so complete as that which now took place in the relations between Hus and his former friends. From the time of Hus's opposition to the Pope's indulgences, the reforming Doctors became zealous champions of the Papacy, and bitter enemies of Hus; and the bitterest of all was his old friend Polec. It is reasonable to suppose that Hus must now have begun in the pulpit and in private conversation to enunciate the doctrines afterwards defended in the "Quaestio de Indulgentiis." In that case the alarm of the most liberal Catholic is easily accounted for: for those doctrines amount to a virtual negation of the value of all Indulgences and priestly absolutions whatsoever.

Stanislaus and the rest of the Doctors of the Theological Faculty prohibited the disputation. But on the day appointed, the 17th of June, 1412, Hus appeared in his "Cathedra" in the Schools, and there boldly attacked the whole fabric of Sacerdotalism. At the conclusion of the lecture, Jerome of Prague, a far more brilliant orator than Hus, harangued the crowd of students and others who were assembled in the School, and awakened in his hearers an enthusiasm which showed that public feeling in Bohemia was already ripe for a revolt against Rome. In the evening the two Reformers were escorted home in triumph by their excited supporters.

The proceedings of this day seem to anticipate that open declaration of war against the Papacy which was inaugurated with more
success a century afterwards by the burning of Leo X's bulls at Wittemberg. But there was a coarseness about the Bohemian demonstration which does not augur well for the future of the movement. A loose woman was placed in a chariot and carried round the town with the Papal bulls hung round her neck; a mob of armed townsmen and students followed the car and afterwards burned the lying parchments in revenge for the destruction of Wyclif's books.

Václav Wenzel had consented to the publication of the bull, probably from fear of Sigismund. He now enjoined the magistrates to prohibit all insults to the Pope or resistance to his bulls under pain of death. But the popular excitement was not to be suppressed by threats. When one of the indulgence-hawkers was discoursing in the accustomed strain upon the value of his wares, three young artisans in the crowd shouted out, "Thou liest! Master Hus has taught us better than that. We know it is all a lie." The culprits were seized, taken before the magistrates, and condemned to death. Hus immediately proceeded to the Council-chamber at the head of a crowd of two thousand students, and there demanded with all the eloquence of indignation the remission of the sentence. "I did it" he explained, "and I will bear the penalty. I and all who are with me are ready to receive the same sentence." The Senate (27) feared the people, and promised that the sentence should not be carried out. But no sooner had the mob dispersed, than the prisoners were hurried off to the place of execution. The affair got wind, and the officers were obliged to behead their prisoners on the road, just in time to anticipate a rescue. The criminals were treated as martyrs. Hankerchiefs were dipped in their blood; and their burial-place the Chapel of Bethlehem, was named the Chapel of the Three Saints.

The dispute between Hus and the Doctors continued. The

(27) The Senators of Old Prague, one of the three separate towns which composed the capital, were for the most part Germans, and therefore hostile to Hus and his party. It was, no doubt, this body which condemned the "three Saints."
King, while he asserted his orthodoxy by prohibiting the teaching of the doctrines on the subject of Indulgences condemned by the Faculty, consulted his own inclinations and the safety of his throne by refusing to silence his Consort's popular chaplain. When told to refute the heretic instead of trying to shut his mouth, the Doctors complained that Hua would not commit his opinions to writing. Hua offered to accept their challenge, on condition that whichever party should be vanquished in the disputation, should suffer death at the stake. The eight Doctors having seriously debated the proposal, submitted that the forfeit on their side should be the death of only one of their number. Hua refused to assent to the unequal terms. Who was to be the umpire in this strange contest, is a question which does not appear to have suggested itself to either side.

The Theologians now sought to obtain from the Holy Father that redress, or rather vengeance, which their own sovereign refused them; they sent a paid agent to Rome, one Michael de Causis, who having fled from Bohemia with a considerable amount of the King's money in his pockets, had adopted the suitable profession of a "Proctor in matters of Faith" in the Papal Courts. It would be tedious to trace the history of the suit through all its mysterious transferences from one Cardinal to another. The upshot of the matter was that the Cardinal de S. Angelo refused to dispense with a personal appearance on the part of Hua, condemned him for contumacy, confirmed the sentence of excommunication previously pronounced against him and his adherents, and added to it one of Interdict against the place of his abode. Hua's proctors, still remonstrating against the sentence were imprisoned. One of them, however, the learned civilian and canonist Josanic of Prague, managed to escape, and returned to Bohemia. There he published a treatise in which he attempted to demonstrate the canonical nullity of all the proceedings hitherto taken against Hua. But it was in vain to show that rules had been disregarded which owed their validity to the same authority which now set them aside; and Hua saw no reason to hope that he should obtain from
an assembly of Cardinals and Bishops that justice which individual Cardinals and Bishops denied him. Accordingly, towards the close of 1412, he appealed not to a General Council, but to "the only just Judge, Jesus Christ." This appeal curiously illustrates a very marked characteristic of Hus's mind, the combination of great moral fearlessness with great intellectual or theological caution. The document by which he really declares his revolt from the whole system of Sacerdotal Christianity, is worded with all the precision and formality of a legal instrument. Great moral principles and the merest technicalities appear side by side. He enumerates the causes which prevented his personal appearance at Rome, shows that the principles of Canon Law and of natural justice had alike been violated in the proceedings of the Papal Courts, and in justification of his conduct appeals to our Lord's disobedience to the Jewish Sanhedrin, and to the authority of Chrysostom, of Bishop Andrew of Prague, and Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, whom he imagines to have made similar appeals under similar circumstances.

There is one part of this document which must not be passed over. Hus states that his proctors had declared themselves "willing to oppose themselves with any one who should be willing to the punishment of fire and makes themselves parties in the Roman Court;" L'Enfant saes in these words (28) a proposal to submit the questions at issue to the decision of the Ordeal of Fire. But Hus nowhere shows any disposition to countenance popular superstitions: he believed that recent miracles were either impostures or due to the agency of evil spirits. Moreover, trials by Ordeal had long been condemned by the Church, and it is probable that the offer of his proctors was only a repetition of the challenge which he had already made in person to the eight Doctors. At all events, it is quite inconceivable that one who on all other occasions showed himself rash only when others were in danger, should seriously have

(28) L'Enfant, I, p.34. He supports this view by a reference to the case of Savonarola. Hus's temperament was, however, the very opposite of Savonarola, and the ordeal proposed in his case does not seem to have been authorised by the Pope.
proposed to remain at home while his representatives offered to be burnt on his behalf. Both Hus and his proctors must have known perfectly well that the proposal could not be accepted; it was in fact a piece of grim and solemn irony.

Meanwhile, Sunday after Sunday, within the closed doors of the Churches (29) the Apostolic cursings sounded, and the smouldering tapers were trampled under foot. While Hus remained in Prague, a cloud must hang over the city: no procession of joy or sorrow could thread its streets; no sound of church-bell, no note of music could break the gloom. The King persuaded Hus for the sake of peace to leave Prague for a while. He retired to the Castle of the friendly Lord of his native village. For a year and a half he remained in the country, staying in the castles of the nobility, and preaching at times in the villages through which he passed. In this way nobles and knights, yeomen and serfs, became personally attached to the teacher, whose name they were hereafter to inscribe upon the banner of national independence.

This was the period of Hus's literary activity. It will be more convenient to postpone the discussion of the doctrines put forward in the "De Ecclesia" and the other works written at this time, until we are able to discuss their author's theological position as a whole. For the present we must return to the position of affairs in Prague. The efforts made by the King to effect a compromise between the parties came to nothing. The King punished the obstinacy of the Theologians by banishing four of their number, among whom were Páleč and Stanislaus. (30) Hus's exile was brought to a close by a summons to give a reason for the faith that was in him before the assembled powers of Western Christendom.

(29) Divine offices were allowed to be celebrated without music and with closed doors, after all excommunicated persons had been excluded.

(30) Doc. 510. Stanislaus died before the Council of Constance.
The Council of Pisa had, at the conclusion of its deliberations determined that another General Council should assemble within five years to complete the work of reforming the Church "in its Head and Members." Sigismund demanded that the Pope should give effect to the decree of the Council. A Pontiff who owed his election to the reforming Cardinals, and who could only hope to regain his lost Italian dominions by the help of the reforming King of the Romans, could not positively refuse compliance. He tried to put off the evil day by prolonging the negotiations as to the place of meeting. At last, however, the firmness of Sigismund compelled him to agree to the convocation of a General Council, for the first time in the history of the Papacy, in a city of the Empire. Not least among the evils from which the Council was to deliver the Church, was the spread of heresy in Bohemia. Sigismund desired his brother Václav (Wenzel) to send Hus to Constance. Five years before, Hus had refused to appear in Italy in obedience to the summons of the Pope. Had he now declined to appear before the fathers of Constance, the nobles of Bohemia would have been as ready to defend him in life as they were afterwards to avenge his death. On each occasion he debated the question of conscience presented to him with singular simplicity. He was willing to die; but his imagination was not excited by the prospect of the martyr's crown. Yet when the Imperial safe-conduct was offered him, it was clearly his duty to go: although from the fact that he left a letter behind him with directions that it should not be opened till the news of his death was received, it is clear that he was far from placing implicit confidence in the protection which was promised him.

For his own part, there was nothing which Hus desired more than an opportunity of clearing himself before such an assembly from accusations which he believed to be founded on nothing but misrepresentation. Innocent of many of the heresies laid to his charge, he imagined that all the opinions which he really held were conformable to the doctrine of the Church. He was aware that worldly men had denied the evangelical truths which he preached; and he was aware that, in
those latter days, worldly men were predominant in the Church. But the Sacerdotalism which he denounced appear to him so entirely opposed to those truths, that he could not understand how any spiritually-minded man could seriously believe in the teaching of Christ and in the teaching of the indulgence-hawkers also. He had, in short, no conception of the extent to which Sacerdotalism had imposed upon the minds of good and great men. And hence, although he was far from expecting a triumph at Constance, he did not despair of an acquittal. He hoped that at all events he should find some in that assembly who had not bowed the knee to Baal; he was confident that if he were only allowed an opportunity of preaching before the Council, a minority at least of its members would come over to his side. Even after his imprisonment at Constance, these hopes were never entirely laid aside until the final refusal of the Council to grant him such a hearing as he desired.

Before taking his departure for Constance, Hus appeared once more in Prague. Even those who from their position would have seemed the least likely to favour one accused of heresy, appear to have recognised that the character of the nation was to some extent involved in the character of Jan (John) Hus; they felt that he was being betrayed by malicious enemies into the hands of foreigners who hated their nation. He was, indeed, refused admittance to the Synod then sitting: but the Synod which had opposed him so strenuously in former years, does not now seem to have taken any prominent part against him. The new Archbishop, Conrad of Vechta (31) who had been appointed to the see on account of his supposed zeal for orthodoxy, gave Hus a letter in which he stated that he had nothing to allege against him, but the fact of his excommunication. The "Inquisitor of heretical pravity," a member of the Court before which he had so boldly defended the heretic

(31) Albic of Unicow had retired from a position the difficulties of which he had found too much for him. Conrad afterwards joined the Calixtine section of the Hussites.
Nicholas of Wielčnowic, certified that having had many opportunities of conversing with him as to his theological opinions he had always found him perfectly orthodox.

He left Prague on the 11th of October, without the safe-conduct, which he did not receive till he had been three days in Constance. He was accompanied on his journey by two of his most ardent supporters, the Knights Václav (Wenzel) of Dubá and Jan (John) of Chlum, to whose protection Sigismund had confided him. He was welcomed almost with enthusiasm by the magistrates and inhabitants of many of the German towns through which he passed; even the humble parish priests, who were unaffected by the broils of the Universities, wished the heretic God-speed. Some of them told him that they had always thought as he did. The unexpected kindness which he received from the hereditary enemies of his nation, did something to inspire him with the hope that he should not find himself absolutely without a friend among the hundreds of churchmen who were now wending their way towards the Imperial City of Constance.

(32) This fact has been used by the apologists of the Council, among other equally sophistical excuses, to justify their breach of faith.
Hus reached Constance on the 3rd of November, 1414. The Pope, who had arrived three days before, sent to inform him that he had determined to relax the Interdict, the observance of which would have made the holding of the Council impossible, and the Excommunication which laymen were not likely to obey even in Constance. He was enjoined to keep away from the churches; but he continued to celebrate mass daily in a room adjoining his lodgings. He occupied himself in preparing the apologetic discourses which he hoped to be allowed to deliver before the Council. But soon after the arrival of his Bohemian enemies, headed by Páleč and Michael de Causis, his liberty came to an end. They had brought copies of his works with them; and accusations of heresy were posted on the doors of every church in Constance. Other Articles were drawn up by Gerson, the famous Chancellor of Paris. It was represented to the Cardinals that so dangerous a heretic should be deprived of a freedom which might lead to the dissemination of his errors. It was thought desirable that the contemplated violation of Sigismund's safe-conduct should take place before the arrival of that monarch. Accordingly, on Nov.28, two Bishops appeared at Hus' lodgings and invited him to follow them to the Papal palace. Chlum remonstrated with his accustomed vehemence; but there were soldiers drawn up in the street, and Hus could only obey. On arriving at the palace, they found the Cardinals assembled. Being informed that he was accused of having propagated "capital and manifest errors in Bohemia against the Catholic Church," Hus replied in the formula which he was in the habit of employing on such occasions, that he would rather die than be convicted of any heresy; and that if he were convicted of any error, he would abjure it without hesitation. It is not easy to say whether it was from a grim kind of humour or from a want of humour, that he constantly spoke as if he did not know that the word "conviction" meant one thing in his mouth, and
another in his opponents*. It is certain that such language often excited unfounded hopes in his enemies and unnecessary fears in his friends. Soon afterwards, he was told that he was to be a prisoner in the house of the Precentor of the Cathedral.

Here Hus remained for eight days under an armed guard. Then he was removed to a pestilential dungeon close to a sewer, in a Dominican convent on the Rhine. Chlum hastened to inform Sigismund of the conduct of the Cardinals. The Emperor was at first extremely angry, and threatened to break open the doors of the prison if Hus were not released. But when he arrived in Constance, he was informed that the grant of a safe-conduct to a heretic was beyond the powers of any temporal prince. In that age, the Church claimed a coercive jurisdiction, at least over the clergy, as of right, and not as a concession of the temporal power: it was only when blood was to be shed that she became fastidious about wielding the secular sword. Though he was a man of honour, and his conscience long remained ill at ease on the subject, Sigismund was a devout Churchman; and if ever superstition can be pleaded in palliation of a breach of the moral law, surely it can be pleaded on behalf of one who yields to the express commands of an authority which he believes to be infallible. That faith must not be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the Catholic faith, was and is as much a doctrine of the Roman Church(1 as the doctrine of Transubstantiation or of the Immaculate Conception. Had Sigismund delivered John Hus out of the hands of the Council, he would have deliberately proclaimed himself a heretic, and have brought about the dissolution of an assembly which was on the point of effecting that Reunion of Christendom which had been the nobles* object and the most ambitious dream of his life.

Never, indeed, since the darkness closed in around the Church,
had the prospects of Reform, to the superficial observer, appeared so fair. Never, in the whole history of the Middle Ages, was so formidable a blow aimed at the Papacy, as the deposition of a Pope by a General Council. And not only was the Papal authority declared to be inferior to the authority of the Council: it seemed as if doubts were beginning to arise in the minds of Churchmen as to the mysterious efficacy of Episcopal consecration. An assembly which attempted to go back to the traditions of the Undivided Church, listened with approval while the Cardinal of Cambrai declared that "an ignorant Bishop was a mitred ass." A crowd of courtiers whom the Pope had made Bishops of Italian villages or Eastern cities which they had never seen, had come to Constance to support their patron, by sheer force of numbers, against the attacks of Archbishops who were the equals of Princes, and Bishops who ruled in the Council-chambers of Kings. They were now told that the representatives of culture and learning were to be on a level with the descendants of the Apostles. Generals of Orders, Doctors of Divinity and of Civil and Canon Law, Proctors of absent Bishops and Proctors of Chapters, were to have equal voices with Cardinals, Bishops, and Abbots. Even lay Princes or their representatives voted on all matters not "de fide." Moreover, the Council was to be divided into four nations, and every question was to be decided by a majority of nations. The seven representatives of England enjoyed a voting power equal to that of the whole herd of Italian Prelates and Papal Chamberlains. It was determined that every matter to be brought before the Council should be discussed first by each nation separately, and then by an assembly of all the nations together. The solemn Sessions in the Cathedral, with their elaborate introductory ceremonial, merely ratified what had been already determined upon in the informal Congregations.

The Council of Constance represents the fleeting triumph of Gallicanism. But in spite of the facility which it showed in breaking with the traditions of the past, it soon became apparent that a Reform
of the Church, or even such a reform of the morals of the clergy as the Church of Rome did succeed in effecting in the seventeenth century, was as little to be expected, without strong pressure from without, of a priestly Democracy or a priestly Aristocracy, as of a priestly Absolutism. The theologians of Constance might alter the distribution of sacerdotal authority; but they were as firmly attached to the maintenance of that authority, they were as little disposed to favour any questioning of the power of the priesthood over the souls of men, as the Franciscans of that day or the Jesuits of the last century. John Hus stood as small a chance of obtaining fair treatment from the Reformers who asserted the superiority of Councils over Popes and the legislative equality of Bishops and Priests, as he would have done in the Court of a Cardinal who lived upon simony and judicial bribery in his Palace at Avignon or at Rome. Various efforts were, indeed, made to induce Hus to agree to some kind of compromise. But they were prompted by a conviction that Hus's submission in any form would have been a greater triumph for the Council than his execution. Hus never showed the smallest disposition for compromise, even where many honest men would have had no scruples in yielding. He refused to abjure even those opinions which he had never held: and he was probably not wrong in thinking that such an abjuration would have been construed into an admission that he had held them.

While Hus was a prisoner in the Dominican dungeon, the effluvia from the sewer had brought on a severe attack of fever and weakness. It was feared that the victim might die before his time; the Pope sent his own physician to attend him, and he was moved to a less noisome cell. But the misfortunes of the Pope altered his position for the worse; with the rest of the Papal retinue, the gaolers followed their master in his ignominious flight. The Emperor transferred Hus to the custody of the Bishop of the diocese, who sent him to his castle of Gottlohen, three
miles from the town. The Papal "Clerks of the Chamber" had shown their prisoner some kindness: now he was kept in chains day and night; and the hemorrhage and racking headache which the close confinement brought on, procured no relaxation in the rigour of his imprisonment.

Before his trial came on, news arrived from Prague which seriously aggravated the prejudice already existing against Hus. A zealous disciple of his, one Jacobol of Missa, Parish Priest of S. Michael's, had put himself at the head of an agitation for the restoration of lay communion in both kinds, and had actually administered the Chalice to laymen in his own church. Opinion among the Hussites was divided upon the subject; and the advice of their leader was sought for. Hus declared himself in favour of the practice in a treatise (2) which he sent to Prague. And from henceforward, the right of the laity to the Chalice became the watchword of the Bohemian Reformation. The refusal of the Cup to the laity asserted in a more ostentatious manner than any other practice of the Roman Church the spiritual inferiority of the laity to the clergy, as well as the right of the Church, not to interpret or to supplement, but to repeal the commands of Our Lord Himself. Resistance to this innovation was, therefore, peculiarly exasperating to the sacerdotal mind. Upon Hus naturally fell the odium of all that had been done by his disciples in Prague, and of much which they had not done. The most exaggerated reports were industriously circulated: it was said that the blood of Christ was carried about in flasks; that laymen administered the Sacrament to one another; that cobblers heard confessions and gave absolution.

(2) This treatise is full of quotations from the Fathers, Decretals, Acts of Councils, &c. If it was written, as is most probable, without reference to books, the retentiveness of Hus's memory, or (as some have thought) his common-place books, must have been extraordinary.
All through his imprisonment, Hus had manifested the greatest anxiety to obtain a full and free hearing before the whole Council, and especially before the Emperor. It was with the greatest difficulty that he succeeded in obtaining a hearing at all. Two commissions (3) were successively appointed for the preliminary investigation of the case. At first, indeed, it was intended that the Council should act solely on the report of the last of these commissions; but, though he explained what his opinions were, Hus declined to defend them except before the Council itself; and the Bohemian nobles induced the Emperor to promise that he should not be condemned unheard. Accordingly, on the 6th of June, he was brought back to the city, and confined in a Franciscan Convent. In the refectory of this Convent, on three successive days, he appeared before "an assembly of all the nations."

The first of these congregations was on the 6th of June, 1415. The Fathers were proceeding with the case in the absence of the prisoner; but Hus's friends hastened to inform Sigismond, who sent orders that he should be allowed to appear. He was accordingly brought up from his cell. Copies of his books were placed on a table before him, and he admitted the authorship of them. Then the reading of the Articles began. What followed may be told in the quaint language of L'Enfant's translator: "They had scarce made an end of the first with the Evidences supporting it, when so terrible a noise arose, that the Fathers could not hear one another, much less the answers of John Hus. When the clamour was a little over, John Hus, offering to defend himself by the authority of the Scriptures and the Fathers, was interrupted as if he spoke nothing to the purpose, and they set upon him with reproach and banter."(4) The behaviour of this congregation was so disgraceful that its more moderate members interfered, and succeeded in carrying an adjournment till the next day.

(3) One appointed by the Pope, the other by the Council, after his flight
At the second hearing, a certain amount of decency was ensured by the presence of the King of the Romans, who had been prevailed upon to attend by the Bohemian nobles. The first charge examined was the alleged denial of Transubstantiation. Hus could with justice maintain that he fully believed in Transubstantiation; and he believed it on the strength of that realistic dogma of the *accidenta sine substantia*, which had once been almost as much a part of the orthodox creed as the doctrine itself. But now Gallicanism, and consequently Nominalism - the doctrine of the once suspected Abelard, was completely in the ascendant. To the Cardinal d'Ailly and his friends it seemed that a Realist could not consistently believe a doctrine which as a formal Article of Faith owed its existence to an extravagance of Realism. He began to browbeat the Bohemian Master with questions about his views on the *universale a parte rei* and similar scholastic pedantries. The good sense of an Englishman put a stop to this irrelevant discussion; he declared that the Council ought to be satisfied with Hus's assurances on the subject. *L'Enfant* thinks that his advice was taken, and that this was one of the two Articles which were expunged from the accusation. Then he was questioned about his defence of the forty-five Articles of Wyclif; his views as to the voluntary character of tithes; his Appeal to Christ; his sympathy with Wyclif; the part he had taken against the Germans in the matter of the three votes, and the part he was supposed to have taken in procuring the banishment of the four Bohemian Doctors. Lastly he was reproached with having asserted that he had come to Constance voluntarily. This brought up the honest Knight of Chlum. "Though I am one of the meanest Lords in Bohemia," he exclaimed, "I would undertake to defend him for a twelve-month against the forces of the Emperor and the King." It must have been a surprise, if not a shock, to the judges whose minds had been so completely predisposed to expect thorough-going Wyclifism on the part of Hus, when in a written reply he positively and unequivocally rejected thirty-three of the forty-five Articles with a curt, "I have not held it
and do not now hold it." In regard to another three Articles, he asserted that he neither affirmed nor denied them; one of these he limited to the first half of the proposition. Only in connection with nine Articles did Hus reply that they might be understood in an orthodox, acceptable meaning and explained, after properly qualifying the meaning, in what sense he would be willing to hold them. But since all the forty-five Articles had been already condemned, Hus by implication was guilty on account of the nine Articles he held, although he did not defend the particular interpretation given them.

This was not a convenient "accommodation" on the part of Hus in an effort to save himself. That it represented his real opinions held prior to his imprisonment may be seen from his famous "Defensio quorundam articulorum Ioannis Vvicleff" (6) delivered before the University late in July, 1412. There Hus defended only six Articles out of the forty-five, namely, the fourteenth and the fifteenth, the former asserting that those "who cease to preach or to hear the word of God... for the fear of the excommunication of men, are already excommunicate"; and the latter, "that it is lawful for any deacon or presbyter to preach the word of God without the authority of the Apostolic See, or of a Catholic Bishop..." Besides, Hus defended the seventeenth Article, which asserted the right of temporal lords to deprive "habitually delinquent" clerics of temporal possessions; the eighteenth Article, declaring tithes to be pure alma; the sixteenth Article, declaring that "no man is a civil lord, a bishop, or a prelate whilst he is in mortal sin" (in the sense that no one is so "worthily and justly"); and finally the fourth Article, "that if a bishop or a priest be in mortal sin, he doth not ordain, consecrate the elements, nor baptize." (7)

(5) V.Flajšah: "Obrany v Kostnici" (Defence in Constance).

(6) "Historia et Monumenta," I, 111 ff.

(7) "Historia et Monumenta," I, 11-134.
Of Wyclif's nine Articles dealing with his teaching regarding the Papal Office (viii, ix, xxviii, xxx, xxxiii, xxxvi, xxxvii, xl, xlii) not a single one was defended by Hus. This is significant as implying his rejection of them. At about the same time, Hus wrote an outline of his defence, in which he enumerated seven Articles of the forty-five which he was willing to accept. I will point them out later, when all the forty-five will be dealt with, but it is to be noted that his denials in Constance coincided with those previously publicly avowed, except for the thirty-third Article, which he "dared neither to deny nor to affirm."

Hus was not a blind and indiscriminating follower of Wyclif. He clearly formulated his attitude towards the English Reformer when he answered the accusation of one of the witnesses, who deposed that he had heard Hus preach in the Bethlehem Chapel that, "he would not take a chapel-full of gold in order to renounce the words and the way of Wyclif." To this Hus answered, "Here the liar confounds a lie with truth. For I said that I would not take a chapel-full of gold in order to renounce the truth which I had learned from Wyclif's words, but I did not say, Wyclif's way. For whatever truth was propounded by Wyclif, that I accept, not because it is Wyclif's way but because it is Christ's truth."

In the final formulation of the charges, presented to Hus on 18th June, 1415, one of the depositions of witnesses affirmed that "John Hus was in the said city of Prague a constant follower, friend, advocate and defender of the errors of John Wyclif, quondam archheretic, and was held, named and considered as such in the city and the neighbouring territories."

(9) Palachy: "Documenta", 184.
To this Hus answered point blank: "It is not true, although some of my enemies have regarded me as such." (10)

In view of the foregoing, although it is not possible to treat the matter exhaustively, at least the major specific differences in the theological concepts of the Czech and the English Reformers must be considered. In this we shall follow the order of the forty-five Articles, from which all the quotations are taken. (11) But it must be understood that it is not implied that these Articles accurately summarise Wyclif's teaching, but only that they were so accepted by the Council and that consequently Hus was judged on that basis.

In the first place, Hus categorically repudiated the first three Articles dealing with Wyclif's denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation. According to them, Wyclif affirmed "that the substance of material bread and wine doth remain in the sacrament of the altar after consecration," and "that the 'accidents' do not remain without the 'subject' in the sacrament after consecration," and that "Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar identically, truly and really in His proper corporeal person." (12) Hus never adopted Wyclif's deductions, which were based upon a thoroughgoing application of philosophical realism to the doctrine of transubstantiation, and which resulted in a concept fairly closely resembling Luther's "consubstantiation." (13) He consistently held tenets which he understood to be the orthodox dogmas of the sacraments and which he regarded just as consistently as Augustine to be necessary to the process of sanctification, even when salvation in the last analysis depends upon predestination. As for the sacrament of the altar, he rejected both Wyclif's teaching of remission and the quite current popular view that the priest "makes

---

(10) Ibid., 230.
     Quellen, 220-33.
The crudeness of the popular concept against which Hus protested may be judged from his description of it in "The Exposition of the Faith?"

"From these testimonies you may see how foolishly and erroneously those priests speak who say: 'We can create God or God's body whenever we desire.' As if they were creators of their Creator, although all together they could not create a single fly!....for the Mother of God gave birth to his body but once, but a priest may create it many times and whenever he wishes."(14)

Hus held that the real presence was to be understood in a sacramental sense, and that the material bread and wine were transubstantiated into a sacramental entity. As has already been stated, in his De corpore Christi he had the temerity to point out by implication, that the Archbishop Zbýněk's official notice, forbidding the teaching of the Wyclifite doctrine of remanence, erred in the opposite direction, by forbidding the use of the word "bread" as applied to the consecrated host.(15) Hus held that it was perfectly correct to speak of sacramental bread - panis super-substantialis - but not of material bread.

That Hus held the orthodox view of the eucharist to the end is witnessed by a small tract entitled, "Concerning the most holy sacrifice of the altar," written by him in the Constance prison for the instruction, and at the request, of his jailer, Robert. In this elementary treatise he defines the sacrament as follows:-

"Further one should believe that both a good and an evil priest holding the right faith regarding the holy sacrament and having the intention to act in accordance with the command of Christ, and repeating at the mass the words instituted by the church, transsubstitiates, that is, by the power of the words, he effects that under the form of bread there is the true body of Christ; and similarly, by his office he effects that there is the true blood of Christ. I say 'by his office he effects,' namely, that as a servant of Christ he effects by the words and power of Christ what Christ effects by his own words and power, transsubstantiating the bread into his body and the wine into his blood."(16)

Had the fathers of the Council been disposed to credit Hus's statements regarding the sacrament of the altar, they could have found no great fault with them. The official dogma, formulated by the Fourth Lateran Council just two hundred years before (1215), defined the eucharist to the effect that Christ's "body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the form of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into body and the wine into blood, by divine power." (17)

Accordingly, Hus was in full and unequivocal agreement with the official definition that the bread and the wine are changed, transubstantiated, into the body and the blood of Christ as far as their substance is concerned, although the accidents outwardly retain the appearance of bread and wine. Hence, Hus's view was wholly orthodox. Nevertheless, he was charged in the final redaction of the Articles (xxv) with repudiating the condemnation of all the Articles regarding remanence. Thus the Council persisted in making him a Wyclifite in spite of himself.

The radical teaching of Wyclif, by which the sacerdotal system of the church was totally undermined, namely, "that if a bishop or a priest be in mortal sin, he doth not ordain, consecrate the elements, nor baptize,"(18) was likewise rejected by Hus in that particular, absolute form. He replied to it: "I do not know where it is to be found. It is correct in the sense, as the saints assert, that (such a cleric) does not ordain, transubstantiate, and consecrate worthily; but otherwise, even the worst priest does so, for God performs it through him."(19) This fully agrees with his previously expressed statements, made even during the heat of his controversy with the Palec party. In 1413 he wrote in one of his sermons:

(17) Kirbt: Quellen, 179.
(18) Ibid, 229.
"It may be and often is that although the bishop is wicked, yet he who with good intention and order piously receives consecration from him, receives a gift of the Holy Spirit. Not from the bishop but from a higher one than he, Christ, who consecrates his faithful. Likewise when a wicked priest baptizes or grants absolution, a man of good intentions receives the Holy Spirit from Christ through the act of the wicked priest." (20)

Thus Hus held to the orthodox Catholic view, asserted by Augustine in his struggle with the Donatists, that the validity of the sacraments does not depend upon the personal character of the officiating priest. But in his reforming zeal he also stressed the view that a bishop or a priest in mortal sin does not perform his functions worthily, and hence ministers to his own condemnation. (21) Being an unworthy prelate or priest, he is in reality not a true member of the church, and hence not a true prelate or priest. Nevertheless, his acts are not thereby invalidated. It was the adverb "worthily" which made all the difference between the position of Wyclif and Hus. And by ignoring this important modification, the Council persisted in misjudging Hus' true view. As against Hus, Stephen Fáleč claimed that an evil priest not only administers valid sacraments, but administers them worthily, and hence is a worthy servant of the church. (22)

In regard to the fifth Article, that, "It hath no foundation in the Gospel that Christ did ordain the mass," Hus replied: "I do not know where it is recorded. It is correct in the sense that Christ did not appoint the service of the mass in the Gospels, but he gave the priests the possibility of celebrating it." As to the sixth Article, "that God ought to obey the devil," Hus curtly and categorically answered: "It is false." The seventh Article read: "If a man be duly contrite all outward confession is for him superfluous and unnecessary." This Hus countered by: "I do not know where it is recorded. I do not and never have held it, but I read the contrary in

---

(20) "Postil", Sobrané spisy, I, 140.
(21) "De declinis" in Historia et Monumenta, I, 134.
(22) Fybal: Jan Hus, II, 213.
the Gospel: 'Jesus was descending from the mountain....'"

A great deal of emphasis has been placed upon Hus' antipapalism, which has been commonly identified with that of Wyclif. It is perfectly true that in comparison with the rest of the relatively moderate, conservative tenets of Hus, his views of the office of the papacy were radical. But it must be borne in mind that Hus protested primarily against the excesses of the papalist theory, the ultramontanism and papal infallibilism of the time.

"They likewise blaspheme who assert that the Pope cannot err, and that men should obey him in all things, and that he can send whomsoever he wishes to heaven or to hell. For such power belongs to God alone. They likewise blaspheme who say that the Pope is an earthly god, who may do whatever he pleases on earth, and who may rule all men as he pleases; and those who say that he may set up another law against God's law or rightfully issue commands which are contrary to those of the holy apostles. They likewise say that no one on earth should speak against him, no matter what he does."(23)

It was such extravagant papalism that Hus opposed.

But, for that matter, the whole age - the age of the Great Schism - was necessarily critical of the papacy. In fact, the Council of Constance was rigorous with Hus in order to avoid being charged with antipapalism and doctrinal laxity. For the conciliar principle - that the general council is superior to the pope - was essentially antipapal. It is highly significant that out of the final thirty articles on the basis of which Hus was condemned in the fifteenth session of the Council on 6th July, 1415, twenty-two deal with these concerning the church and the papal office. Nevertheless, Hus as usual, kept clear of Wyclif's overstatements and extremism. He denied the eighth Article of the forty-five Theses, which stated that, "if the pope, according to the divine foreknowledge, be an evil man, and consequently a member of the devil, he hath no power over the faithful of Christ given to him by any,

(23) Erben: "Concerning Simony" in "Sebrané Spisy, I, 392."
unions, peradventure, by the Emperor." He likewise rejected the next Article: "That after Urban VI, none other is to be received as Pope, but that Christendom ought to live after the manner of the Greeks under its own laws." (24) The commend of Hus to the first proposition was: "I do not and never have hold it, but affirm that even the worst Pope has the power, by virtue of his office, through which God acts, according to Matthew XXIII: 'On the seats of Moses, etc.'" To the ninth Article he replied: "I have never hold it and do not now hold it, since I have acknowledged as Popes, Boniface, Innocent, Gregory, Alexander and the present Pope, John XXIII." (25) Like Wyclif, Hus argued that the only real title to the papal office is worthiness of character. "Hence any pope is called apostolic so far as he teaches the doctrine of the apostles and follows them in works. But, if he puts the teaching of the apostles aside, teaching in word and works what is contrary then he is properly called pseudo-apostolic or an apostate." (26) "If his (the Pope's) life be contrary to the life of Jesus Christ, he is Christ's adversary, even though he hold the place and office of Christ." Accordingly, even the Pope is a sinful man, particularly venially, but may sin mortally. If he lives well to the end, he shall be saved; but if evilly, he shall be damned." (27) But unlike Wyclif, Hus made an important distinction between the papal office and the pope's character. He asserted that no matter how unworthy as to character a pope might be, he was still legally a pope as far as his office was concerned, and as such obedience was due to him in all things lawful. But unless he be among the predestinate, he did not truly and worthily hold his office, was not truly "a successor of Peter," for he was not in reality even a member of the true church - that is the company of the predestinate - despite the fact that

(25) Plajáhans: "Obrany." II.
he might hold the highest office in the Roman Church. Hus cited the example of fifteen popes whom he regarded as unworthy of their office, although he did not deny the validity of their jurisdiction as far as their office was concerned. Nevertheless, despite Hus's assertions to the contrary, the unmodified Wyclifite version (although not in the identical words of these viii and ix, for it rather follows article xxxvii) was inserted into the final charges against him (articles xii and xiii), and he was condemned to death for what he had never taught. The most curious part of the matter is that this same Council deposed three popes, it declared one of them, John XXIII, "to be guilty of simony and a waster of the goods of the church both in things spiritual and temporal," and described his character, "as a scandal to all Christendom." (29)

Furthermore, the thirty-seventh Article affirmed that "the Roman Church is the synagogue of Satan, and the pope is not the immediate and nearest vicar of Christ and the apostles." To this Hus replied: "I have never held it and do not now hold it, for I have written the contrary in the treatise 'De ecclesia.'" Similarly, the fortieth Article, asserted that "the election of the pope by the cardinals was instituted by the devil." Hus catagorically repudiated it.

This matter is closely connected with the concept of the Church held by Hus, which is very similar to that of Wyclif, although ultimately both concepts are essentially Augustinian. Against his opponents, Stanislav of Znojmo and Stephen Páleč, who had put forth the exaggerated thesis, condemned by implication by the Council of Constance, that the Pope is the head of the church and the cardinals its body. (30) Hus defined the true church as the totality of the predestinate. This then, was the true universal, catholic church, of which Christ alone was the

(30) "Responsio ad scripta Magistri Stanislai de Znoyma, doct. Theologio" in "Historia et Monumenta", I, 266.
the head, while the predestinate formed its body. The church which existed at the time, the church militant, was composed of both the predestinate and the foreknown - sheep and goats, saints and sinners. Of this church militant the Roman church was part, and it was of this latter church that the pope was the head - either worthily or otherwise. The Council refused to allow the distinctions made by Hus, and condemned him (Arts. i, iii, v, vii, x, xi, xii, xxviii) as if he had denied the authority, or the very existence, of the Roman church - and consequently the authority of the Council which claimed to represent that church.

The distinction made by Hus between the true, universal church - the totality of the predestinate - and the Roman church, did not imply that he refused to acknowledge the authority of the Roman church or repudiated obedience to it. As he expressed the matter in "De ecclesia," "obedience should be rendered the pope and cardinals so long as they teach the truth according to God's law." "But if...popes and cardinals charge or admonish anything besides the truth, even though the whole Roman curia is on their side the faithful is not to obey when he knows the truth."(31) In his letter to John XXIII, dated 1st September, 1411, Hus had asserted his obedience in clear and unmistakable terms.(32)

Knowing the reforming zeal of Hus and his invectives against the money-grubbing, avaricious clergy and monks, it is instructive to observe the moderate position taken by him in regard to Wyclif's radical demand of "apostolic poverty." The tenth Article of the forty-five theses asserted that "it is contrary to Holy Scriptures that ecclesiastical persons should have temporal possessions." Hus rejected it, saying "I have never held it and do not now hold it, but adhere in this matter to the opinion of St. Augustine, Jerome, Gregory and other saints." The

(32) Novotny: Korospondence, No. 31, p. 95.
thirty-second Article piled Pelion on Casa by affirming that "To enrich
clergy is against the rule of Christ." Hus responded: "I have never
hold it and do not now hold it, for the clergy may hold possessions
properly, if they do not abuse them." Furthermore, the thirty-third
Article asserted: "Pope Sylvester and Emperor Constantine erred in
endowing the church." Hus returned a cautious answer saying: (I dare
neither to affirm nor to deny it, for both could have sinned saying)
"I dare neither to affirm nor to deny it, for both could have sinned
venially, the latter in giving and the former in receiving." The
thirty-sixth Article again attacked the riches of the pope by asserting:
"The pope with all his clergy possessing property, are heretics because in
they own property - as well as all who agree with them, that is, the
temporal lords and other laymen." Again, Hus unequivocally countered
with an approach to a sarcastic repartee: "I have never held it and do
not now hold it, for I myself possess property."

There is similarly an important difference between Hus and
Wyclif in the matter of property holding in general. The fifteenth
Article stated that "No man is a civil lord, a bishop, or prelate, whilst
he is in mortal sin." To this Hus replied: "According to the opinion
of St. Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, Chrysostom, Remigius, and
Gratian, this sentence possesses a correct sense, that is, that no one
is such worthily, although he is such according to his office." Thus a
lord - civil or ecclesiastical - sinning mortally retained his office and
possessions before men, but before God he was not entitled to them. This
thesis had been plainly stated as early as 1412. (33) In his last
reply on 10th June, 1415, Hus reiterated his affirmation in this properly
modified form. Nevertheless, the unmodified thesis was retained in the
final redaction of the charges (art.xxx) (34), and Hus was condemned on

(33) Novotny: Korrespondence, No. 43, pp.124-25; also "Historia et
Monumenta", I, 134. "Nullus est dignus et iustus civilis Dominus, dum est
in precato mortali."
(34) Kirbt: Quellen, 231.
the basis of this tenet which he had never held.

Very offensive to the prelates was the sixteenth Article affirming that "temporal lords may at will withdraw their temporal goods from ecclesiastics habitually delinquent." In this very delicate matter a modification or softening of Hus's earlier opinion may be discerned: in 1412 he had affirmed Wyclif's thesis unequivocally. (35) In his exceedingly earnest and even polemical treatise, "Concerning Simony", completed early in 1413, he had again advocated secular supervision over the clergy as far as an unworthy use of their endowments was concerned. Simony should be suppressed, by right and in the first place, by the pope. But alas! "it would indeed be a mighty miracle if such a pope should now appear; I am certain that his apostles would not let him live long!" (36) Failing the papacy, secular princes and lords should uproot the evil. The most effective method is the confiscation of superfluous temporalities, and restriction of the income of the clergy to the necessities of living. "For as fire ever burns and consumes as long as there is anything to consume, so the devil's fire ever burns in the entire world into which it is cast as long as it has something to feed on." In the third place, the church authorities should withhold benefices from simoniac clerics. Hus had defended the proposals by citing examples from the Old and New Testaments. No wonder that such radical remedies seemed to the anti-reformists as worse than the disease! But at Constance Hus temporised saying: "I neither affirm nor deny it, for it may possess a correct meaning." On this point Hus might have honestly changed his mind. At any rate, it need not be interpreted as impugning the character of Hus, for after all he did not deny the thesis!

As for the functions and prerogatives of the clergy and the prelates, the eleventh thesis asserted as Wyclif's teaching that "No

(35) Novotný: Korespondence, No. 43.

(36) Erben: Sebrané spisy, V.200-201.
prelate ought to excommunicate any man except he first know him to be excommunicated by God; and he who doth so excommunicate is thereby himself a heretic or excommunicated." Hus replied discriminatingly, asserting that "The first part of the thesis seems correct, for no prelate should excommunicate anyone except for a mortal sin, as is asserted in the canon law."

The twelfth Article asserted: "A bishop excommunicating a cleric who hath appealed to the king or to the council of the realm in so doing is a traitor to God, the king, and the realm." Hus categorically repudiated the assertion: "I have never held it, do not now hold it, and do not believe that it is correct."

To the following thesis, "They who cease to preach or to hear the word of God or the preached gospel, for fear of the excommunication of men, are already excommunicate, and in the day of judgment shall be held traitors to God." Hus assented with qualifications. Pointing out that he had adhered to the conciliar principle as affirmed by the Council of Pisa sooner than the Archbishop Zbyněk did, Hus replied diplomatically: "This might possess a correct meaning. For it happened to me that on account of my renunciation of obedience to Gregory, the Archbishop of Prague, forbade me to preach and to conduct services. But I continued to preach, and disregarded his excommunication."

The fourteenth thesis affirmed: "It is lawful for any deacon or presbyter to preach the word of God without the authority of the Apostolic See or of a Catholic bishop." Hus replied saying: "This may possess a correct meaning; namely, that in times of great need it may be permitted that a deacon or priest preach without any special authorisation."

As for the validity of ecclesiastical functions and regulations the eighteenth Article asserted that "tithes are pure alms, and that parishioners may, on account of the sins of their prelates, detain them
and bestow them on others at pleasure." Hus gave in this instance a somewhat evasive answer, saying: "As for the first part, I dare neither to deny nor to affirm it; but I deny the second part." But there can be no doubt that previously Hus unequivocally called tithes alms. In his Postil of 1413 he wrote in one of the sermons:

"And although they rejected (the article) that tithes are truly alms, still since they live on tithes, they are almoners, although they do not wish to be called so; for they did not secure them (the tithes) by inheritance, nor did they win them in a game of dice, unless some bought the benefice from the pope or someone else and thus came by it in such a way. Nevertheless, tithes are alms given for the sake of souls for God's praise. Accordingly, they are called "the soul-pay" (zadušni). Moreover, when anyone wishes to withhold the tithes, they complain, lament, cry, and preach that they are being deprived and stripped of their poor'soul-pay! But when no one interferes, then they call it rule! The devil's lords! When are they called to earthly rule by Christ?"(37)

The seventeenth Article affirmed that "the common people may at will correct delinquent lords." Hus answered that, "If the term 'correct' is to be understood as 'kindly counsel', according to Matthew VIII: 'If a brother sin, etc.,' then it may possess a correct meaning."

The bellicose fulminations and tirades of Wyclif denouncing the laziness and cupidity of the monks and friars, are well known. Quite a number of articles of the forty-five theses deal with this matter. Only a few samples are here cited as illustrations of this class of charges.

Thus the thirty-fourth Article states that "all members of the mendicant orders are heretics and those who give them alms are excommunicated." To this Hus replied: "I have never held it and do not hold it, for I trust that they are good Christians, and I myself often gave them alms and concerned myself about contributions to them." The thirty-fifth Article asserts: "Whoever enters religious life or an order, is thereby diabled to observe the commandments of God; consequently he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, unless he abandon them." There is a note of mistrust of the monastic vocation in Hus's reply: "I have never held it nor do I hold it now, although for some it is perhaps more difficult to keep the rules

(37) Ibid, VI, 77-78.
then to observe the general law of Christ." The forty-fourth Article
goes so far as to affirm: "Augustine, Benedict and Bernard are damned
unless they repented on account of possessing property and of having founded
orders and having joined them; accordingly, from the pope to the least
monk, all are heretics." This was easy for Hus to refute; he said, "I
have never held it nor do I hold it now; indeed, I regard St. Augustine
especially as a great and holy doctor of the church."

In addition to these tenets enumerated in the forty-five
theses, Hus differed from Wyclif even in the all-important matter of the
authority of the Scriptures. The latter held them to be the sole and
absolute rule in matters of faith and conduct. Accordingly, he rejected
all tradition, and adhered to the patristic teaching only so far as it was
in accordance with the Scriptures. Thus since God's commands were
explained "sufficientissime" in the holy Scriptures, men owed obedience to
them alone. (38) Consequently, all human ordinances, civil and
ecclesiastical, not contained in the "lex evangelica" are superfluous and
wicked. (39)

Again Hus had no part in the radicalism of Wyclif. Páleš
in his Antihus, charged him with the rejection of all ecclesiastical
authority on the ground that Hus held to the Wyclifite tenet of "sola
Scriptura". From this he concluded that Hus rejected everything which
was not found in the Scriptures. On the other hand Páleš affirmed that
the authority of the Roman curia was absolute, and all its pronouncements
were in conformity with the Scriptures. (40) This charge was repeated
in his Tractatus gloriosus, in which Hus was accused of being of the
"Armenian sect" which was said to adhere only to the Scriptures and to
reject all other authority.

Hus differed from Wyclif, in the first place, in distinguishing

(38) De civili dominio, I, ch.33, p.379.
(39) Ibid, 399.
between the degrees of inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, in
favour of the latter. Furthermore, he summarily denied Páloc's accusation.
He stated that he acknowledged as his judges beside the Scriptures, also
"God, the apostles, the holy doctors of the church, and the catholic
church." (41) Thus Hus accepted tradition as the secondary source of
dogmatic and canonical authority, but definitely subordinated it to the
Scriptures. Specifically, Hus acknowledged the authority of the apostolic
tradition, of the creeds, the writings of the doctors of the church,
particularly of Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Athanasius,
Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, and John Chrysostom. Besides these,
he often quoted such theologians of repute as Bernard of Clairvaux, Anselm,
Thomas Aquinas, and Peter Lombard. Moreover, Hus accepted as authoritative
the decisions of general councils. He was ready to submit to the decision
of the Council of Constance, and came to attend its meeting voluntarily.

On the other hand, Hus denied that the pope, or anyone else
had the right to define or order anything without, or contrary to, the
Scriptural warrant, as for instance in the case of the papal indulgence
bull. In such a case every Christian, layman or cleric, had the right,
may even the duty, to disobey the order on the ground that God must be
obeyed rather than man. Likewise, in the matter of Wyclif's rejection
of all civil and ecclesiastical bans as "superfluous", Hus adhered to the
sober and moderate middle ground. He recognised the validity of civil
and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, provided it were not in conflict with, or
directly contrary to, the Scriptural precepts. (43)

To present every step of the trial in detail would be tedious.
That the various charges against Hus, assembled for the most part by his
known enemies such as Stephen Páloc and Michael de Causis, were often
baseless lies or statements wrenched and distorted from their original

(41) Ibid, II, 60 ff.
(43) Ibid, II, 368.
meaning, may be gathered from the fact that the successive commissions eliminated a great many of such accusations from the later lists. After the flight of Pope John XXIII from Constance, following his deposition on 29th May, the trial of Hus entered upon a new phase, for the papal commission had thereby lost its jurisdiction. Had the Emperor wished, he could now have freed Hus. But instead, he turned him over to the Council, which appointed its own commission.

The ultimate formulation of the charges comprised twenty-nine theses, (44) which were based largely on the writings of Hus, especially his De ecclesia, and the polemical works against Stephen Paleč and Stanislav. Besides, there were sixteen other charges compiled largely by Michael de Causis from the testimonies of various witnesses,(45) most of which had been disproved by Hus long before. Paleč had excerpted thirty-four such charges from De ecclesia, but the commission reduced these to eleven, although it added twenty-eight other theses considered heretical.

The forty-five theses of Wyclif do not figure prominently among these last charges, although some few, even those which Hus had rejected or had properly delimited as to their meaning at the very beginning of the investigation were retained among them. Such were the twentieth Article, which corresponds essentially to the eighth Article of the forty-five theses, and the thirtieth Article, which is identical with the fifteenth article of the latter. There are, of course, many others reminiscent of Wyclif's articles. Since Wyclif and his forty-five theses, as well as two hundred and sixty additional ones, had been solemnly condemned in the session of 4th May, the two articles with which Hus was charged were ipso facto incriminating - except that he did not really hold them in the sense in which they had been condemned. Hus added to these charges explanatory remarks which, had the commission been willing to consider them, would have materially changed their meaning. Thirteen of the sixteen of these

(45) Palacký: Documenta, 225-234.
accusations were based upon "testimonies of witnesses." Hus summarily rejected them with a curt, "It is not true." Of the remaining three, he acknowledged only one as wholly true - the "crime" of appealing to Pope Alexander. When these final charges, expanded to thirty by the division of the article twenty into two separate articles, had been read to him in the session of the Council on the very day of the execution - 6th July - Hus again wished to explain which ones he repudiated and in what sense he held the others. But he was not permitted to speak. Both the president, Cardinal d'Ailly, and the reader, Cardinal Zabarella, ordered him to keep silent.

The tragic character of the trial cannot be understood without a clear realisation of the contradictory conception, held by Hus and the Council, of the nature of the trial. Hus agreed to go to the Council not as one accused, but as a free Christian desiring to present his views before the assembled representatives of the Christian church in order to receive correction on the basis of the Scriptures, if he had erred in anything. In this sense Hus was willing, and repeatedly affirmed his willingness, not to defend any view stubbornly, but to abandon every position proved contrary to the Scriptures. Long before, he had defined heresy as an "erroneous doctrine contrary to the holy Scriptures and stubbornly defended." To the last he pleaded with the commission and the Council to be shown wherein the Articles which he acknowledged as his own were contrary to the Scriptures. The Council, on the other hand, never dreamed of arguing with an accused heretic - for such Hus was held to be - for the purpose of convincing him of his error. It claimed to be the supreme tribunal in the Christian church, and its judgments were binding on all members of the church, from the popes to the least layman. It was a special concession granted to Hus that he had been allowed public

(47) "Concerning Simony," in Sobrané spisy, V, 140.
(48) Kirbt: Quellen, 228.
hearings at all; a concession grudgingly made to Emperor Sigismund, who on his part then ceased pressing the claims of his "safe conduct" which he had granted to Hus. That the leaders of the Council never really meant to live up to their promise to grant the Czech Reformer a free hearing is evident from the fact that even on the first of these occasions the sentence had been drawn up even before the hearing began.

Nothing can better illustrate this fundamental difference between the points of view of the Council and Hus than the record of the most reliable of the eye-witnesses of the trial, a devoted adherent of the Czech Reformer, Peter of Mádonovič. He describes one of the scenes at the Council after a public hearing given to Hus, when Cardinal d'Ailly attempted by earnest exhortation to secure Hus' recantation:

"Master John! Behold, you have two paths before you, from which you may choose one; either that you submit completely and altogether to the mercy and into the hands of the Council, that whatever disposition the Council should make of you, therewith you rest satisfied. The Council, from respect of the Roman King here present, and of his brother the King of Bohemia, and for your own good, shall deal kindly and lovingly with you. Or if you still desire to hold and defend some of the previously mentioned theses, and wish for another hearing, it shall be granted you. But consider that there are present here famous and brilliant men, doctors and masters, who have such strong arguments against your theses that it must be feared lest you become entangled in still greater errors if you should hold and defend these theses. I advise you, and do not speak as a judge." And others added: 'Indeed, Master John, it were better for you to submit yourself completely to the mercy of the Council, as the Lord Cardinal says, and to hold nothing stubbornly.'

And the master bending his head, replied with humility: 'Most reverend fathers! I came here freely not that I should stubbornly defend any views, but that if I had presented some view not quite properly or faultily, I might submit humbly to the instruction of the Council. But I pray for God's sake that I be granted hearing for the exposition of my meaning and of the writings of holy doctors regarding the theses which are laid to my charge. And if my proofs and those of the writings should prove insufficient, I am willing to submit humbly to the Council.'

Thereupon instantly many shouted, saying: 'Behold, he speaks with reservations and stubbornly. He is willing to submit to the instruction of the Council, but not its correction and decision.'

He then answered: 'Yes, to the instruction, correction, and decision of the Council I am willing to submit. God is my witness that I speak sincerely, not with reservations.'

Thereupon the Cardinal of Cambrai said to him: 'Master John! Since you are willing to throw yourself on the mercy of the Council and to
submit to Its instruction, then know that the instruction to you by at least sixty doctors (of whom some have already left and those from Paris have just come), without any demur and by the command and order of the Council, is as follows: that, first of all, you humbly acknowledge the error of those theses which you have hitherto held; secondly, that you recant those theses, and swear that you shall never again hold, preach, or teach them; third, that you publicly renounce and reject those theses; and fourth that you expound, profess, and teach the opposite of what you have held, written, and preached (as was here proved against you).

Then Master John, among many other things, discussed and brought out here and there, said: 'Most reverent father! I am ready humbly to obey the Council and to receive instruction. But I implore for God's sake that you do not lay before me traps of damnation, that I be not forced to lie, and to recant those theses about which - God and my conscience are my witnesses - nothing is known to me. The witnesses bear testimony against me about matters that have never entered my mind, especially that after the consecration material bread remains in the sacrament of the altar. Those, however, of which I know and which I have incorporated in my books, I am willing - after receiving instruction to the contrary - humbly to recant. But if I should recant all the theses charged against me, of which many, God knows, are falsely ascribed to me, I should prepare for myself by lying a trap of damnation. For 'to recant', as I remember having read in the Catholicon, is to renounce an error previously held. But since many of the theses were ascribed to me which I have never held and which have never even entered my mind, it seems to be against my conscience that I should recant them and to lie.' (49)

It is in the light of this understanding that the conduct of Hus must be viewed. Although the Council was governed by a policy of expediency, as may be seen from the astonishing fact that the fourteenth session was convoked in the name of Pope Gregory XII who had been deposed by the Council of Pisa, because this was one of the conditions stipulated by Gregory as the sine qua non of his abdication, and the Council accepted it despite the fact that it thereby logically and legally undermined its own bases of authority, yet in the case of Hus the Council felt that its authority must be asserted. Nevertheless, on its part, it in the end went so far as to offer Hus a compromise, a delimited form of recantation. Hus was to renounce on oath such theses as had been selected from his books, and such portions of the testimonies of the witnesses, as he had acknowledged to be accurately reported. As for the testimony of the witnesses the truth of which he had denied, he was to swear that he did not hold them and

(49) Petor of Vlodonovic: "Relatio de Mag. Joannis Hus causa" (Palacky Documenta), 303-309.
never would. (50) But even this extreme concession was not acceptable
to Hus, who in response referred to the final declaration of his principles
offered to the representatives of the Council on July 1st. This brief
declaration is of the greatest importance for the comprehension of the
issues involved, and is as follows:

"I, John Hus, in hope a priest of Jesus Christ, fearing to
offend God and to commit perjury, am not willing to abjure all or any
of the theses which were brought against me in the testimonies of the
false witnesses. For as God is my witness, I have never preached them,
nor asserted them, nor defended them, as they said that I had defended,
preached, and asserted them.

Furthermore, regarding the articles taken from my books, at
least those correctly abstracted, I say that whichever of them contains
an incorrect meaning, that I reject. But fearing to offend against the
truth, and to speak against the statements of saints, I am not willing
to abjure any of them. And if it were possible that my voice might
be heard throughout the world, as every lie and every sin of mine shall
be revealed at the day of judgment, most gladly would I recant every
falsehood and every error before all the world which I taught, imagined,
or expressed.

This I say and write freely and voluntarily.
Written by my own hand on the first day of July." (51)

Accordingly, Hus could not recant what he had never held,
for to him "recantation" implied the previous holding of such views. On
the other hand, he could not recant the theses which had been taken from
his books, even those he had acknowledged to have been correctly formulated,
unless he were convinced by the commission with proofs from the Scriptures
that they were erroneous. In that case he was willing to recant them.
Without such a proof to their erroneous nature, to recant involved a
betrayal of the truth. His conscience was too sensitive to permit him to
do it. He who had written: "Therefore, O faithful Christian, search for
truth, hear truth, learn truth, love truth, speak the truth, hold the
truth till death," (52) could not now himself deny the truth in order to
save his life. In other words, the Council insisted on judging what was
wrong as it seemed proper to it, and then demanded that Hus submit

(50) Novotný: Jan Hus, II, 452.
(51) Novotný: Korespondence, No. 162, p.333.
unconditionally to this judgment, whether or not he were convinced of its correctness. From the Council's promises, that is, as being the highest tribunal in Christendom, this position was justifiable; granting the presuppositions of Hus, it follows that he could not act otherwise than he did unless he betrayed his convictions. That is the tragedy of the trial of Hus.

Consequently, nothing remained for the Council to do but to condemn Hus to death as an incorrigible heretic.

II.

It is sufficiently clear from the foregoing that even in the most important tenets of Wyclif, Hus differed essentially from the latter, and always in the direction of moderation and conservatism. We are, accordingly, now in a position to give an answer to the question raised at the beginning of this study or research as to the degree of dependence of Hus upon Wyclif. It is evident that the Council's condemnation of Hus as a Wyclifite did not rest upon a foundation of verified and proved facts; the majority of the charges were repudiated by Hus as either wholly contrary to his beliefs and tenets, or as couched in a garbled form which distorted his meaning. Since in accordance with the usages of the time a man accused of heresy was not held innocent until he was proved guilty, and his self-defense was discounted in advance as unworthy of credence, the trial of Hus was not conducted in accordance with the fair and equitable rules which we moderns expect in connection with a process of law. As this investigation has shown, Hus was not guilty of holding the great majority of charges upon which he was condemned to death. Accordingly, he was executed unjustly.

But if the Council put Hus to death as a heretic, and if all the Wyclifite charges ascribed to him could not be sustained had Hus received what in our modern notion passes for a fair trial, then it follows that those historians who concur with the Council in regarding Hus
as a thoroughgoing Wyclifite err in this judgment. Hus may in reality be described as a medieval scholastic of the "leftist" orientation, as Kybal had characterised him, (53) or still better, as the best representative of the Czech reform movement. That is why his ideas agree essentially with those of his reformist predecessors, even though he goes beyond them, and despite the fact that he often expresses them in the language of Wyclif. For the same reason, Hus's chief interest lay in moral reform, rather than in ecclesiastical revolt or in theological speculation. Accordingly, his essential characteristics are not of the Wyclifite, but of the native, reform movement.

Nevertheless, if the Council condemned Hus for many "Heresies" he did not actually hold, it must be admitted that it sensed the direction which the consequences of the premises of Hus would take. For that reason, it would be a grave mistake to let the matter rest with the judgment expressed above; for there are certain elements in the presuppositions and convictions of Hus which logically and inevitably lead to the subversion of the very foundations of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical structure and doctrine. It would be an error to regard Hus merely as a medieval scholastic. There are two sides to him, which could be loosely designated as Catholic and Protestant, as was the case with Augustine. There were elements implicit in Hus's teaching which the Reformation made explicit. These elements were characteristic of the principles of the Protestant Reformation. Hus was doubtless quite unconscious of the ultimate conclusions which must be in course of time inevitably drawn from his principles. For that matter, the church, too, was not fully aware of the full scope of their implications. The Council of Trent was clear as to the consequences of these views, and defined its positions accordingly.

(53) Kybal: Jan Hus, II, 37.
But to affirm that these views of Hus contributed to the principles of the Reformation does not imply the fallacious doctrine of "post hoc, ergo propter hoc." Nothing would be more misleading than to affirm that Luther received his ideas from Hus, who in turn had derived them from Wyclif. The familiar representation of the torch being passed on from Wyclif, through Hus, to Luther, makes a pretty picture, but is hardly to be taken as a strictly critical portrayal of historical truth. Moreover, Luther went considerably beyond Hus in his rejection of the orthodox Catholic system of doctrine. All that is here attempted is to point out which of the tenets of Hus tended, under the stress of later developments, to contribute to the process of differentiation which in the end resulted in that schism within western Christendom known as the Reformation.

What, then, were the implicit elements in the tenets of Hus which, in their explicit, developed form, culminated in, and contributed to, the Protestant Reformation? First of all, the biblicism of Hus clearly manifested this tendency. As has already been pointed out, Hus did not hold the doctrine of "sola Scriptura", but when the inevitable conflict between the authority of the church and the Scriptures flared up, Hus's view was unmistakable on the side of the latter. This may be seen from the fact that the Taborites - admittedly an extreme group among the Hussites - and the Unity of Czech Brethren, acknowledged the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith and practice. On the other hand, the Utraquists did not go beyond Hus in this matter. Nevertheless, the step which Hus himself refused to take, was in the end taken by others who were to a considerable degree under the influence of Hussitism.

His definition of the church as the totality of the predestinate was contrary to the tendency which ultimately led to the affirmation of papal infallibility. The Protestant Reformation, therefore, found support in Hus for its definition of the church and its
rejection of the whole system of papalism. If one's salvation ultimately rested upon the divine predestination - the inscrutable and sovereign will of God, as both Luther and Calvin asserted - the visible church ceased to be central in the scheme of salvation.

The predestinarian tenet of Hus likewise logically led to the undermining of the sacramental and sacerdotal systems of the Roman church. Since salvation ultimately derived from the fact of divine election, the whole system of sacraments and all other external aids to salvation were not fundamental or primary, as the later Reformers, with varying degrees of consistency, brought out in their teachings. Although this was not clearly realised by Hus himself, yet in the end the implication of his position became apparent.

Hus's insistence that no man should obey his ecclesiastical superior, even the pope, unless his commands be in conformity with the Scriptures, was in line with the later Protestant idea of the priesthood of all believers. The startling insistence on the use of reason foreshadowed the Age of Reason, and made for Protestant individualism which was essentially destructive of ecclesiastical authority. Hus's own noble protest against the blind submission of one's conscience to the dictates of ecclesiastical authority clearly implied the assumption of essential freedom of conscience which in his case took the form of the affirmation that one must obey God rather than man. His insistence at the Council that he could not submit to its fiat unless he be first convinced of its truth by proofs from the Scriptures or arguments from reason, forecast the implicit principles of the Reformation and even went beyond them. At any rate, such a position clearly differentiated him from all the previous medievalists, and linked him with modern men. This feature of Hus's religious view is of the very essence of the modern religious conception for it affirmed that external authority has no place in the realm of truth. Life of the spirit is essentially free.
But above all, it was the heroic example and the moral earnestness of the Czech Reformer which constitute his most potent influence. The Czech Reformation always stressed the quality of life, ethical conduct, rather than abstract thought. Hus also stressed conscience, rather than intellect. It was his moral courage, enabling him to stand alone against the judgment of the supreme tribunal of the Church, which marked him as great. It was his devoted search for truth, his stern moral emphasis, his zeal for reform, his sterling character, and his insistence upon personal responsibility in matters of religion which secured for him the influence which he has enjoyed ever since.
JOHN HUS LETTER TO THE INHABITANTS OF PRAGUE.

May God be with you! I conjure you, dearly-beloved to attach yourselves to the cause of the Lord; for several endeavour to stifle the word, and to take away from you the Gospel of Christ, which I have preached unto you, in order to turn men from their salvation. Reflect, in the second place, on the slights and outrages which your nation inflicts on you - which hypocrites wickedly excite against you; think of the infamies and insults heaped upon you; in a word, support all things with joy and patience.

If Satan insults you, if Antichrist hold you in derision, he cannot harm you more than a dog tied-up, as long as you love the Word of God and defend it with all your power. Look at me! Satan has persecuted me for some years past, but he has not been able to do me any harm, because I trust in God. I will even say more, God strengthens in me every day joy and contentment. Remember also, that to deny a thing, is to abjure what one believes, be it the true faith or a heresy. If a man is a Christian, and if through fear or death or persecution, and seduced by the wiles of the demon, he join the sects of Jews and Pagans, and declares on oath that he does not wish to be a Christian, he denies the true faith.

But if another has adopted a heresy; if, for example, he does not believe Jesus Christ to be God; if in the end he abjures this opinion, it cannot be said of him that he persists in his error. Acknowledging, therefore, how much he sins who denies the truth, when he has once come to a knowledge of it, or who adheres to error or heresy, and esteeming more than all things, and live in Charity with all men. Wrestle courageously against the imposture of Antichrist, having with you your Saviour, who strengthens you, and whom no one can vanquish. He will not forsake you, if you do not forsake him; but will bestow on all the faithful who believe in him, their eternal reward.

I wrote these things, not being able to come to you in person.

Constance 1415.
UNTO ALL FAITHFUL CZECHS.

Master John Hus, a servant of God in hope, unto all faithful Czechs who love and will love the Lord God he uttereth his desire that the Lord may vouchsafe it unto them to prevail in His Grace until their end, and to prevail in heavenly joy for ever and ever, Amen. Ye faithful and ye in God's grace, rich and poor, I entreat and admonish you to hearken unto the Lord God, to extol His Word, and gladly to hear and fulfil it. I entreat you, as touching the truth of God, the which I did write from the Law of God, and did preach and write from the utterances of the Saints, that ye cleave fast to it. I likewise entreat any whoseover heard from me in my preaching or privily, aught against the truth of God, or if I did anywhere write any such thing - the which, in God's name, I trust is not - that he keep not to it. I likewise entreat any who beheld in me wanton usage in talking or in deeds, that he keep not to them, but that for my sake he ask God to vouchsafe me forgiveness. I entreat you to beware of the crafty, concerning whom the Saviour saith that they are in sheep's clothing, but within are ravening wolves. I entreat the lords to show mercy unto the poor, and to be righteous towards them. I entreat artisans to perform their labour and enjoy it righteously. I entreat the servants to serve their masters and mistresses faithfully. I entreat teachers that, leading godly lives they may instruct their pulpits faithfully; foremost in order that they may love God, that they may study for His praise and for the weal of the community and for their own salvation; but not for covetousness or for worldly glorification. I entreat the students and other pupils to hearken unto their masters and to follow them in what is good, and to learn diligently for God's praise and for the salvation of themselves and others....I have written this letter to you in prison in chains, awaiting on the morrow to be condemned to death, having full hope in God, that I may not disavow what the false witnesses have witnessed against me as errors. In what gracious manner the Lord God acteth unto me, and is with me amid sore temptations, ye shall know when we meet in God's presence in joy with His good help....I likewise entreat you to love one another and
to suffer not the good to be oppressed by violence, and to grant truth unto all.

Written on the 10th June, 1415.
JOHN HUS LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF BOHEMIA.

May the grace and peace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you, so that being delivered from sin, you may walk in grace, increase in modesty and virtue, and enjoy after this life, life eternal.

My well beloved, I conjure you all who live according to God's law, disdain not to occupy yourselves with the salvation of souls: be careful, when listening to the word of God, that you are not deceived by false apostles, who do not condemn sins, but who excuse them; they flatter the priests: they do not show to the people their transgressions: they glorify themselves, extol their works, and exalt their own virtue; but they deign not to imitate Jesus Christ in his humility, in his poverty, in his cross, in his sufferings. It is of them our merciful Saviour said - "False Christs and false prophets shall rise, and deceive many" and to warn his elect against them he said to them, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves; ye shall know them by their fruits." And truly the followers of Christ have the greatest need to be prudent and careful; for the Saviour has said, "Insomuch that if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect." Watch, therefore, my beloved, through fear of falling into the snares of Satan. It is necessary you should be more circumspect in proportion as Antichrist places in your way greater obstacles. The last judgment is nigh, death will swallow up many, but the Kingdom of God is waiting for his elect, since for them to deliver up his body. Fear not death; love one another; and endeavour, without ceasing, to understand the will of God. Let the terrible and formidable day of judgment be present ever before your eyes, for fear that you may sin, think also of the joys of eternal life, to which all your efforts should be directed; think also of the passion of our Saviour that you may bear with humility all things with Him and for Him for if you bear in mind His sufferings and His cross nothing will appear too rigorous for you; you will accept
without murmuring, tribulations, calumnies, outrages, chains, and should it be required, you will not hesitate to lay down your life for the holy truth. Know, dearly beloved, that Antichrist has recourse, in his rage against you, to diverse persecution; but he has been powerless against a great number; he has not been able even to remove a single hair from their heads; learn to know him by my example, although he is violently irritated against me. Wherefore, I conjure you all to intercede for me in your prayers at the throne of God, that He may grant me wisdom, mildness, patience, as well as strength, to keep always in the heaven by truth. It is that which has already conducted me to Constance; and during the whole journey I have publicly and openly declared my name, as become a servant of God. Nowhere did I conceal myself; but in no place have I found more dangerous or declared enemies than in this city; and I should not have had them for adversaries; if some Bohemian imposters, for the money which they had received, and seduced by avarice, had not persuaded them that I mislead the people from the good way. But I have good hope of the mercies of our Saviour and your prayers that I shall persevere until death in the inimitable truth of our Heavenly Father.

Know lastly, that everyone here has his duty assigned him; I alone am neglected. It is the Pope who has regulated everything here. I recommend myself to our sweet Lord Jesus Christ, to the true God, to the Son of the Virgin Mary, who ransomed us by a bitter death, and not through our merits, from eternal punishment, from the power of the devil and sin.

Written at Constance in January, 1415.
"On Transubstantiation," says Dean Milman, "(notwithstanding the subtleties of his adversaries), the Communion in one kind, worship of the Saints and of the Virgin Mary, Hus was scrupulously, unimpeachably orthodox."(1) Thus far Dean Milman's judgment upon Hus's theological position may be upon the whole accepted, though perhaps not without some reservation.(2)

As to the Communion in one kind, it is true that Hus was orthodox, if by that is meant that he accepted the doctrine of Concomitance.(3) But he distinctly supports the practice of lay communion in both kinds, as desirable if not obligatory. (4) To speak of the "Worship of the Saints and of the Virgin," is to use language which few Romanists would recognise as a correct description of the practices

(1) "Latin Christianity", Bk.XIII, chap. IX.

(2) Hus accepted the orthodox formula as to Transubstantiation on the strength of the dogma of the accidens sine substantia. The Realists held that there was a "substance" in every class of things represented by a generic name which made that thing what it was, apart from the qualities perceived by the senses, which were called "accidents" of the thing. After consecration, the "substance" of the host was the "substance" of the Body and Blood of Christ, but the "accidents" - powers of affecting the taste, touch and sight - remained those of the bread and wine. Hus adhered rigidly to this doctrine, and hence disapproved of many of the popular expressions which were used with regard to the consecrated bread. He objected to its being said that the Body of Christ was tasted or handled or seen. He refused, though required to do so by his Diocesan, to give up applying the term "bread" to the host after consecration, on the ground that the word "this" in the words of institution could only mean "this bread." In his assertions of the dogma, he constantly uses such qualifications as these: "Sufficit multia sanctis credere et sufficit indoctis et simplicibus Christianis in sacramento christi," "sacramentaliter," "sacramentaliter," in sacramentali mysterio." De Caecna Domini, Opera, vol.I, fol.39. All these expressions show that his views were far removed from the grossness of the popular view of Transubstantiation. He dwelt little upon the miraculous aspect of the Sacrament, which to his adversaries was everything - far less than many Anglican upholders of the doctrine of the Real Presence; much upon its commemorative value.

(3) In this respect he was once able to retaliate the charge of heresy upon his Diocesan, who had directed his clergy to preach that after consecration "nothing but the body of the Lord remains in the bread, and nothing but the blood of the Lord in the wine." - See the "Ordo Procedendi" drawn up by Hus in Palacky's "Documenta."

(4) Fol. 42.
of their Church. The intercession of Saints and of the Virgin, Hus firmly believed in: and in his letters he prays for that intercession. He attached considerable importance to the doctrine of a Treasury of Merits, though he denied the power of Pope or Bishop to make any one a participant in those merits. He held that it was better to help the "sleeping church" in Purgatory by adding to the sum of the good works of the Church (which in his view meant holiness of life, and not Masses or "whole Psalters"), than to pray for its deliverance. The most important practical measure of Reform which Hus urged upon the clergy of his day, was the abolition of the thirty Requiem and other lucrative superstitions with which the obsequies of all but the very poor were celebrated. His teaching as to prayers for the dead is, if anything, rather in advance of Wyclif's position than behind it. He declares that "neither the Prophets, nor Christ and his Apostles, nor the saints who lived just after their time, explicitly taught men to pray for the dead; but they taught the people very earnestly that he who lived without fault was a holy man." At the same time Hus did not absolutely condemn prayers for the dead, although he thought it better that they should be offered on behalf of all the dead than for any particular person. He held that every Mass was "a sacrifice for the living and the dead;" but he unequivocally condemned all the mediæval superstitions which had gathered about this undeniably ancient, although post-apostolical, doctrine. He held that no Masses should be said specially for one dead person; he attached no value to the mere number of Masses said, and he held that it was simoniacal for a priest to take money for saying them. It is curious to observe how in his hands a belief in Purgatory becomes positively an argument against Sacerdotal pretensions: he condemned the Indulgences granted in favour of the dead.

(5) Fol.148, 149. The Virgin is there called the "reparatrix humani generis et porta coeli...Sine ejus suffragio impossibile est salvari aliquam peccatorem." - Quoted by L'Enfant, I, p.434.
(7) Opera, II, fol.111, b.
as well as of the living by John XXIII., on the ground that such Indulgences would dispense with the necessity of purgatorial probation. (8) In this as in other cases he rejects Romish doctrines just where they favour Sacerdotal pretensions, or, at all events, just where Sacerdotal pretensions become immoral.

He was, indeed, completely under the thraldom of the theory which erects an eternal, impassable barrier between the Priest and the layman. He adhered to the traditional distinction between the Evangelical Precepts and the Evangelical Counsels. Matthias of Janow had, however, taught him that the calling of the Parish Priest was higher than that of the Monk or the Friar. Yet he shrank from the assertion of Eyclif and of Nicholas of Welesnovic, that it was lawful for all men to preach the Gospel, because he imagined that that would imply that it was obligatory upon all men to preach the Gospel. He contented himself with placing the Priesthood in the position which the popular Theology of the day assigned to the Regulars: for them the Evangelical counsels were precepts; they were bound, others were only encouraged, to aim at "perfection."

His view of the obligation of the Priesthood to obey the Evangelical counsels in all the strictness of the letter, led him into a kind of Quakerism. He taught that the clergy might not under any circumstances engage in war, or in litigation for temporal matters, or take an oath. (9) We have alluded to his defence of Nicholas of Welesnovic, who refused to take an oath before the Inquisition. And he acted upon the same principle himself by refusing to make answer upon oath, though required to do so by the Archbishop, to the Articles exhibited against him in 1409. (10)

(8) Opera, I, fol. 185 a.
(9) Questio de Indulgentiis, cap. 11., fol. 186-9, a.
(10) "Ad quos respondi... sine juramento." These answers, according to Palacky, were made just before his departure for Constance.
But the very point on which Hus is most sacerdotal, - his doctrine as to the obligation of the Clergy, and of them only, to obey the Law of Christ in all its strictness, - was the foundation of his anti-hierarchical doctrines. The powers and rights of the Priest were, as he held, so indefeasibly theirs that a Priest "living according to the law of Christ, and having a knowledge of the Scripture," might not lawfully cease from preaching or administering the Sacraments, in obedience to the commands of any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever. He ascribes the origin of the Papacy solely to the supposed donation of Constantine: (11) he declares that at some future time the Church may be ruled without a Pope or Cardinals, as was actually the case during the first three hundred years of its existence. He denies, in short, as an historical fact, the Primacy of S. Peter, and the *jus divinum* of the primacy of his successors. The commands of the Pope are only to be obeyed when in the judgment of the person commanded they are in accordance with the law of Christ. "The faithful disciple of Christ," he says, "is bound to consider whence a command given by the Pope is derived (*quomodo emanat*), - whether it is expressly the command of any Apostle, or of the law of Christ, or has its foundation in the law of Christ; and when he has satisfied himself of that, he is bound reverently and humbly to obey a command of this kind. If, however, he truly satisfies himself that the command of the Pope is contrary to a command of Christ, or tends in any way to the hurt of the Church, then he is bound boldly to resist it, less he be a participator in the crime by consent." (12)

The power of Bishops Hus does seem to place upon a somewhat higher footing than that of the Pope. But the Apostolical succession would seem in his estimation to confer upon them no power whatsoever except

(11) 221 a., 225 a. - Hus does sometimes appear to recognise the divine origin of the Papacy, but he does so merely in the sense in which he would have said that secular authorities derive their power from God. He followed Wyclif in holding that secular as well as ecclesiastical authorities had no power when in mortal sin.

(12) Fol. 236 a.
that of conveying Orders. He sets exactly the same limits to the duty of canonical obedience in the case of Bishops as he does to the Papal supremacy. A Bishop in mortal sin is no Bishop. His commands are only to be obeyed when they are in accordance with the law of Christ, and the inferior is bound to examine them before he obeys them.(13)

Hus entirely denies both to Bishops and Clergy what may be called destructive powers. That excommunication which shuts a man off "from participation in the favour of God, from a worthy participation of the Sacraments, and from a participation in the prayers which prepare for eternal life" can only be pronounced when the Bishop knows by special revelation (14) that the offender is already excommunicated by God. And he nowhere implies that such revelations were to be expected. Practically, the only excommunication which he recognises is "the public exclusion from the conversation of Christians by the sentence of a spiritual or secular judge;" and this is only to be pronounced as a punishment for mortal sin. In short, he makes excommunication a purely temporal penalty, and it is to be disregarded when unjustly imposed.

On Absolution his doctrine is much the same. No priest ought to pronounce unconditional absolution, unless he knows by special revelation that the penitent is absolved by God. "Wherefore," he says, "the wise priests of Christ do not assert simply that the person confessing is loosed from his sins, but only under the condition, 'If he is sorry, and will sin no more, or has faith in the mercy of God, and will henceforward observe the commandments of God.'"(15)

We hope that we have already shown sufficient grounds for rejecting the conclusion of Helm, that the heresy of John Hus "has never been clearly defined,"(16) and that it did not consist in "any of those tenets of belief rejected afterwards by the German and English Reforms."

(13) Fol. 239.
(14) De Ecclesia, XXII.
(15) Fol. clxxv. 6 ad fin., and clxxvi, a.
It is perfectly true that "he was the martyr to the power of the hierarchy," but that was because he had denied the powers of the hierarchy; and a belief in those powers was as essential a part, as it was, in our estimation, by far the most dangerous part of the Roman Creed.

But whatever may have been his opinions upon other points, there is one matter in which he is absolutely, unhesitatingly, a Protestant: in which he is opposed to the teaching of the whole of the Roman Church. He denies the claim of any man, or any body of men, to Infallibility. He will own no authority in matters of Faith but Holy Scripture: neither Fathers, nor Popes, nor General Councils. In so far as the Reformation was an assertion of the right of Private Judgment, Hus asserted it as fully and as clearly as any of the German Reformers. He expressly denies that any man, or any body of men, has a right to tell another what he is to believe: and he denies that it is lawful for any man thus to believe a doctrine upon the authority of another, or to say that he believes it when he does not. If this be not Protestantism, the word has no meaning.

But in spite of the clearness with which he assets the right and the duty of Private Judgment, he certainly believed that his doctrinal system was as a matter of fact in perfect harmony with the teaching of the Fathers, and of the Popes and Councils of the Western Church until within a comparatively recent period. His Patristic learning was vast. But in reading the Fathers, his attention was fixed exclusively upon the Evangelical side of their writings: he entirely ignores that side of their teaching which supports the claims of authority. It is difficult to fix the exact period from which he would have dated the corruption of the Church's doctrine. For he was a consummate debater; and his knowledge of ecclesiastical history was very remarkable for those times. He was thus constantly able to quote the decretals of earlier Popes against those of their successors, of earlier Councils against later Councils; he delighted in refuting the claims of the Popes out of their own mouths. The Decretals, the Extravagants, the Canon Law, all furnish him with weapons against the
claims of the authority which they were intended to support. But although
in some of these citations he is certainly ironical, although sometimes
he uses his authorities merely as argumenta ad hominem, he does not seem
to have been aware to what an extent the right of Private Judgment had been
denied, or how indissolubly the whole Church-system of the Middle Ages was
bound up with those views of Hierarchical authority and of the Infallibility
of the Church which he rejected. He does not seem to have realised that
Doctors for whom he had the greatest respect, such as S. Cyprian, or Pope
Gregory, or S. Bernard, would have rejected with indignation the claim of an
individual priest to interpret Scripture for himself. Those writers who,
apparently with a view of aggravating the guilt of his judges in putting
him to death, have pronounced that Hus was an orthodox Catholic according
to the notions of his time, seem to have been content to accept his
undoubted belief in his own orthodoxy as a sufficient refutation of the
charge of heresy. But the very fact that he should have maintained that
he was orthodox and the Council unorthodox, shows that his mind was so
wholly uncatholic in its bent, that he really did not know what orthodoxy
meant.

From the point of view of the individual conscience, Hus was,
as we have said, quite clear in his assertion of the right and even the
duty of private judgment. And to a very considerable extent he maintained
also what we may call the political right of Liberty of Conscience. The
whole tenour of his protests against the ill-treatment of good and hard-
working priests on account of opinions which in some cases he admitted to
be erroneous, leaves upon the mind the impression that he means to condemn
all persecution on account of opinion. He constantly urges that those who
accuse others of error, should refute and convince, instead of trying to
suppress them. But when asked at Constance what was to be done with
heretics who were deaf to all argument, he admitted that they must be
punished in the body — he does not say burned to death.(17) If an answer

made under such circumstances is to be taken as representing the settled opinion of the speaker, we may at all events feel sure that he would have interpreted the term "Heretic" liberally. Although he could not quite get rid of the mediaeval notion which made Heresy a crime or worse than a crime; yet in his own works the term is more often applied to unlawful and immoral practices, such as simony, than to diversities of doctrine. The fact is that the toleration which he demanded was a toleration by the Church as well as by the State. He would have been beyond his age indeed if he had seen that it might be right for the State to allow the public preaching of one whom the Church might rightly condemn. His advocacy of Toleration sprang not from any abstract conclusion of political science, not from what is called in modern times liberality of mind, but from the breadth of his Christian sympathies. He wished not that those whom he denounced as heretics should be suffered to live, but that the Christian Church should include all whose lives were the lives of Christians. In this respect he shows a largeness of heart which contrasts very favourably with the temper of most of the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century.

The great work of John Hus was to make a protest on behalf of the rights of Conscience. The most marked characteristic of his mind and of his character was an intense, an unsurpassed conscientiousness. This conscientiousness, this scrupulous sincerity, was the source of all his Protestantism. The key-note of his Theology and of his life is sounded in the title of one of his works, the treatise "On the sufficiency of the law of Christ." The Gospel was to him primarily a law, a rule of life; his great aim was to find out what was the will of Christ upon the smallest details of his own life and of the lives of his flock. On their purely contemplative or speculative side he was ready to accept the traditional beliefs of his age, or those beliefs modified by that Augustinianism which was as the life-blood of the sound part of the Mediaeval Church. With doctrines which did not directly affect practice, such as Transubstantiation and Purgatory, he had no quarrel. The power of binding and loosing, the power of giving and withholding the body of Christ, he did not in the
ababstract deny to the Clergy; but the moment such doctrines were so understood as to involve — and in an age in which Balthasar Cossa could be a Pope and Abdike of Unicow an Archbishop, they inevitably did involve at every turn — the calling of evil good and good evil, Hus was at war with them. This practical, pastoral bent of his mind saved him at once from the mediaeval danger of Mysticism, and from the Protestant danger of Dogmatism. It constituted his great excellence as a religious teacher; but it constituted also the weakness of his position as a Reformer.

John Hus was indeed a Protestant before Protestantism, rather than a Reformer before the Reformation. He viewed the corruptions of the Church too much from the point of view of the pulpit, — it may almost be said of the confessional. It was in this respect that he most conspicuously fell behind Wyclif. The abolition of the Papal supremacy, of religious orders, of monasteries, of the enforced celibacy of the clergy, of Latin services, of Chantires and endowments for Masses, — all these measures Wyclif saw to be necessary conditions of any permanent Reform. Hus denounced the abuses and the erroneous doctrines connected with these institutions, instead of demanding the abolition of the institutions with which they were indissolubly bound up. From the want of a definite plan of Reform, such as he might have bequeathed to them, the Bohemian nation agreeing in nothing but in reverence for his name, speedily became split up into two factions; one of which demanded reforms too moderate to be effectual, and too moderate to be lasting; while the other drifted into extravagances almost as wild, if not as immoral, as those of the Anabaptists of the succeeding century. When we consider the enormous influence which he wielded during his lifetime and the devotion which his memory inspired after his death, we cannot help feeling that had Hus possessed something of the political common-sense of Wyclif, the result of the Bohemian Reformation might have been very different to what it was. It is melancholy to reflect that a nation which has perhaps suffered more in defence of religious and political liberty than any other
in Europe, should have been a province of the Austrian Empire, covered with the hideous Pagan temples which attest the triumph of Jesuitism, (18) the most immoral development of that religion against the immorality of which Hus protested. They have laboured, and others have entered into their labours.

Wyclif was, as we have seen, a more thorough, a more violent but also a more statesmanlike reformer than John Hus. He was more conscious than Hus of the antagonism in which his principles stood to those of the Medieeval Church, and saw more clearly the necessity for vigorous legislative reform as well as for a revival of religious life. But in one important matter, both of them belonged to the age which was passing away, and not to the generation which was to prepare the way for the movement which was to carry out what Hus had begun. At the Council of Constance the disciples of the Angelical Doctor and the Master of the Sentences sat side by side with men who are still celebrated for the elegance of their Latinity or for the re-discovery of forgotten Classics.

Hus and Wyclif were schoolmen. Both of them, indeed, are still remembered as champions of their native languages; and both of them preached and wrote powerfully in them when they were addressing themselves to the populace. But their minds were thoroughly in bondage to Scholasticism; when they wrote for the learned, they wrote in syllogisms. Wyclif's more logical mind saw through the absurdity of the *accidens sine substantia*, with which Hus was perfectly satisfied; but both Hus's defence and Wyclif's denial of Transubstantiation were alike based upon scholastic grounds. A rebellion against Philosophy, as it was then understood, was as necessary for the emancipation of human thought as a rebellion against Sacerdotalism. When the Reformation came, Philosophy was its foe; Literature was its friend. The sympathies of Wyclif, Hus, and Jerome of Prague were with the decaying Scholasticism of the Middle Ages, and not with the dawning Revival of Letters.

(18) Almost every Gothic Church in Bohemia was destroyed in the troubles of the Hussite wars.
There were standing by the fires in which Hus and Jerome perished, men who most unconsciously were to do something to set forward the cause for which they died. Poggio and Aeneas Sylvius have left us accounts of the constancy of their deaths. The tone in which they write shows how very cold Faith was to become in the age which was yet an indispensable preparation for the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Aeneas Sylvius says: "We don't find that any of the philosophers ever suffered death with so much courage as they endured the fire." (19) Poggio is similarly reminded, not of the saints of Christianity, but of the heroes of Paganism. He calls the account of Jerome's death "a History so much like to those of Antiquity. Mutius Scaevola did not express more constancy when he saw his arm burnt than Jerome did at the sight of his whole body in the flames." (20) The South of Europe had to go through a period of revived Paganism before the North could produce men who should unite the enthusiasm of Hus and Jerome with the scholarship and literary culture of Aeneas Sylvius and Poggio.

The deficiencies of John Hus as a Reformer were the noblest testimony to the beauty of his character as a man. He was unconscious of the fact that he was playing a great part in history. He possessed an extraordinary gift of inspiring strong personal affection in those with whom he was brought into contact; yet he knew not what power he wielded. He possessed few of those qualities which are generally necessary to secure the applause of multitudes. He was eloquent, but less so than his far less respected associate Jerome of Prague. He possessed none of Wyclif's bitter, keen satirical power, or of the rough, hearty humour of Luther; he was, we should gather, habitually serious, though not stern. (21)

(21) The following character is given of him by the Jesuit Balbinius: "He was more subtle than eloquent; but the modesty and severity of his manners, his unpolished austere and entirely blameless life, his pale thin visage, his good nature and affability to all, even to the meanest persons, were more persuasive than the greatest eloquence." *L'Enfant*: Vol.1, p.24.
There was in him nothing of the braggadocio of the Puritan; nothing, on the other hand, of the ostentatious humility of the Mediaeval Saint. Few men who have enjoyed so much popularity, and that the dangerous popularity of a religious leader, have been so absolutely free from affection. His life was devoted to the assertion of a great principle which had been obscured for centuries: he thought that he was asserting a principle in defence of which good men of all ages would have gladly died. He behaved at Constance as one who was falling a victim to the malice of personal enemies, as one who grieved at being misunderstood; not as one who rejoiced, with a lawful pride, at being accounted worthy to die for a great cause. Few Reformers have been less violent even in words; hardly was he betrayed, even by a righteous indignation into a single word or action which his mature judgment would have condemned; yet he became the national hero of a people whose ferocity in religious warfare stands unexampled in the history of Christendom. No man was ever less of a demagogue, no man was ever more gentle or more humble; yet it may be doubted whether a whole people ever conceived such an enthusiastic affection for one who was so worthy of it.
Jerome was the knight-errant of the Hussite movement, whose restless activity spread its influence far and wide. Sprung from a noble family, he represented the alliance between Hus and the Bohemian aristocracy. He studied at Prague, Heidelberg, Cologne, Paris and Oxford, and wandered over Europe in quest of adventure. He was imprisoned as a heretic at Vienna (1) and only escaped through the intervention of his noble friends and of the University of Prague. Dr. Alzogs says of Jerome, that in some of the cities of Europe, Heidelberg, Paris, Pesth, Jerome created much disturbance by his skilful defence and ardent advocacy of the doctrines of Kyclif and Hus. (2) He had dreamed of a reconciliation between the Bohemian reformers and the Greek Church.

Returning again to Prague, he (Jerome) learned of the imprisonment of his friend Hus, and resolving to be near him, though Hus asked him not to come to Constance(3) he arrived, secretly and in disguise, at Constance on 4th April, 1415, and on 7th April posted on the Church door a request for a safe conduct, (4) saying that he was willing to appear before the Council and answer for his opinions. On 17th April, the Council cited him to appear within fifteen days, giving him a safe conduct against violence, but announcing their intention of proceeding legally against him. Jerome, already repenting of his rashness, judged it wiser to return to Prague, but was recognised when close to the Bohemian frontier, at Hirachau, was made prisoner and was sent back to Constance, where he arrived on 23rd May. He was led in chains by his captor to the Franciscan Monastery, where a general congregation of the Council was sitting. Jerome was asked why he had not appeared in answer to the citation and answered that he had not received it in time to do so. He waited for some time, but had turned his face homeward in despair before

(1) Von der Hardt, 638.
(2) Alzogs: Hist. - Univ. (Reut.)
(3) "Letters", 182.
it was issued. Angry cries arose on every side, for Jerome's keen
tongue and fiery temper had raised him enemies wherever he had gone.
Academic hatred blazed up; the hostility of the Nominalists against the
Realistic Philosopher was proved to be no inconsiderable element in the
opposition to the tenets of Wyclif and Hus. Gerson exclaimed, "When you
were in Paris, you disturbed the University with false positions,
especially in the matter of universals and ideas and other scandalous
doctrines." A doctor from Heidelberg cried out, "When you were in
Heidelberg you painted up a shield comparing the Trinity to water, snow
and ice." He alluded to a diagram which Jerome had drawn to illustrate
his philosophic views, in which water, snow and ice, as three forms of
one substance, were paralleled with the three Persons co-existing in the
Trinity. Jerome demanded that his opinions be proved erroneous; if so
he was willing humbly to recall them. There were loud cries of "Burn
him, burn him." "If you wish my death", he exclaimed, "so be it in God's
name." "Nay," said the chivalrous Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury,
"Nay, Jerome; for it is written, 'I will not the death of a sinner, but
rather that he be converted and live!" In the midst of general
confusion Jerome was hurried to the prison in the tower of St. Paul's
Church—a dark and narrow dungeon where he could not see to read and
was treated with the utmost rigour.

The fathers of Constance had seen how little impression their
severity produced on Hus; they learned that it produced equally little on
his followers in Bohemia. Hence there was a general wish to win over
Jerome if possible to the Council's side, or at least, to spare the Council
the odium of making another martyr. Every method was used to induce
Jerome to retract; till, overcome by the pleading of men whose character
he could not but respect, he consented on 11th September, 1415, to recant
and declare his approval of the condemnation of both Wyclif and Hus. (5)

(5) Documenta, 597.
Hardt, IV., 499. The formal recantation was made before the Council
on 24th September, 1415.
This letter was printed in Dobrovsky’s Geschichte der böhmischen sprache und Literatur (407) also in Vybor z Literatury české (Selection from Bohemian Literature and Doc. 598.) (Translation from Palacky's Doc.)

My services to you, dear noble lord, and my dear benefactor.
I am letting you know that I am well and in good health here in Constance.
I hear that there is a great storm in Bohemia and Moravia because of the death of John Hus, as though he had been unjustly condemned, and brutally burnt. Therefore I am writing this of my own free will to you as to my lord, that you may know what you should do. Do not believe, my lord, that I am writing this by necessity, nor that I deserted him through fear. I was long kept in prison and many great scholars endeavoured to lead me to other views, but they did not induce me to change my opinions. I also believed that injury had been done to Hus. But when the articles, because of which he was condemned, were shown to me, I examined them very carefully and discussed them repeatedly with more than one scholar. I then clearly understood that of these articles, some were heretical, some false, others liable to cause scandal and harm. But I still continued to be doubtful, not thinking that these articles were by the deceased; for I believed that they contained only fragments and segments taken from the context of his speeches, and that his meaning had thus been altered. I have asked for his books, and the Council gave me some manuscripts written by his own hand that I might examine them. Then I, together with some of the reverent masters of the holy scriptures, again examined the articles for which he had been burnt, and compared them with the books written with his own hand; and I find in his books all the contexts of the articles, fully and almost in the same words. Therefore, I cannot do otherwise than justly declare that the deceased wrote many false and hurtful things, and I, who was his friend, and with my lips defend his honour against all, having found this, must decline to be the defender of such errors; this I have in a lengthy speech declared before the Council. Now having much
work to do, I cannot write more extensively but I think that with God's help I shall write extensively about the events concerning me, and (these writings) I will send to your Grace. And now I commend myself to your favour. Written by my own hand at Constance on the Thursday after the nativity of the Mother of God.

Dobrowsky, who discovered this important document in the Carthusian Monastery in Moravia, had at first some doubts as to its authenticity. Further research tends, however, to prove that Jerome was certainly the author of this letter.

Dr. Flajshana, the recent Bohemian writer on the life of John Hus, admits the authenticity of Jerome's letter, but suggests that he may have been forced to write it.
This letter Jerome wrote to his Bohemian friend, Lacko Kravar, that, on examination of the articles against Hus he found many of them heretical, and, comparing them with Hus's own manuscript writings, he had been forced to own that the articles fairly represented Hus' works: he consequently felt bound to admit that Hus had been justly dealt with by the Council, though he wished to defend Hus's honour, he did not wish to be associated with his errors. The Council was proud of its triumph, and caused Jerome to renew his recantation in a more formal manner in a public session on 23rd September. It also passed a decree against those who assailed Sigismund for violating his safe conduct to Hus. The decree asserted that neither by natural, divine, nor human law was any promise to be observed to the prejudice of the Catholic faith. But Jerome's recantation did not secure his freedom. He was kept for seven months longer in his dungeon. The Commissioners who had examined him - Cardinals Zabarella, D'Allly, Orsini and the Cardinal of Apulia - urged his release; but the Bohemian party dreaded the result of his return to Bohemia, and declared that his recantation was not sincere. To this effect Gerson wrote a pamphlet to examine the amount of evidence to be attached to the recantation of one accused of heresy. The fanaticism that had been aroused by antagonism to the Hussites won at Constance the victory which it could not win in Bohemia. The Council determined to proceed against Jerome, and on 24th February, 1416, appointed fresh Commissioners to examine witnesses on the points laid to his charge. On 27th April, the Articles of accusation were laid before the Council. Jerome was not a writer like his master Hus, and his words could not be quoted against him, but every fact of his life was set forth as a separate charge. He had been at Oxford and had brought back some theological books of Wyclif, he had been


(7) Dialogus - Triialogus.
concerned with the disturbances in Bohemia, he had travelled over Europe carrying with him the heresy, and every daring act into which his impetuous temper had led him was now raked up against him. He had interfered to aid a citizen, whose servant was being carried off for some slight cause to a monastery prison, and when the monks attacked him, he had snatched the sword from one of the citizens and put them to flight. He had been moved with pity for a young monk whose abbot denied him the necessities of life, and had accompanied him into the abbot's presence, where he flung off his cowl and rushed away from the monastery. He had slapped the face of a monk who publicly insulted him.

To these charges Jerome demanded a public audience, and on 23rd May, 1416, was brought before the Council to answer them. Amongst those who were present at his trial was the Florence Scholar, Poggio Bracciolini, who had come to Constance as Secretary to John XXIII. Poggio, who tells us the story of Jerome's trial and death, was formally orthodox, and as an easy-going humanist could not understand why anyone should persist in risking his life for his theological convictions. He was deeply impressed, however, with the dialectic ability, the eloquence, the ready wit, the learning, and the manly courage of the accused. As a man of letters, and of culture, Poggio looked with some slight contempt on the theological disputes of the assembled fathers. To his mind theological questions were not of much importance. The established system must, of course, be maintained for the preservation of order, but after a decent recognition of its outward authority, the cultivated individual might think or act as he pleased so long as he avoided open collision. Poggio had no fellow feeling with a man who was prepared to die for his opinions: he thought him clumsy for reducing himself to such an unpleasant alternative. But he was attracted to Jerome by his force, his mental versatility, his fiery self-confidence and above all his

(3) Hardt IV. 140 ff., 485 ff., 634 ff., 748 ff. (For the whole proceeding against Jerome.)
Mansi XXVII, 642 ff.
philosophic spirit. To him Jerome was an interesting character-study and he saw the permanent and human interest attached to the religious martyr. From Poggio's testimony we are able to bring vividly before our eyes the scene of Jerome's trial. (9)

When Jerome appeared before the Council, he was asked to answer to each of the articles brought against him, but this he refused to do and demanded that he should first state his case - in which he would answer any allegations brought against him. His claim was over-ruled, however, and he asked, "What iniquity is this, that I was kept in a foul dungeon for three hundred and forty days without means of preparing my defence, while ye have been lending a ready ear to my opponents and detractors." (10) Its members had already come to the conclusion that he was a heretic, an enemy of the faith and the clergy and with this prejudice in their minds they would not give him a chance of stating his own case. Let them not presume on their own infallibility and beware of committing injustice. The Council nevertheless, adhered to the demand that he should first answer simply the charges against him. The recital of the articles, with the testimony of the witnesses, then began. Poggio was astonished at the dignity, openness, and vigour of his replies and was fain to admit that, if he spoke the truth, there was not a shadow of a case against him. He not only excelled in serious argument, but he overwhelmed his opponents with his sarcasms sometimes with fiery indignation, or raised the laugh against them by his witticisms.

When he was asked whether he believed that the bread remains after consecrations in the Eucharist, "It certainly remains bread at the bakers," was the retort. When one of his adversaries appealed to his conscience, he was told that this was the surest way to deceive. Another he called an ass, in the controversial manner of the age. To an excited

(9) Von der Harst III, 64;
Poggio Opera, 301;
Palacky, Documenta, 624.

(10) Doc. 625. Prof. MacInnon 211.
Dominican he shouted "Hold your tongue, you hypocrite!" So numerous were the charges against him that his case had to be put off for three days until 26th May, 1416.

In resuming the reading in the next audience, he was at length allowed, despite much opposition, to speak for himself. Beginning with an humble prayer to God, he began a magnificent defence. He began by reminding his hearers of the celebrated victims of false testimony in ancient times from Joseph and Socrates to Boethius. Then he turned to the Scriptures, Stephen and the Apostles had, he pointed out, been falsely condemned to death as formentors of sedition, as enemies of the gods, and as malcontents. He, too, was the victim of the malevolence and envy of his enemies. He had willingly come to Constance for the purpose of clearing himself from the charges against him. Let them remember the custom of learned men of old to discuss freely, not to ruin the faith, but in order to discover the truth. Had not Jerome and Augustine disputed with each other without any suspicion of heresy? His speech, says Poggio, "moved the minds of all and bent them to mercy." The members sat awaiting the expected recantation. Instead of this came the declaration that he was guilty of no error and had nothing to retract, except his former retraction. He had recanted through fear and against his conscience but now revoked the letter he had written to Bohemia. John Hus, he boldly said, was a good man, just and holy, and unworthy of death and he himself was prepared, with steadfast courage, to undergo the same death as his master. Great was the grief of Poggio and others near him "for they were eager to save so excellent a man." No, nevertheless, persisted "seeming anxious for death." Hus, he continued, had maintained nothing against the Church of God. He had only opposed the abuses of the clergy - the pride, the arrogance, and pomp of the prelates. The patrimony of the Church ought first to be used for the benefit of the poor and strangers, then for buildings. To that good man (Hus) it seemed unworthy to spend it on harlots, feastings, horses and dogs, finery and other things not in keeping with the religion of other things.
Little wonder that this plain speaking was interrupted by the protests of his hearers. His readiness in retort, and his determination to have his say, compelled them to hear him to the end. Instead of passing sentence forthwith they allowed him several days' grace and Zabarella and others laboured to bring him "to the right way." This time there was no thought of equivocating and on 30th May, at a final sitting in the Cathedral, he was condemned to the fire. Like his Master and friend, John Hus, he went to die with calm cheerful face, and like him, he followed him on the same day a year later, to the stake. (6th July, 1416) Hus was the symbol of the dawn of a moral and religious, Jerome was that of a moral and intellectual, insurrection against the corruptions and disorders of the clergy in what was perhaps the most corrupt and wicked age, the Ecclesiastical body has ever known and the very enormity and almost incredible vastness of the evil against which their honest voices were raised, is one of the principal things that now stand in the way of the due appreciation of their services to the human race. They, and our nation, ripened before the others and both have paid the penalty which falls upon those who are before their time. As a nation we have been denied the recognition and appreciation which, may I say, we deserve.

Hus and Jerome and the Czech (Bohemian) nation opened a new path, into which others entered and walked successfully. Honour to those who followed their footsteps and carried the sacred banner further and further onwards! But honour too, to the men and the "little" Bohemian Nation that made the first beginning.
As this part of the Czech history is so well known and many elaborate volumes have been written and as the Hussite wars were discussed in great detail by writers and historians of different nationalities, I would like to bring into this Chapter only the important happenings of that time in Bohemia and Moravia.
It would be impossible to realise the importance of Hus in the world's history if we dealt with the events of his life independently from those of the subsequent Hussite wars.

Our Czech historian Palacký has pointed out how comparatively unimportant would have been the place of Hus in history, had not the unrivalled bravery of the Bohemian people and the genius of leaders such as Žižka enabled Bohemia to beat back the united forces of almost all Europe, which endeavoured to crush the religious movement in the Country. Palacký clearly grasped the real character of the Hussite wars. In one of his controversial writings, he says: "One school of historians has maintained that the Hussite war is the first war in the world's history that was fought, not for material interest, but for intellectual ones, that is to say, for ideas. This ideal standpoint was so seriously and so sincerely maintained by the Bohemians that when victorious they never attempted to replace it by a more interested policy. It is true that during the war they forced foreign communities to pay taxes and an annual tribute to them; but they never thought of subduing them, or of extending their dominions over foreign lands - a thing that under the circumstances of the time would not have been difficult.

In the modern school of German historians there are persons who attribute this attitude mainly to the incapacity of the ancient Bohemian, and who with brutal derision attempted to deduce from it their racial inferiority. I leave it to a more enlightened posterity to decide what conduct is nearer to barbarism - that of the disinterested victor, or that of the imperious and rapacious conqueror.

Two centuries later the enemies, after one victory - that of the White Mountain (Bila Hora) - certainly acted differently, and endeavoured in every way to use their victory for the purpose of material
gain. Was their conduct nobler and more Christian?

As to the Hussites, they never during their prolonged and heroic struggle ceased to consider it and to term it "a struggle for the liberty of God's word...."

The Hussite battles, as Dr. Gindely wrote, "were fought for a national cause; poets and painters choose them for their subjects, the most popular stirring songs date from this time, the names of the leaders of this movement have lingered in the memory of the people; the name of no Bohemian King is as familiar to them as that of the blind leader of the Hussite armies."

The fire of the stake at which John Hus suffered, kindled a conflagration that raged for years with insatiable fury. (1) As soon as the news that he had been executed reached Bohemia, all classes were profoundly moved. Many who had been undecided in their views, or timid in expressing them, openly joined his followers; the Roman Catholic priests were quickly expelled from their parishes which were given to Hussites; the houses of his personal enemies among the clergy at Prague were plundered, and siege was laid to the palace of the Archbishop, who fled in dismay. The efforts of the Council to restore order increased the commotion. Letters which it issued justifying the execution of Hus, warning against his doctrines, and threatening his adherents with the severest discipline of the Church, called forth a defiant answer from the Diet (2nd September, 1415), signed by four hundred and twenty-five barons and knights, full of reproaches and counter-menaces. Three days later, a Hussite League was formed, whose members pledged themselves to act in unison, to allow free preaching of the Gospel on their estates, to obey episcopal mandates in so far only as they were in harmony with the Holy Scriptures, to resist all unjust bans, and to uphold the decisions of the

(1) Palacky, Vols. IV, V, and VI; Bruckner, Ut. u. Tab.; Eckold, Ausländ.; Czerny, I.; Holzer's three Vols; Palacky's Möller. Leclerc, II, ch. VI.
Although the Fathers were encouraged, by the speedy organisation of a Catholic League, to persevere in their denunciations and to enforce them with the ban, the Hussites were not overawed. Nearly three years passed by without effecting a change; so that when the Council finally adjourned, on the twenty-second of April, 1413, Bohemia and Moravia were still fired with excitement which was ready, at any moment, to burst into flames. Nor had anything been accomplished at Constance by way of reform. The new Pope, Martin the Fifth, elected on the 11th November, 1417, disregarding the hopes of all Christendom, postponed this work to the next Council. Impotent end of the august convocation that had, for nearly four years, deliberated on ways and means to purify the Church!

A peculiar feature of the Hussite movement was the preaching of itinerant evangelists, in private houses or open fields. They attracted large congregations; and when [Wenzel] in 1419, ordered the restoration of the catholic priests to the parishes from which they had been expelled, such congregations began to undertake pilgrimages to neighbouring or more distant churches, where they could enjoy the Holy Communion under both kinds. A hill, in the vicinity of Austi, constituted a favourite gathering place and received the name of Mount Tábor. (3) It was dotted with the tents of the Hussite clergy who had been driven from Austi, but continued to minister to the people that came to them in crowds.

On that hill, at the instance of Nicholas from Pištín, (4) an extraordinary meeting was held on the 22nd of July. In the early hours of the morning there began to arrive, from all parts of Bohemia and

---

(2) Frimmel's "Utraquisten und Taboriten, p.3; Palacký, IV, p.376.
(3) Palacký, V., p.35, and Note 64.
(4) Palacký, IV, p.416, Note 525.
Moravia, solemn processions carrying banners and the emblems of the Holy Sacrament, until a multitude of not less than forty-two thousand people was assembled. They gave each other a jubilant welcome as brethren and sisters in the Lord. To worship Him, under the open canopy of His own heaven, was their common object. Accordingly they divided, each sex by itself, into numerous congregations of which the priests took charge. Some preached, while others heard confessions, or administered the Lord's Supper under both kinds. At noon the entire assembly partook of a simple meal; the rest of the day was spent in religious conversation and social fellowship. The utmost decorum prevailed; no levity or worldly amusements were allowed. It was a primitive camp-meeting on a grand scale. Toward evening the pilgrims bade each other farewell with mutual pledges to uphold the holy cause of the Cup, and of free preaching; then each company, again in procession, took its way homeward and made the long summer-twentight vocal with sacred song. The owners of the fields, where the gathering had taken place, were liberally indemnified for the losses which it had occasioned. Similar meetings were subsequently held at the same place. 

An event of a different and most alarming character occurred at Prague. On Sunday, the 30th of July, a Hussite procession, led by John of Celau, the priest of the church of Maria-Schnee, while passing the Council House of the Neustadt, was insulted by some of the councillors and their servants. A fearful tumult ensued; men rushed together from all sides with arms in their hands; the Council House was stormed and

(5) There are two original and very valuable sources giving an account of the meeting on Mt. Tabor and of many other events in the history of the Hussites. The one is Brenow's Liberum Belli Hussitici, and the other the Chronique de Pilgrin, the favorite Bishop. Both are frequently quoted by Valacky.

(6) John was a monk who had escaped from the Premonstrant Monastery of Celau. He became prominent during the hegemony of Prague, and for two years, 1420 to 1422, practically ruled Bohemia. In the latter year a party was formed against him, and he was secretly executed. Although originally a demagogue and fanatic, he showed, when in power, great moderation both in his measures and theology, and laboured hard to unite the two great parties among the Hussites.
whoever attempted to oppose the mob was cut down without mercy; eleven councillors escaped, but seven others were hurled from an upper window and impaled on the spears and lances of the multitude below. Amidst peals of alarm the riot spread throughout the Neustadt, which was seized by the populace. Wenzel, who was at the castle of Wenzelstein, when informed of what had happened gave way to so terrible a burst of anger that a slight attack of apoplexy ensued; on the 16th of August he had a second and severe attack, in consequence of which he died in a few hours.

According to the compact of 1411, Sigismund was to be his successor. Blind to his own interests and obstinate in his resolution to crush the disturbances in Bohemia by force, he did not come to claim the kingdom, but appointed Queen Sophia his regent and persuaded the Pope to inaugurate a crusade against the Hussites. Thus began one of the most remarkable, and at the same time terrific, wars the world has seen. For sixteen years Bohemia single handed defied all Europe.

The truth which history sets forth, more or less clearly, in every age, that when a nation is passing through a crisis it produces the man for the crisis, was anew established at the opening of this war. A greater general, a mightier man of valour, a more invincible leader than John Žižka from Trocnov, never drew sword. Žižka was born, probably about 1354, at Trocnov, about ten miles South East of Budweis, and was the owner of several small estates. He belonged to the lower order of nobility, is supposed to have, at one time, served under the king of Poland, and subsequently found a place at the court of Wenzel with whom he stood in high favour. He left the court and espoused the cause of the Hussites. At an earlier time he lost one of his eyes, in that way is not known; at the siege of Haby, in 1422, the other was destroyed by an arrow. Totally blind though he now was, he continued in command of the army; in time of battle he mounted a wagon and stood under the folds of his banner whose device was the cup. He
died on 11th October, 1424, while besieging the Castle of Příbislau, and was buried first at Königgrätz (Brádec-Kralove) and then at Časlau. He created armies. He originated the most novel and successful tactics. He never lost a battle. Through his indomitable energy, peasants and mechanics, armed with lances and slings, iron-pointed flails and clubs, were trained to beat down the mail-clad knights of Europe like straw and to scatter them like chaff. His carricades of wagons, now motionless as a rampart, and again circling over the field of battle in bewildering evolutions, were a notable instance of his military genius; and the battle hymn, "Ye who the Lord God's warriors are," etc., which he is said to have composed and which his men were accustomed to sing when advancing to the fight, shows that he made religion the source of their irresistible courage. Intolerant, fanatical and cruel, he was nevertheless a true patriot, disinterested and humble, striving to lead a godly and righteous life. Deeming himself an avenger of the divine law, he mercilessly destroyed all whom he believed to be its foes, and in the spirit of Israel's stern leader, "hewed in pieces before the Lord." (8)

The first crusade against the Hussites laid the foundation of his fame. On the 14th of July, 1420, at the Witkowberg, now known as the Žižka Hill, half a mile to the East of Prague, he totally defeated, with a far less numerous force, the imperialist army of more than one hundred thousand men. Sigismund fled in dismay from Bohemia, while the Archbishop of Prague went over to the Hussites.

About the same time they issued the celebrated Four Articles which set forth the principles for which they were contending. These articles were the following:


(8) 1st Samuel, IV., 33.
I. The Word of God is to be preached, in a proper way, by priests of the Lord, without let or hindrance, throughout the Kingdom of Bohemia.

II. The sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is to be administered, under both kinds, of bread and wine, according to the institution of the Saviour, to all believers not disqualified to receive it by reason of mortal sin.

III. The secular dominion exercised by the clergy over worldly goods and possessions, to the prejudice of their spiritual office and the damage of civil authority, is to be taken away from them, and the clergy are to be brought back to the evangelical rule and apostolic practice of Christ and His disciples.

IV. All mortal sins, especially such as are public, as also all other irregularities contrary to the divine law, in whatever estate they may appear, are to be punished by those to whom it pertains. (9)

These four Articles of Prague, as they are commonly called, supported by many citations from Scripture and reference to the early Fathers of the Church, were drawn up in Latin, Bohemian and German, and sent to all parts of Europe. In June, of 1421, they were formally adopted by the Diet of Čáslav, which body at the same time renounced allegiance to Sigismund and appointed twenty Regents to administer the government.

But there was no harmony among the Hussites. At an early day two principal parties arose, the Calixtines, or Utraquists, and the Taborites. (10) The former received their tendency from the University of Prague. They were conservative and aristocratic, and as they continued to hold to the Roman doctrines and usages, except in so far as these were at variance with the Four Articles of Prague, they hoped for an eventual reconciliation with the Church, after it would have been purified and reformed, but which resulted in a policy which was unstable.


The leaders of this party, to which the higher order of the nobility mostly belonged, were John of Jesenic, Jacobellus of Hies, Christian of Prachtic, John Kardinalis of Reinstein, Šimon of Tišnovic, Šimon of Rokycan, John of Příbram, Prokop of Pílson, and Peter Payne, an Englishman, known as Master English. (11)

The germs of the Taborito party were planted in 1415, at Austi, where a rich weaver, one Pytol, opened his house to several Hussite leaders whose extreme views had given offence at Prague and who began to exercise an influence in opposition to its University, drawing together a large number of adherents. In 1420 Tabor was founded, by order of Žižka, which town gave to the entire faction its name and became its chief and formidable seat. (12)

The tendency of this party was progressive, radical and democratic, leaning, in its political aspect, toward a republican form of government with an abolition of all differences of rank, and taking a theological position which was far in advance of the Articles of Prague and, in almost every point, at variance with the Romish Church. The Taborites accepted the Bible as the only source of faith and rule or practice, recognising in Christ the only Lawgiver of His people. They acknowledged Baptism and the Lord's Supper as the only sacraments, and taught that the latter may be celebrated in any place and not merely in a consecrated church or chapel, but that the ministration of a priest guilty of mortal sin is not valid; they rejected transubstantiation, purgatory, prayers and alms for the dead and the invocation of the saints; they denounced fasting as a penance, the idolatry practised with relics, images and pictures, the use of priestly vestments, the singing of the hymns of the Roman Catholic Church, and the distinction which it made between bishops and priests, claiming that priests have the right to elect and ordain bishops.

The leaders of this party, which embraced nobles of low rank, burghers and the great mass of small land-holders and peasants, were Nicholas Polhřimow or Pilgram, the only Bishop whom the Taborites appointed, Václav Koranda of Pilsen, Karkold, John Čapek, John Šimek of Saaz, John of Jičín, Ambrože of Königgratz and Prokop the Great. To them John Žižka, their victorious leader, also attached himself, although he was not in full agreement with their radicalism, but preferred the less radical trend of the Crebites.

While the system of the Taborites, in not a few particulars, bore a scriptural character that has re-appeared in Protestantism, it was marred by extreme views and, at times, by gross fanaticism. As instances of the former we may mention their opposition to the Latin language and a collegiate course of education, although they carefully trained their children in the common branches and in a thorough knowledge of the Bible; their tenet, that to give or receive an academical degree constituted a mortal sin; the loose notions which occasionally showed themselves, with regard to the administration of the Lord's Supper by unordained men and even by women, (13) and the tendency to emancipate women, in other respects also, from the rule laid down by the apostle in connection with public worship. (14) Examples of fanaticism were the chiliastic errors into which they fell, under the leadership of Martin Houska, and the gross excesses which followed; the community of goods established at Tabor during a period of nearly two years, when the possession of private property was pronounced to be a mortal sin; and the wanton destruction of churches, chapels and altars, with all their beautiful works of art. For the blasphemy and shameful immoralities of the Adamites, who grew out of the scum of the chilias, the Taborites must not be held responsible.

Höfler: I, 482.
(14) Bezold: pp.33-44.
A third faction, occupying a middle position between the Utraquists and Taborites, became prominent after Zizka's death. This faction consisted of his immediate followers, who assumed the name of Orphans. There were several other parties of minor note.

Efforts were not wanting, although they proved unsuccessful, to put an end to these divisions and unite the Hussites. The only common ground they occupied was their acceptance of the Articles of Prague. When engaged in war, however, they forgot their differences. It continued in all its fury and was disgraced by horrible cruelties on both sides, but especially on the part of the Catholics. Four more crusades were undertaken by the imperialists, in all of which they were ignobly defeated. In 1427, led by Prokop the Great, who took the place of Zizka, the Hussites began offensive campaigns and invaded Austria, Silesia, Bavaria, Hungary, Franconia and Saxony. Their most wonderful victory was gained at Tausa (Domažlice) where they routed one hundred and thirty thousand crusaders, led by the Margrave of Brandenburg and the Cardinal legate Julian (14th August, 1431.) All Europe stood aghast. It seemed as though God Himself had sent confusion into the midst of one of the most puissant hosts that had ever been marshalled.

For that very reason the Council at Basle decided at last to negotiate with the Czechs as equals on the Council, since they and their ideas for reform were everywhere having great repercussions and were not to be overcome by force. On the invitation of the Council, which at last answered the readiness of the Czechs for real negotiation, no longer with crusades, but with a friendly summons, the Czechs came on 4th January, 1433, to the Council at Basle, representatives of the conservatives as well as the radicals. John Rokycana, administrator of the Bohemian Church, Prokop the Great, representative of the Taborites,

(15) Dezold: pp. 70 and 71.
(16) Balácký: Geschichte von Böhmen, III.
the Englishman Peter Payne, representative of the "Orphans" (Waisen) in Bohemia, and others, in order to negotiate on the points at issue on the basis of the Four Articles of Prague. As had already been agreed at *Eger*, the Holy Scriptures, the Apostolic Church and those Fathers of the Church who are truly grounded in the Holy Scriptures, were to act as arbitrators. The Council apparently made advances to the Czechs, but took the negotiations along so cleverly that the Prague Articles were worked into four articles of the Basle Compact Acts, that only the minimum was granted to the Czechs, namely, the communion "sub utraque", and this only in the Catholic sense, and restricted to the Hussites, with the secondary design of winning the conservatives through it and of playing them off against the radical Taborites who remained dissatisfied with the Compact Acts. It came really to this that the Conservative Hussites, inflamed and financially supported by the Papal Legate, went forth against the Taborites and, on 30th May, 1434, defeated them heavily at Lipany, east of Prague. The victorious Pragueans then negotiated with the King and Council for reconciliation on the basis of the Basle Compact Acts. In 1436 the Hussites were again recognised as the true sons of the Church. They rejoiced in having done something great, and expected that their Hussite Archbishop Rokycana (1435-1471) elected by the Landtag, would be acknowledged by the Pope and that the Compact Acts would be supplemented. They did not know that the Council had only made advances to them in order to put the halter the more easily on them, as in the case of wild horses or mules, and to subdue them once more entirely to the Church. In 1436 King Sigismund at last took over the inheritance of his brother, as King of Bohemia. Instead of the Hussite leader, there suddenly stood at the head of the State a powerful and crafty King, and beside him the Papal Legate, who had now come to Prague to exert the Papal power politics. The Taborites were pushed aside as heretics, many were put to death and Archbishop Rokycana, not recognised by the Pope, had to flee to Königsratz (Hradec-Králové). Thus the conservatives and the reactionaries were favoured amongst the
The Hussites, Not until the country was under George Poděbrad, as administrator, did Rokycana again obtain his post as elected Archbishop. But the leaders of the Taborites were incarcerated by George in his castles and held in prison until death. With the election of George as King (1450-71) (17) Rokycana's resolute Hussite movement attained full freedom again and a place as a favoured majority in the land. The Hussite King ruled with a firm hand, tolerant also to the Catholics. The land flourished. The King also took pains to keep peace among his people and to make peaceful settlements of all international troubles. While their Archbishop was not recognised by the Pope, the Hussites had a Church of their own, the Utraquist or Hussite or Bohemian Church with its Consistory. But because of their adherence to unity with the Roman Church, the Bohemians fell into difficult situations. They continued with the consecration of priests by bishops, but Rokycana, as an unsanctioned archbishop, could not consecrate and the Catholic bishops refused to consecrate the Hussites. The result of this was a great scarcity of priests. The candidates for the priesthood sought consecration abroad and obtained it here and there in different ways. All priests who had fled to Bohemia from abroad were gladly received in Bohemia. The result was that in every Hussite Church, which had grown out of a desire for a cleaner Church, the moral deterioration of the priests and from other circles entered in and gained ground exactly as in the Catholic Church. A few saw a way out by connection with the Greek Church, but the plan failed with the conquering of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. In 1462 the position of the Bohemian Church grew worse when Pope Pius II declared the Compact Acts invalid, banned the Hussite King and his family in 1467, kindled new wars against the Hussites and so brought ruin to the land.

Passionate Hussites, brought up on the Scriptures, saw with pain the decline of their Church. Peter Chelčický, (18) a free farmer on

(17) Hόtzov: The Hussite Wars, 360-370. (The Life and Time of J.Hus.)
a little piece of land in Cholčice in Southern Bohemia and an earnest Christian, had been following the development of the Hussite Church for long with great concern. As early as 1421 he had presented himself resolutely as a man who was ready to defend the Law of God with the sword. With pain he saw the inhumanity of war in the land, and especially the unworthy priests and the ruin of the Church. He felt himself closely related to the Taborite priests and their serious view of life, but he was against their attitude to the war and their doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

He would rather suffer wrong with Christ than to do wrong himself, and in the Lord's Supper he found Communion with Christ, whilst he became partaker truly of the body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine not, to be sure, in a "Naparaitic" way. He wanted to be a true disciple of Christ, to follow him and to conform to his Gospel, especially as shown in the Sermon on the Mount, and to regulate everything in the Church accordingly. Many agreed with him and found edification in his writings. In Prague there were many who felt an inner relationship with him, particularly among the hearers of Rokycana, who preached in the Teinchurch in Prague against Antichrist and his growing power, as also against unworthy Priests who, themselves bad, absolved unrepentant sinners from their sins and admitted them to the Lord's Supper and so let good and bad Christians perish. Against this he painted in bright colours the situation in the early Church and indicated it as the idea for the souls of his hearers.

Among his hearers, one of the most noteworthy, was Gregory (Řehoř) a pious man, inspired by the idea of a living Christianity, and a relation of Rokycana. Gregory and his friends, bowed down by a deep anxiety about their salvation, attained the conviction that, if they were not to perish with others, they must turn from bad priests, hold to  

---

Three of his works (1)"The Met of Faith," (2)"Postil" containing expositions of the Gospel Lessons, (3) "The Picture of Antichrist", were printed in the 16th century. The rest remain in manuscript.
good priests, and with them, build up a community of good Christians. Rokycana, and above all Chelčíky, strengthened them in this desire. Rokycana, to be sure, did not want to join them and be their leader, but he obtained for them a place of retreat on the royal property of Litice, near Žamberk in Eastern Bohemia. And so Gregory and his companions, in 1457-58, left Prague and other places in Bohemia and Moravia for Krumwald and raised a brotherhood there. They adhered to the good priest Michael in Softenberg. Their numbers grew through related brethren and sisters, especially from the serious Utraquists, former Taborites, and also sundry Picards, so far as they were purged from unhealthy elements. They all lived in brotherly love and moral discipline before God, in the spirit of the Scriptures, and especially of the Gospels, devoted from the heart to belief in God and Christ, from the power of the State and the sinful affairs of the world, busy with agriculture and handwork. They held simple evangelical services in their mother tongue, in which Michael administered the Sacraments to them, but kept the unrepentant away. They detested all force, capital punishment and mutilation, also the oath—because of which they would accept no offices which had to do with force. The nobility too, were objects of suspicion to them. Thus they formed within the Utraquist Church a special community of earnest Christians, who drew the most earnest members of the Hussite Church to them.

Soon, however, tension arose between the new brotherhood and the Church 'sub-utraque'. The brethren were persecuted. They saw that neither through the Roman nor through the Utraquist priests could they be sure of salvation, since not only were the priests unworthy, but their consecrations, consummated by unworthy bishops, were invalid. After much consideration and prayer they came to the conclusion that it was according to God's will and in the spirit of the Gospel that true Christians should choose their own priests and bishops, as the Taborites had already sought to do, and so form a priesthood of their own. And so they took the plunge: in 1457/1458 they chose by lot three simple, but
worthy, men to be their priests, namely, the farmer's son Matthias (Matěj) of Krunwald, the miller Eliáš of Krčenovice in Moravia and Tomáš (Tuma) of Přelouč, who had acquired his education in a Latin school. As bishop the twenty-five year old Matthias of Krunwald was elected by lot. Priest Michael then entreated an old Waldensian Senior as bishop (Martin the German) for consecration as a bishop, transferred this consecration to Matthias and resigned his own office as bishop and priest. Matthias, however, as bishop consecrated Eliáš, Tomáš and Michael as priests. Thus the brethren set up their own priesthood and formed an entirely autonomous Church, independent of the State. This was a step of enormously wide bearing, which brought them much persecution, certainly, but which proved the only way of constituting and maintaining their unity. The United Brethren, under the leadership of Brother Gregory and the Priests, soon became the centre of attraction for the scattered souls in Bohemia and Moravia, who longed for a Community of good Christians. There soon arose quite a number of little brotherhoods in Bohemia and Moravia.

The United Brethren developed healthily, particularly when, after the death of King George in 1471, Vladislav, a Polish Catholic Prince was called to be King of Bohemia on George's recommendation. During his long but weak reign (1471-1516) the Catholics, indeed, enjoyed the favour of the Government, but the Utraquists and Brethren were not persecuted for decades. The wars of religion ceased, the isolation of the Bohemian State from part of neighbouring peoples, was already ceasing, particularly under Vladislav, and culture, which had suffered much during the war, recovered again quickly when peace was restored.

In the social sphere, the former less free conditions returned after the Hussite wars, from which the democratisation of the people had resulted. It came about through deficiencies in labour strength that the lot of the subjects worsened (the right to emigrate was limited) almost to serfdom.

(20) Jaffet's MS. Geschichte der Entstehung, p.33.
Reichel's, Zusatze, p.10.
The nobility and the towns for the most part, however, arose stronger than ever from the war. They were enriched by Church property, especially in Bohemia, in which the clergy had even lost their seats in the Landtag.

Czech literature, especially religious literature, had developed greatly, and had entered into the spirit of the people. The Holy Scriptures, especially, were spread abroad in translations and eagerly read. The first New Testament was printed in Czech in 1475, the whole Czech Bible in 1480-88. Others soon followed on the first edition. The religious tension in the land ceased gradually, and they accustomed themselves to confessional tolerance. In 1485 there came the important religious treaty, in which the different churches were to remain in the possession of those churches. Memberships in these possessions they were on Vladislas's accession to the throne. On this peace between Catholics and Utraquists was founded for a long time. The Catholic Church, in Bohemia led by the Upper Consistory and Administrator, in Moravia under the Bishop of Olomouc (Olmutz), remained a minority in the land, although it enjoyed the royal favour. The Utraquist Church was under the protection of the Utraquist Clergy, governed by the lower Consistory and Administrator. The consecration of the Utraquist priests was simplified, as in 1482 and 1504 the Utraquist Clergy succeeded in calling an Italian bishop to Prague. The Government strove against the reconciliation between the Utraquists and Rome, and, therefore, favoured the Conservatives and reactionaries amongst the Utraquists who were ready, without serious concessions, to reconcile themselves to Rome. But all such attempts proved unsuccessful, because the legislative assembly demanded the total submission of the Hussites and the surrender of all Hussite individuality; and the more resolute Hussites, among whom there were still many Taborite elements, spurned the Pope and held fast to Hussite individuality in the spirit of the Scriptures, and the majority in the land, likewise, held to them.

(21) Prof. F. Brojaa: Kirchengeschichte Böhmens, 52 ff.
The spread of the Holy Scriptures, printed in the Czech tongue contributed above all else to this radicalisation and spiritual deepening of the religious life at this time. The Bible reached the hands of many, who obtained from it a spiritual comprehension of Christianity. The penetration of Humanism led, moreover, to the richer study not only of the Church Fathers, but also of the Scriptures and so to opposition to the Catholic Church. (22)

In this respect the influence of the Brethren worked above all else in Hussite circles beside the remains of the Taborites. Many serious Christians sympathised with the Brethren and their quiet and earnest piety. Soon there joined them not only simple people, but also the learned and those of noble birth, although the Brethren rejected social gradations, the power of the State, military concerns, the oath, capital punishments, and scholastic education. The learned, especially after Brother Gregory's death in 1474, soon attained to importance among them. The numbers of the Brethren increased also through the addition of German Waldensians in 1475 and 1481, who had fled among them from Brandenburg to Landiskron in Bohemia and Fulnek in Moravia. The United Brethren were administered by a bishop, with a Council composed of their own Elders (Elder Priests) and by the Synods. Their Communities were among the people like blooming oases or like well-cared-for gardens in the land. They all strove to lead a clean and just life in Faith, Hope and Love, causing anger to no man, and preserving a good conscience before God and man. They kept order and discipline amongst themselves. Yet because of their refusal of the oath and their avoidance of public offices, the Brethren often came into conflict with the authorities. And here the question arose whether it was right to avoid all this and thus to lay themselves open to persecution, and whether it was right to mistrust learning and to live apart from the world. A still deeper question was connected with this: Through what is the salvation of man really settled?

(22) Prof. F. Hrejsa: Kirchengeschichte Böhmens, 53 ff. (Církovní Dějiny České.)
They were all one in thinking that man's salvation does not rest on the meritoriousness of works, but only on the Grace of God in Christ. But the question was how far the strict observance of the law of God was necessary to it, and whether salvation cannot much rather be apprehended through faith alone. Among the leaders of the learned Brethren, Prokop from Neuhau (Jindřichův Hradec), Jan Klenovsky, Lukáš of Praguo and Vavřinec Krasonický perceived that those who, through their anxious adherence to the law of God, would attain a certainty of their salvation, never attained joyful certainty, but that those, also, who would become blessed through faith alone, as reliance on God's Grace failed too, in that they easily let salvation slip from their attention, and let themselves be led astray to a frivolous life. The Brethren found the solution in turning, indeed, from way of strict adherence to the precepts, and in laying stress on the way of faith, but of the living faith which cannot exist without the good will, worked on by God's spirit. This living faith, as the inner surrender of the heart and will to God and Christ can never remain unfruitful, but leads necessarily to repentance and new life. So the Brethren solved in their own way the question which Luther, Zwingli and Calvin tried to solve fifty years later. (23)

In this spirit, it was decided at the Synods of 1490 in Brandeis and 1494 in Reichena (Rychnov) to modify the prohibition of the oath, of offices, and so on. They only demanded that care should be taken to prove true to God in all situations. The United Brethren here surmounted Chelicky's standpoint, relinquished the flight from the world which they had practised until then, and took their stand in the world, that the world might be overcome through Christ. A minority of the Brethren did not go with them, however, but continued to hold fast to the old order and deserted itself from the majority as a "little party". They went on living in separation and gradually came to an end. The remaining Brethren flourished quickly. They shut themselves off no more, but

(23) F. Krejča: Kirchengeschichte von Böhmien, p. 54.
opened up to the world and its education, so far as they could do so
without sin, and could live as disciples of Christ, always striving to
permeate the neighbourhood with the spirit of Christ. The oath, so far
as it was demanded by the authorities, was optional. Trade and
business were omitted, so far as they did not lead to sin. They were
warned against war, but a defensive war was held to be allowable.

Admission into the United Brethren was not made difficult for the well-to-do, the aristocracy, or the learned, but they were not to advance themselves above others but to place themselves and know themselves on an equal footing, in order that they might serve others and do good. In their doctrine they persisted in this standpoint: they held fast to the Scriptures and wished to surrender themselves to God and Christ in living faith, in everything to obey their neighbours in love, and in joyful hope, not in the meritoriousness of works, but in God's Grace in Christ which works in men and makes them the elect of God, a people of God who will hold together through order and discipline, and who will be ministered to by good priests, not appointed to their office by anointing with oil, but who are anointed through God's Spirit and work not only with their lips but their lives. In the Lord's Supper they rejected both transubstantiation and the Picard doctrine of the mere symbol, and taught with Brother Lukáš, that the Bread and Wine were the Body and Blood of Christ, and should be used, not literally, certainly, but also not merely figuratively, but sacramentally in spirit and in truth. In this they deviated from Cholícky's former doctrine, and from Luther's later teaching, turned to the doctrine of the Taborites, and approached Calvin's later teaching.

In the still continuing time of peace the United Brethren sought out good Christians in the whole world in order to get to know them. In 1491, therefore, they sent some Brothers to the Balkans, Russia, Egypt and Palestine; they returned disappointed, however. In 1498 Brother Lukáš went with Brother Thomáš, the German, to Italy and
Rome and to the Waldensians. They handed over to the Waldensians some Latin writings of the Brethren. The Waldensians used them in "Loco es la causa" and "La interrogaciones menors." On 13th May, 1493, the Brethren were present at the burning of Savonarola in Florence. They returned to Bohemia no more satisfied with the Waldensians, but so much the more strengthened by the fact that God had let them find the truth in their homeland. At that time many earnest Utraquists entered the United Brethren so that they already counted numerous little communities. The Brethren formed a selection of the best elements in the Utraquist Church. In addition they had good leaders. After Bishop Matthias' death in 1500, four elders or bishops were entrusted in his place with the administration of the United Brethren, Thomáš of Přelouč as the first, Eliáš of Chřenovice, Lukač of Prague and Ambrož. The spiritual leadership fell more and more to Brother Lukáš, who led the Brethren and defended them against their opponents in a literary way through his many writings.

The growth of the United Brethren made many attentive to it, and awakened many opponents to it, who induced the King to have them persecuted as Picards. The Brethren sent him their Confession of 1507. The noblewoman, Martha von Boskovic, too, in her beautiful letter to the King acknowledged the persecuted Brethren. In July, 1503, the King resolved at the Landtag in Prague, and then ordered through his mandate, that the prayer-houses of the Brethren should be shut, their books burned and their priests brought before the spiritual court. This mandate of Vladislav's hung threatening for a century over the United Brethren. They had to draw back into quietness and meet in secret and in danger. Brother Lukáš, however, wrote in Latin the "Apologetia sacrae scripturae," which in 1510 reached Italy, and was perhaps also sent to the Waldensians. In 1511, it was printed in Nürnberg (only 100 copies) but was soon known everywhere. A copy reached the Augustinian Monastery in Erfurt, and a copy was also ordered for the Emperor Maximilian I. It also reached Luther's hands as he wrestled for
salvation and faith. (24) Even the polemical writers on the opposing
side spread through their Latin polemical writings the doctrine of the
Brethren to the world of learning in wide distribution.

So in Bohemia and Moravia at the time of the Reformation there existed a quiet and joyful evangelical life in the well-ordered United Brethren, while the great mass of the Czech people held to the Utraquist Church, which, indeed, held to the high ideals of Hus, but because of its insistence on unity with the Roman Church and to the consecration by bishops, often had to be satisfied with bad priests, which was a cause of vexation to many, and occasioned the decline of the Church. Still there were also in it many true and earnest men and women and above all much love for the Holy Scriptures, which reached their hands. Besides the reactionaries and conservatives there were many remaining Taborites, especially among the lesser landed noblemen, and with them much zeal for apostolic Christianity.

Of lesser importance was the little religious community of the Vlascenicer Brethren - or Pecinovites, or Weeping Brethren or Mikulášenci (Nicolites) - whose founder Mikuláš (Nikolaus) a peasant, from the village of Vlaseinice, by Pilgram (Pohrušínov). They held the services of the church attached to the Utraquist Church also their church services, but after the service they held their own edifying meeting, in which they discussed the sermon, prayed and wept. They resided especially in Pecinov, by Benesov (Benesov), but also in Prague, Tabor, Ruttenberg and other places. They had no priests, but only superintendents and teachers, still they had meeting houses, led a quiet and moral life and cared for their poor; but they were also persecuted because of their segregation.

The Catholic Church, indeed, formed only a minority in the land, but it found strong support in the Catholic Government, in powerful Catholic lords, in some Catholic towns, especially in Moravia, and also in the Bishop of Olomouc.

At this time the Czech people developed favourably again in
the field of culture. The University of Prague, it is true, by no means
stood on a high level, and could not recover properly from its earlier
decline, since it was neglected by the Government on account of its
Utraquist character. It offered its hearers only a low standard of
education, with few exceptions. Many Czechs, however, sought their
education abroad, in Italy, France and in the neighbouring Wittenberg,
and found there rich compensation, so that their grade of culture did
not remain behind that of the neighbouring peoples. Religiously,
however, the Czech people had hastened ahead of all other nations in
Europe. The United Brethren and the Utraquist Church were the only
Evangelic Churches in Europe and they were regarded with mistrust by the
whole world.
The outbreak of the Hussite disturbance in Bohemia found the German Empire in a condition of the deepest and most hopeless confusion. The disintegration of the internal conditions of the Empire, which under the rule of King Wenzel (Venceslaus), had feverishly endeavoured to gain ground, had on Sigismund's accession to the throne only been brought to an apparent and superficial truce. The expectations, which seemed justified at the beginning of Sigismund's reign, were only too quickly and too thoroughly disappointed.

"The King of Hungary, Bohemia, Croatia and Dalmatia", who harboured unsound and, in spite of the most lamentable failures, continually new surging and fantastic plans, possessed as little will as accomplishment and skill to justify his responsible position as overlord of his Empire. Just at the decisive moment in which it was necessary to mediate between the continually arising irreconcilable oppositions between the parties of the towns, the princes, and the knighthood, and by an energetically accomplished peace order throughout the land and strong intervention to put a stop against highway robberty and feuds, and to collect the strength of the nation, dissipated in dissensions of the parties, to a decisive blow against the continually wilder pushing of Slavdom towards the West — just at such a critical moment it was anxiety about his inherited lands on the lower Danube, his battles with the Turks, Bosnians and Venetians, his adventurous Italian policy, which drew him from the Empire, and delivered it nominally to the guidance of the Electoral-colleges, but in fact gave it up to anarchy. To the mutual battles of the princes and the knighthood and their quarrels with the towns were added the risings of the plebian democracy against the regime of the town gilds. Still more passionately, however, raged the struggle between the former town Episcopal towns against the jurisdiction of their bishops, and those threatened by the autonomy of the same—spiritual
battles that show us plainly the absolute confusion of the ecclesiastical conditions of Germany also in the end of the 15th century. The animosity against the hierarchy, which governed the democratic circle at the Rhine and in South Germany, is shown best in the work of the Mainz democrat, Eberhard Windeck, in his history of King Sigismund in which he says that at that time "all unhappiness and all discontent arose from the priesthood and (originated) because the priesthood was so greedy that it had brought the whole world into its power;" in another passage, he says of the clergy; "All ill-will and malice came from alms, which had grown so rich and powerful that it endeavoured to bring all things under itself....and, all, that one saw, that the priests began, was all to do with money, and, whether right or wrong, it must be money."(1) Under such conditions it was certainly not surprising that that which prophesies had long announced for the future, "one should kill the priests", now in ever wider circles came to be the solution of the day,(2) so that the common man, in face of the condition of universal want of justice, steeped himself more than ever in the old dreams of a social revolution, which should level the poor with the rich and only waited for the favourable moment, to forcefully attack the possessions of the clerics.

More quietly and unobserved, but all the more dangerously, the opposition worked, which had grown from the Church in the religious sects, of which those of the Waldensians had in the beginning of the 15th century, reached the heights of their extension. From Lombardy and the Rhine, the Waldensian missionaries had penetrated to the Baltic, to Bohemia, Poland and Hungary and everywhere found hosts of followers. In


(2) "Chronicon Moguntinum zum Jahre 1404", in "Chroniken der deutschen Städte," Bd. 18 (Mainz II) S.240.
the Austrian dukedom, where the sects could already in the year 1260 count followers in forty villages, the Inquisitor Petrus in 1395 had to fear an armed insurrection of the Waldensians, immeasurably aroused by the mass-executions of their co-religionists, who had also found followers among the clergy; in the Neumark, Uckermark and Pomerania - here too already in 1336 the Waldensians had been persecuted - in 1393 and 1394 hundreds of followers of the Waldensian Sect had been placed before the tribunal of the Inquisition and forced to abjure their "errors", which, nevertheless, a half century later we find again widely held among the population there.\(^{(3)}\) Similarly, bloody oppressions of the Waldensians were made at the same time, in Alsace, in Swabia, Franconia, Bavaria, Thuringia, in the Steiermark, Bohemia, Moravia and Hungary.\(^{(4)}\)

The working together of an irreconcilable religious opposition with the most radical political and social reform movements might perhaps in the first decades of the 15th century have already occasioned a collapse of all existing conditions in Germany, had not the revolutionary movement been brought to a standstill, at least for a short space, by the simultaneous outbreak of the Hussite disturbance.

\(^{(3)}\) Wattenbach, Ueber die Inquisition gegen die Waldenser in Pommern und der Mark Brandenburg (from "Abhandlungen" of the Prussian Akademie der Wissenschaften of the year 1885). An accused Waldensian woman in 1303, declared to have belonged to that Sect more than 50 years and had been won thereto by a woman, who, as well as the accused's husband, had suffered death by burning in Augermünde. It is noted of an Auto da Fe' held in Augermünde in 1336 that 14 "Luciferianer", who had not the right faith were condemned by the Inquisitor Jordanus to death by fire (Stiiborn Chron. Magdb., II, 340); what surmise can be more probable than that these "Luciferianer" as well as those since 1312 persecuted "Adanites" who were likewise accused, in the accredited manner, of devil worship and abnormal lewdness (Friess: "Pataroner, Bogharden und Waldenser" in the "Oesterreichischen Vierteljahrschrift für Katholische Theologie," Jahrg XI, 1872, p.234 fg), were Waldensers? See also Wattenbach in "Sitzungsberichte der berliner Akademie", 1887, Stueck 29, p.517, fg.

Through the same opposing powers, which we find active in

(Germany), Hussitism was called into life and carried along on the high tide of the national movement, which had governed the Czech state (Czechentum) since the turn of the fourteenth century. Thus, from the beginning Hussitism was innately opposed to the German state. With glowing enthusiasm for every opposition, the Taborites, who alone came into consideration as real clear-sighted representatives of the Hussite reform ideas, took up the realization of their political-social and religious programme. John Hus, who had given the last push to the eruption of the long-prepared movement, joined John Hus in fighting the Waldensian and Wyclif doctrines, which appeared as powerfully influenced by the ending of the long-prepared movement, they were rejected with ruthless decision.

On the ground of their refusal of every clerical tradition beyond the Bible, the doctrine of purgatory, the cult of Saints, the adoration of pictures and relics, fasting, the forms of Catholic Church Service, the sacraments, with exception of Communion and baptism, they were - indulgence and the power of punishment of the clergy. But the holy zeal of the Taborites for the spreading of Christ's Kingdom on earth did not stop at this; the socialistic and communist ideas of the 14th century took an important position in their reform programme, even if founded only by religious motives and, at least in the early years of the Hussite movement, the Taborites aimed seriously at the accomplishment of community of goods, the erection of universal equality and brotherhood, banishing all differences of sex, birth and possession. As the realization of the ideal had to be abandoned, at least the confiscation of the material property of the clergy was maintained and therein the Utraquists agreed together with the Taborites - and the confiscated property of the enemies of the godly law was declared the lawful property of the "believers". Everyone, however, who remained aloof from the Hussite-Taborite tenets of
faith was such an enemy and sinner that it was the holy duty (5) of the
taborites to subdue such with all the weapons of the law, to punish and
even to annihilate them.

Through the proclamation of such radical revolutionary ideas,
all the conservative elements in Germany, the knighthood and town
aristocracy, as well as princes and clerics, must have felt in the
highest degree threatened and moved to close co-operation to keep down
by force like dangerous movements in their own provinces, and the
opposition of Bohemia to Germany appeared absolutely irreconcilable,
when the Empire as executer of the Pope’s excommunications called forth
the Hussite war. In Bohemia the triumphant defence of the Hussite
faith against a world of enemies allowed it to become a Palladium of
the nation and the hate against the German hereditary enemy to flamed
up higher than ever. Even if, on the other hand, all proud self-esteem
had vanished from the German people so that even the most shameful
aspersion of German weapon-honour on the Bohemian battle grounds was
scarcely regarded, nevertheless, the fear and the horror felt for
the "bad Hussites", who spread death and destruction even into the
heart of Germany, for a short time brought a uniting power. Even the
almost estranged countries, as Switzerland and the Netherlands, allowed
their contingents to join the Empire against the Hussite armies, and
when these continually withdrew ignominiously through the Böhmerwald,
the fanaticism, which thirsted for the blood of the heretics turned into
a powerless but all the more grim hatred against the whole Czech state.
"It would not have been surprising", so says Eberhard Windeck,(6) a
decided defender of the town democracy, "if after the great misery and
suffering, which Germany experienced from the Bohemians, the German

(5) Bezold, "Zur Geschichte des Husitenthums, pp.18, 53.
(6) Col.1143.
Christian people should have despaired of God and felt unfavourably inclined towards Bohemian and Moravian tongues.

That, in spite of such a deep national emotion, there could even have been mention of Hussite Propaganda in Germany (7), and that this had in the middle of the 15th century found adherents in the widest circles of Germany, is really the strongest proof of the fact, unrecognized on some sides, (8) that the religious reform efforts of the Hussites were very earnestly intimated, that they were not an artificial, only a covering, cloak serving to conceal national and political tendencies in the Hussite movement, which, in so far as religion was concerned, could not merit the alleged reproach of sterility.

If the religious ideas of Hussitism were really artificially put together, providing nothing for really religious wants, how can one then explain that just in those neighbouring states of Bohemia most affected by the Hussite war, evergrowing numbers entered into those battles for Hussitism while, on the other hand, the Taborites in their manifestos turned just to the terribly humbled "arch-enemy of the Bohemian nation", Germany, continually inviting it to peaceful participation in the commencing religious reformation.

(7) In the splendid work of Grünhagen about the "Husiten Kriege der Schlesier" (p. 232) the false opinion is expressed that the Taborites and Kaisern, because their religion was so closely bound with their national feelings, had renounced broadcasting their teachings in German-speaking countries, in direct contrast to the moderate balictine party. Just the contrary is true! What in former examples (for instance Grünhagen's "Kirchengeschichte", II, 4, 480 ff.) was collected about supposed Hussite propaganda in Germany, is mostly of very little value. On the other hand the given proofs by R. Zöllner "Zur Vorgeschichte des Bauernkriegs" (1872) p. 75 ff.; Böhm: "Friedrich Heiders Reformation des Königs Sigismund" (1876) p. 105 ff., and Janasen: "Geschichte des deutschen Volks", II, 7, also p. 303 ff., are very worthy of observation, which we seek to complete in the following, without making the claim to give an exhaustive putting together of the material which comes into consideration for the question under discussion.

The first efforts towards a propagation of the Hussite-Wycliffe doctrines in countries bordering on Bohemia in the south and east came from Hieronymus von Prag. After he had already come into conflict with the University authorities of Paris and Heidelberg (9) we find him in 1410 in Olomouc as preacher of the Wycliffe doctrines; here, as in Vienna, where on the return journey, he made propaganda for Wyclif, he was imprisoned and escaped from the threatened inquisition on the part of the Passau official in Vienna by a flight to Moravia, whose population, as is well known, were mostly Hussite. In the year 1413 Hieronymus agitated with great success at the Polish court at Krakow, whence he turned, in the suite of the Grand-duke Witold, to Lithuania and Russia and sought to win the adherents of the Greek Church there to Hussitism.(10) We must postpone here a detailed description of the further history of Hussitism in Poland, to the Bohemian reformation. Caro has certainly rightly emphasised, that Polish diplomacy, in the whole course of the Hussite movement, never did more than strive to win on the political side only, (11) truly with such cynical want of consideration, that King Vladislav, with his sense of justice and continual boasting and doubtless real orthodoxy, in the years 1432-3 entered the field with Hussite auxiliary troops against the Teutonic Order

Among the Polish people it was evident Hussitism had found a most fruitful ground, in the reform movement started by Jan Milič, as is demonstrated by the continual complaints of the Polish


Schon 1412 hatten die pragrer Pfarrer über die Verbreitung husitischer Schriften in Polen und Ungarn Klage erhoben. Palacký, S.335.

Bezold, "König Sigismund und die Reichskriege gegen die Hussiten, I, 50.
clergy and the repeated intervention of the Inquisition against Hussite Sects. (12) Also in Slavonia and Hungary we meet with traces of Hussite propaganda already in 1413. (13) In spite of the energetic activity of the Minorites acting as Inquisitors, especially that of Jacobus von Monte-Brandonis (1434-9), Hussitism found innumerable adherents in most of the comitats of the Hungarian Kingdom. In the year 1437 Graf Ladislaus von Thamasi described most of the towns and villages in the land between the Save and the Danube as infected with Hussitism, and in 1449 the Hungarian prelates and lords complained to their proctor at the Roman Court that through the Bohemian mercenaries acquired in Hungary, the Hussite heterodoxy had been brought into the country and that in very many of the churches in the Comitate of Zips and Saros communion was given under both kinds. The energetic laws of the zealous King Matthias, who amongst others in 1480 drove the Bohemian brethren from Moravia into exile in Moldavia, may possibly have limited Hussitism in Hungary to narrower circles. (14)

In Austria, Vienna University watched the more anxiously over the orthodoxy of the public lectures in the University because in 1410, and later at the Council of Constance, it had to defend itself on the unmerited charge of favouring heresies against the zealot Passau official.

Palacky: "Geschichte von Böhmen, III, I, 287, 301; III, 3, 330; IV 1, 439 (der vor der polnischen Inquisition gefürchtete Johann Galle als eines der Häupter der Taboriten 1451), 301;
"Monumenta conc. general sac. XV", II, 143;
Schnase: "Die Böhmischen Brüder in Polen", in der "Zeitschrift für historische Theologie", Bd. 37 (1887) S.125 fg.;
Krasinski: "Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland" (London,1833) S. 64 fg.

(13) Loscrth in Mittheilungen.

(14) Pesaler: "Geschichte der Ungarn", IV, 1140 f. 1191.
"Scriptores rer. Hungaricarum", ed. Schwandtner, II, 63;
In 1413 it declined in a very ironically phrased writing the proposal of Prague University to interfere against Johannes Siward, a Carthusian, a graduate of Vienna University, on account of his attacks. We learn from this writing, that in the same year, a former member of Prague University, Dominic von Agram, had been arrested in Vienna by the Passau Official, on account of publishing Wycliffite doctrines, and, through the influence of several "Magistrati" of Vienna University, was obliged to take an abjuration oath. A very remarkable event is indicated in the Acts of Vienna University of the year 1419: in the minutes of the Theological Faculty occurs the mention of a rumour that the Waldensians, who, in the first decade of the 15th century had been persecuted by the Passau Inquisitors, had made a covenant with the Hussites and Jews; a report to the reigning prince concerning the evidently alarming fact, had been postponed by the meeting until the return of some absent "Magistrati". We shall learn later, that, in fact, in Austria, as in other German lands, an alliance had been effected between the Taborites and the Waldensians. For protection of Vienna University against the introduction of Hussitism, an enactment had been ordered by Duke Albrecht V in the year 1421 that all members of the University should take an oath as to their orthodoxy. Nevertheless in the year 1426 several graduates of the University were considered secret adherents of Hussitism and in the same year for this cause a Prague Magister was refused the reception into the theological faculty which he sought until they had been assured of his orthodoxy. Likewise,


the initiative of Duke Albrecht V in 1435 procured the visitation and
reformation of Vienna University by the Basle Council, on making the
evaluation ordered by the Prince of the religious Houses of the
Augustinians also
Benedictines and Masters of Canons, whose attitude widened its scope as
to comes the University.(17)

Also Bavaria, bordering on Bohemia, was well prepared for the
reception of Hussite doctrines by a very active Waldensian propaganda.
In the Bishopric of Passau, as well as in that of Regensburg, in the last
quarter of the 14th century inquisitions against the Waldensians had
had to be held, and their too considerate treatment had met with a severe
reproach from Bishop Johann of Passau (d.1387). In 1410 his successor,
Georg, under whom the energetic Inquisitor, Petrus, came into the land,
himself conducted the examination against the local "Wycliffians", whom
we may regard as Waldensians, in the lower Bavarian villages Giesbach
and Waldkirchen (in the Bavarian Forest).(18) In Regensburg Bishop
Albrecht in 1409 took over, under particularly difficult conditions, the
reins of government; the clergy of the diocese, who had mostly been

(17) Aschbach, S.302, 270;
Fink: "Geschichte der Universität Wien", I, 2, 45; II, 297. Im
Bistum Salzburg, das noch in dem ersten Drittel des 15 Jahrhunderts
blutige Verfolgungsteuerfahrerischer Waldenser gesehen hatte, wurden auf
der Diöcesensynode im Jahre 1420 die auf dem Salzburger Provinzial
concil des Jahres 1418 gegen die wycliffitischen und husitischen, Mährisch
erlassenen Strafbestimmungen wiederholt promulgirt. Von ihrer praktischen
Anwendung auf Anhänger des Husitismus sind Nachrichten nicht überliefert;
dagegen ist den auf den salzburger Provinzial Concil von Jahre 1456
vorgebrachten Klagen des Bischops von Lavant zu entnehmen, dass sich
in dessen Diöcese damals eine besorgnissregende opposition gegen die
Excommunication und eine häufige Nichtachtung derselben seitens der
wegen Verdachts der Ketzerlei Excommunicirten geltend machte, die bis zu
gefolgter Bedrohung der Geistlichkeit ging. Der auf dem Provinzial
Concil von 1418 verurtheilte waldensische und wycliffitische Satz von der
subjectiven Bedingtheit der Wirksamkeit der Gnadensmittel wurde noch auf
den salzburger Provinzial concil des Jahres 1490 nachdrücklich als
heuristisch bekämpft.
Dalham: "Concilia Salisburgensia", S.105, 205;
Martenheim: "Concilia Germaniae" V. 530, 583;
Binterfe: "Geschichte der deutschen Concilien", S.120 fg., 349 fg.

(18) Schäffer: "Die Bischöfe von Passau" (1844) S.116, 125. About the
Regensburger Waldensians I will say more later.
trained at Prague University, partly inclined to the Bohemian reform ideas and met the Bishop with obstinate disobedience. With all the greater decision the latter made his disciplinary regulations; at the diocesan Synod of the year 1419 the measures taken at the Salzburg Provincial Council of 1418 were sharply imposed on the Regensburg clergy, and the setting up of a Heretics' tower ("Ketzerthurm") in Regensburg showed that the Bishop would not leave it at a declaration only. On 25th May, 1420, the chaplain of the Ahakirche (Aha-church in Regensburg) Ulrich Grünsleder, of Bohonstraus (in the Upper Palatine), was arrested in Regensburg Cathedral, on suspicion of Hussitism; the ensuing examination showed that Grünsleder was, in fact, an adherent of Wyclif and Hus, that he had translated writings of the latter into German and had distributed these translations among the laity, and had also endeavoured to disseminate the Bohemian doctrines by clandestine sermons. He was sentenced on 1st April, 1421, to the stake as an unrepentant heretic. In the same year, the priest Peter von Dresen (Dresden?) met the same fate, as defender of nine Wycliffian sentences. In Ariburg the sermons of the cleric Heinrich Ratzsch of Gotha, on his travels, at the same time caused a great sensation, preaching among other things against the immorality of the whole catholic clergy, especially the monks, and attacking the practice of spiritual official rights. Arrested and examined by the Regensburg Inquisition, Ratzsch acknowledged many Hussite sentences, also himself to be an adherent of the French Antipope Benedict XIII, about whose lawful election he had wished to convince himself on his pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostella, and a despiser of the authority of the Constance Council; after long imprisonment, on 21st January, 1422, he decided to abjure these opinions, whereupon he was sentenced to temporary confinement in an outhouse of the Bishop's Palace. After a year, however, Ratzsch, whom the Bishop John II was contemplating freeing altogether, in his lonely confinement, had such violent pangs of conscience as to his denial of his religious
convictions, that, from the window of his prison, with loud voice, in the presence of the assembled people in the Cathedral Square, he took back his denial and declared himself once more to be an adherent of Hussitism and praised as deserving merit, the iconoclasm of the Bohemians. His fate was thereby sealed; on 15th April, 1423, he was delivered up by the Inquisition to the secular law for execution of the death penalty. Warlike attacks of the Hussites on Bavaria which, it is said, a Bavarian nobleman, eager for prey, Tristram Zenger, had called into being began in 1425, and, on account of their supposed support, the Bavarian Jews of the Böhmerwald had to undergo harsh persecution. These may have been the strongest forerunner of the wide dissemination of Hussitism beyond the Bohemian-Bavarian frontier; in the following period we only hear in 1434 of an intervention in Regensburg against the Hussites, of whom one was drowned and others taken prisoner; perhaps here too we may be concerned with Hussite prisoners of war. Similar Hussite movements we shall meet with again in the second half of the 15th century.(19)

In Franconia, whose population, more than any other German country, was more inclined to the reception of new religious and political doctrines and had already shown its sympathy to Hus on his journey to the Council of Constance, the union of the innumerable Waldensians there to Hussitism was already a fact in 1418, if we may believe a not altogether reliable source. A scholar of Wyclif, Master Peter Payne, who had fled to Bohemia, had, it is alleged, sought

Corner: "Chronicon".
in that year at a conference held at Nuremberg by German Waldensians, to
win them for the Bohemian reform movement, without however then
succeeding. A captured Bohemian priest, who had become suspect of
spreading heterodoxy in Gröfenberg (between Nuremberg and Bajrenarth) and
in Nuremberg, was sent on 9th May, 1421, by the Nuremberg Council to
the Bishop of Bamberg for punishment. Neither this activity of its
orthodoxy nor the great material sacrifices made during the Hussite war,
prevented the town of Nuremberg at this period being stigmatised, from
the most various sides, as supporting heterodoxy by importing it, even
indeed of treasonable agreement with the same. After the battle near
Aussig (1426) the Meissen Commander in Chief Boso von Vitzthum was accused
of treason, while the Council of Nuremberg in a letter to the Margrave
of Meissen thought it necessary to defend themselves against the same
reproach. Of the treacherous letters, supposedly written from Bamberg
and Nuremberg to the Hussites, which had come into the hands of the
Margrave, the Council of Nuremberg had no knowledge. We become
acquainted with many Franconian converts to Hussitism from an interesting
document of the year 1427, wherein the Nurembergers Erhard and Kunz the
Schweinfurter Wintzer Aegidius, also Hans von Rhein and four other German
prisoners pledged themselves to the Town Council of Prague to remain
faithful to Hussitism, particularly the communion subutraque, their whole
life long, and under pain of death to attend in half a year in Prague.
In the same year, Pope Martin V addressed a Bull to Bishop Friedrich of
Bamberg, empowering the latter to reconcile repentant Hussite heretics
of his Diocese, both clerical and lay, to the Church again, by giving
absolution; a similar permission was sought by the Ambassador of the
Basle Council to the Bohemians, in the year 1432, in regard to the
transgressors of the trade embargo between Bohemia and the neighbouring
countries for the Nuremberg Dominican Prior. We shall have to return
later to the highly significant results, which Hussite propaganda
achieved in Franconia from the end of the Hussite war into the second
half of the 15th century.(20)

Of all the lands neighbouring on Bohemia, Silesia, Lausitz and Neisse were most severely affected by the Hussite war. Particularly in Silesia, the war was waged with the wildest cruelty and bitterness, not only by the Bohemian side, which was not the least responsible for the enduring enmity between these two neighbour-countries, before so closely united. During the Hussite war, however, the feeling of their close ties came alive in the population of Silesia, broken up as it was into so many separate principalities, and the grim hatred produced by the union of religious, national and political antipathies, which was felt by most German and Catholic Silesians against the Hussite Czechs, formed from the time of the Hussite wars probably the most effective protection against the imminent danger of the Slavonising of the Silesian people. One must not, however, forget that this mutual estrangement between Bohemia and Silesia was caused in a degree by the succeeding isolation of the Hussite wars and the terrible exhaustion of Bohemia. At many stages of the Silesian-Hussite war nothing seemed less probable than a triumph of the Catholic cause, and the reaction of such unfavourable turns of events on the morale of the Silesian people teaches us plainly that in Silesia too the Church was threatened most seriously by Hussite propaganda, which consequences were only stopped in 1433 by the victory of the Silesian arms.

We hear of a dissemination of the Hussite doctrines in a peaceful manner in Silesia only in the year 1410, when King Sigismund at Breslau had the Prague citizen, Johann Krasa, who had there declared himself against the resolutions of the Council of Constance and for the communion sub utraque, drawn to the execution place by horses and there

(20) "Religiöse Sekten", S.81 ff. und Anhang I.
burnt at the stake. Twenty years earlier Wyclif's ideas had already been represented in Breslau by the remarkable heretic, Stephanus, a former Oxford student, whose doctrines indeed remind one in many ways of those disseminated by Waldensian sects in Silesia until the end of the 14th century.\(^{21}\) In unspeakably brutal and violent manner, however, the converting zeal of Hussitism made itself felt during the military expeditions, beginning in 1425, into Silesia and the Lausitz: the pastor of Wünschelburg was burnt in 1425, because he refused to recant his former attacks against Hussitism; the small town of Bernstadt in the Upper Lausitz bought its capitulation in 1430 by the supposedly voluntary and gratefully given promise on oath of the inhabitants "never more to go against the holy articles of the truth of the 'Evangelic' and Christian faith, for which the Bohemian army fought and all other lords and brothers, who fight for the increase of the same godly truth". From a document of the year 1432, unfortunately only fragmentary, we learn that the Breslau chief of mercenaries, Hain von Tschirne, a prisoner of the Hussites, became bound to follow certain "truths" and orders of the Taborite leaders, and as we find this same nobleman again later as a decided partisan of the Hussites in Silesia, "as one of the Hussites and Bohemians", one may draw the conclusion that conversion to Hussitism was the condition of his liberty. Not only external coercion, however, but also despair of the German State and Church, the prospect of war-glory and material profit, also - why should we doubt it - honest religious conviction may have led many Silesians to the Hussite party. For instance we find the Hussite field-marshall Heinrich von Peterswaldau, beheaded by order of King Sigismund after his capture in 1430, the unhappy Mikuláš Zedlitz of Alzenau, paying with his death for the supposedly treacherous

delivery of Ottramachau Castle in the same year, as well as the groups of
Silesians, mentioned in many documents of the year 1430 as penitent
former "partisans and helpers of the heretics against the Holy Church",
those people of the Knight Hermann von Zettritz, who took part in the
plunder of the Hussites of Grünau Monastery, burnt as heretics and
lastly the hosts of Silesian peasants, who, according to a statement in
a letter of 1423, "zu on gotrotin sein, der zuhole vil ist." When we
read in the same letter, that the Hussites at that time in Silesia only
burnt to ashes churches, parsonages and seats of noblemen, the motives
which led the Silesian peasantry in war-comradeship, the Upper Lausitz
peasants in 1431 in "tribute and devotion" to the Bohemians, becomes with
some truth apparent. (22)

The towns, particularly the fanatical men of Breslau and
Görlitz, distinguished themselves by their war-like zeal for the cause
of the Catholic faith; nevertheless we meet in some the same
threatening signs of sympathy with Hussitism, as in Zittau, where in
1424 the Burgomaster, with twelve companions, was in treacherous concord
with the Hussites, and in Bautzen where in 1429 the town-clerk, Peter
Frischwitz, who set fire to the town and played into the hands of the
Hussites, was quartered. A letter of the year 1429 shows us how unsafe
from the heretics one felt in one's own country and with what fear their
secret combinations in the neighbouring lands oppressed the spirit.
Four hundred Hussites, it was then rumoured were, as weavers and skinners,
to march into the town and surrounding lands, to spread fire and misery.
In the year 1430 the town of Dresden was informed by its ruling prince
"that the damned heretics had made much acquaintance with secret mess-
engers in our land", and notified them of the expected appearance of a
Hussite spy sent from Sagan, who had been several times in the land and
had his letters hidden between his shoulders. In 1429, more than

(22) "Scriptores rorum Silesiae", XII, 313; VI, 116, 143, 193 fg. 143;
Grüninger: "Husiten Kämpfe", S.111, 193 fg., 233, 260, 279;
40 suspected traitors, "who were suspected of setting fire to the town", some of whom were servants of the local Bohemian nobles, were arrested and tortured in Glatz, and the head of the province of Upper Lusatia adds a warning to this communication for the town of Görlitz: "be therefore prepared for the same". (23)

Ever since the year 1423, from among the Silesian nobles, the most bitter reproaches about the lukewarm and inglorious conduct of the war against the Hussites had been expressed, nevertheless, the example, once given, of the purchase of a truce, however short, was widely

As nearly all the records of the lost to us, the question whether the payments, demanded further decided. Therefore, the sole of peace between a Silesian prince, Hussites, is all the more important as which Hussite propaganda at the time; September, 1431, the Duke (having Hussites against the guarantee of a truce) except with his sons (one of them, in 1428, made a lasting peace with the four Articles and to defend them against he died before the end of the year, his the said document was to be returned and the four Articles and for a half year

ion sub utraque. As to whether this

(23) Mencken: "Scriptores rerum German", II, 1317, 1320;
Palacky: "Urkundliche Beiträge", II, 7;
Neues Archiv Sächsische Geschichte VII, (1836) 145 f.;
"Ober Nordbrennerbanden in der Oberlausitz im Jahre 1429;
Scheltz: "Gesammtgeschichte der Ober und Niederlausitz" im "Neuen
Lusatzer Magazin", Bd. 57, S.109, 126, 130;
"Scriptores rerum Slesiacar", VI, 77.
40 suspected traitors, "who were suspected of setting fire to the town", some of whom were servants of the local Bohemian nobles, were arrested and tortured in Glatz, and the head of the province of Upper Lusatia adds a warning to this communication for the town of Görlitz: "be therefore prepared for the same". (23)

Ever since the year 1423, from among the Silesian nobles, the most bitter reproaches about the lukewarm and inglorious conduct of the war against the Hussites had been expressed, nevertheless, the example, once given, of the purchase of a truce, however short, was widely imitated in the following years. As nearly all the records of the contracts characterising this are now lost to us, the question whether the Hussite army-leaders, beyond money payments, demanded further concessions can in most cases not be decided. Therefore, the sole remaining document of the conclusion of peace between a Silesian prince, Duke Pazenko of Troppau and the Hussites, is all the more important as a speaking example of the success which Hussite propaganda at the time had obtained in Silesia. On 28th September, 1431, the Duke (having formerly made a pact with the Hussites against the guarantee of a truce) promised at the end of a year to accept with his sons (one of them, Wenzel von Leobschütz had already, in 1428, made a lasting peace with the Hussites) the Hussite profession of faith, especially as to the Communion in both kinds and the four Articles and to defend them against all antagonists. In case the Duke died before the end of the year, his sons would carry out the contract; the said document was to be returned to the Prince, when he had adopted the four Articles and for a half year had made profession of the Communion sub utraque. As to whether this

curious contract was ever fulfilled, we have no knowledge; from a written notice of 15th May, 1432, wherein the Taborites then notified the withdrawal of peace from Duke Przemko as well as from other Silesian princes, it may be surmised, that the old prince had not then made his public conversion to Hussitism. As to the other numerous peace-pacts between Silesian princes and the Hussites, which in all probability mostly contained similar suspicious clauses, it is sufficient to quote a passage from a letter of Bishop Konrad of Breslau of May, 1428, that "unfortunately heterodoxy had so greatly increased and had been strengthened by so many who had joined it in those lands and that many princes in Silesia had made peace with it, namely, Duke Bolko the elder and younger, of Oppeln, his brother Berhard, Duke Johannes von Münsberg, Ludwig von Olau, Wenzel von Lockschütz, Duchess of Ratibor, Przemko von Troppau, Kasimir von Auschwitz and Konrad der Kantner of Teschen, whereby we, other Princes in Silesia, and lands and towns have been much weakened," and at the beginning of 1429, the Bishop complained continually that no dependence was to be placed on the princes of Upper Silesia in fighting the Hussites. Ebehard Windeck principally accuses the Silesian princes for the successes of the Hussites in Silesia because "they did not unite, and treated with the heretics." That they were their secret aiders, Windeck like many others, particularly Duke Ludwig von Bries, declares, without, however, any particular evidence being brought forward for this accusation.(24)

A clear proof of the influence of Hussite tendencies on the supposedly orthodox circle in Silesia also, and of the unbelievable disintegration in the internal conditions of the land at the time of the Hussite wars is shown by the contracts of the wild Duke Johann I of Sagan with the Sagan Augustin Canons. After the Duke (whom we find often fighting against the Hussites) had, in 1426, peacefully set aside

his quarrels with the Monastery which had led to his excommunication, and had promised to give it back its possessions, he made use in 1429 of a dispute between the canons to take the Abbot Heinrich II into custody, and when the latter withstood the Duke's attempts at extortion, had him thrown into a dungeon and finally had him blinded in his presence. He subsequently violently broke up all the rooms of the cloister, isolated the inhabitants from all intercourse, endeavoured to starve them out, appropriated the possessions of the Monastery by force and threatened its faithful servants with death. Defying the interdict which for years hung over him, he demanded two priests from outside whom the clergy considered Wycliffites and Hussites for holding divine service. Their sermons, so the Sagan cloister chronicle accuses, were to take as basis only the Evangelium, they discarded the doctrine of purgatory, and declared, in consideration of their missing clerical authorisation that the word of God suffered no bonds. If the Bohemian weapons had remained victorious, would not Hussitism have here found the ground perfectly prepared for its doctrines and have found an easily won adherent in the Duke, coveting the Church goods. Duke Johann I's son, Johann II the Cruel, altogether followed in his father's footsteps. Put into the place of his brother Balthasar, as Duke of Sagan by Georg Podiebrad, he attempted to murder the Abbot of the Monastery, remained four years unconcernedly under interdict as an adherent of Podiebrad, and was only driven from the Dukeedom through a small deputation of the Papal Legates to the proclaimed Silesian Princes.(25)

Duke Bolko (Boleslaw) V of Oppeln appears an open and, as we may conclude, a convinced adherent of Hussitism from the year 1430. Acquainted with the Hussite doctrines as student at Prague and "Baccalaureus", he nevertheless in 1423 opposed the Hussites hostile

invasion of Silesia. After the occupation of his town Oberfolgau on 
13th March, 1423, he made a peace treaty with the conquerors, for 
himself, as also for his father Boleslaw IV, which, was probably 
identical with that of the afore-mentioned Duke Przemko. While we only 
know of Boleslaw IV (d.1437), that from that time he held himself aloof 
from the wars against the Hussites, the younger Bolko on 15th April,1430,
to entered into an alliance with them and "many honourable persons" with 
him. Carrying the Hussite campaign against the worldly possessions of 
the clergy into practice, he took the goods of the Augustine Canons at 
Oberfolgau, occupied, in agreement with the Hussites and supported by 
his father, a whole line of castles of the Breslau Cathedral Chapter and, 
as army commander of the Hussites, took a principal part in the battles 
in the years 1430-1433. Also, after the end of the Hussite wars, which 
for him had no unpleasant consequences, he remained true to the Hussite 
faith. Unconcerned as to the admonitions of the clergy, mocking at the 
ecommunication hanging over him, he kept in his possession until his 
death the possession and income he had taken from the Oberfolgau Priory, 
Cathedral Chapter, and, as first of the Silesian Princes, associated 
himself with King George. When the Cracow Professor Andreas Galka 
was in 1443 persecuted as a Wycliffite, he found safe protection in Duke 
Bolko's court in Oberfolgau. Not daring to take revenge against the 
living, the Church attacked the Duke after his death. His corpse, 
buried by the Minorites was, on order of the Breslau Bishop under the 
pretence that the spirit of the deceased disturbed the cloister day and 
night, dug up and buried in unconsecrated ground.(26)

We may mention also, in connection with the above, that since 
the year 1430 the Polish Taborite leader Dobko Puchala and the Polish

(26) "Scriptores rerum Silesiacar" VI, 106, 105; VIII, 53; IX, 307; 
VII, 30; X, 26; VIII, 53; XII, 9, 50. 
Caro: "Geschichte Polens", IV, 408 ff.
Prince Korybut in Upper Silesia, converted to Hussitism, the one in
Kreuzburg, the other in Koœol lands, began an enduring government, which
Puchala at any rate managed to maintain until 1433. We may therefore
regard the influence of the Hussite doctrines on the Silesian population
as not unimportant. Religious tolerance, as is well-known, has never been
a factor of Hussitism, and the opposition which the popular ideas of the
Catholic people in so many ways felt towards it, was very slightly
demonstrated. The presence of a greater number of adherents of Hussitism
in Silesia is confirmed for us by the fact that in 1435 at Brünn at the
peace conference, the Hussites demanded a religious freedom for their
adherents not only in Bohemia, Moravia, Poland and Hungary (Tirnau) but
also in Silesia, without, however, as it appears, any success.(27)

After the Hussites had abandoned Silesia, the revenge of
the Catholic princes overtook many of the adherents of the Silesian bond
and faith. So we hear of a subject of the Monastery Heinrichau,
imprisoned in 1435 as a former helper of the Hussites and a traitor to
the country. In 1437, King Sigismund freed the Breslauer of all
responsibility towards the Silesian adherents of the Hussites and
included in the measures taken their personal punishment and the conquest
and destruction of their castles. If in the same year, the related
burning of the advocate of the Breslau Consistory, Peter Lesnitz, was
for religious reasons, as it may well have been, we may presume that he
also was an adherent of Hussitism, particularly hated in Breslau.
Whilst, on the other hand, Hussite doctrines unquestionably found
acquiescence in the lands of Bolko von Oppeln until his death, we see
under the government of King Georg Podlebrad fanaticism again arising
against the Hussites and suspicion against the confederates of the
heterodox King in Silesia. It is well known that Georg's sons,
Victorin and Heinrich, the later Dukes of Troppau, Münsterberg and

Monum. cond. general saec. XV., I, 532.
Glätz were conspicuous at the head of these confederates. Although it would be very instructive to follow in detail the suspected sympathies of the princes, nobles and towns in Silesia in the matter of the Hussite King, as shown by the church's continual sentences of interdict, this would be going beyond the scope of our present

Since the overthrow of the Taborites, the wild and really revolutionary element had been removed from Hussitism, which element alone, at the time of the Hussite wars had made successful propaganda for the Bohemian reformation in Germany, the spineless and intolerant Utraquist State-church of that time being in no condition, even if it wished to make the effort, to strengthen its party beyond the frontiers of Bohemia. Therefore in the periodical inclination of Silesia and Lausitz towards Georg Podiebrad and in conjunction therewith the measures taken in Neisse, Silesia and Lausitz against the dissemination of Hussitism, we recognise no more than a symptom of the rapid sinking of the respect and authority of the Catholic Church, since the Hussite disorders.

**Lands of the Teutonic Order**

In the Prussian ecclesiastical state, the Bishopric at the end of the 14th century had already stood up to the heretic movements and Hussitism had early made entrance into the Prussian towns, probably from Poland. Later, we shall meet a Prussian cleric, Peter Turnow of Tolkenitz, who had been educated at Prague University and made propaganda on the Rhine for Hussitism. In the year 1420, the pastor of Gilgenburg (south of Cöthen in East Prussia) was arrested by the local Order commander, because, according to the complaint of his congregation, he

(23) "Scriptores rerum Silesiacarum", IV, 149, 151; XII, 92; IX, 126; Grünhagen: "Geschichte Schlesiens", I, 233, 234, 316 f.; Scholz: "Neues Lusatier Magazin", 4 VIII, 82, 86, 89, 101; Collet Diplomat, Saxonie regiae", II, c. (Urkundenbuch der Stadt Chemnitz) 3, 165.


had preached Hussite doctrines from the pulpit. At the same time the
Magistrates of many other towns, especially the Magistrate of Thorn,
were warned by the Grand-master to be on the watch against the
infiltration of Hussite heresies. A letter from the Bishop of Ermland
to the Bishop of Gnesen in the year 1425 gives a very sad description
of the prevailing condition of the Church in the country and complains
of the progress of heterodoxy, which led to derision of the clergy,
disdain of the dignity of the Papal See and general contempt of
spiritual jurisdiction. Five years later the pastor of Stüblau had to
seek the protection of the Grand Master, because his whole congregation
had threatened him with death. Similarly in 1430 Thorn became the
theatre of a passionate dispute between the Dominicans on the one side
and the "Sectores" and his supporting Knights of the Order on the other,
wherein the monks endeavoured to bring all the Order under suspicion of
favouring Hussitism. Even after the Dominicans had been partly banished,
partly chased from the country, the dispute lasted for years; the monks
and townspeople declared each other banned, the parish churches were
closed and the inhabitants of Thorn split up into parties for and against
the heterodoxy of the pastors in question. One of them, Andreas
Teuchner of Pfeffendorf, we meet in 1433 as Proctor of the German Order at the
Council at Basle, where he was, at the same time called to account by
the Inquisitor Peter Wichmann on the accusation of dissemination of
Hussite doctrines. (20)

(20) Thiel, "De synode dioecesana Henrici III evisc. Warmiensia, Index
lectiones libri Braunsbergensis per hionem 1661," S. 8;
Zeilau's "Preussische Chronik" (h. von Perlbach), II, 85 fg. Das
Zeilau berichtet über die Ketzerischen Verhaftungen der Kochmeister Konrad
von Hallenrod und Heinrich Reuss von Plauen (I, 674; II, 23, 35, 41-47.
Voigt V-720 fg.) und über das angebliche Auftreten eines husitischen
Predigers in Danzig (II, 48 fg.) berichtet (danach z.B. Hartknoch;
"Preussische Kirchenhistoria" 1598 5.243 fg., 246 fg.) durfte nicht
berücksichtigt werden, da diese Angaben offenbar auszwecklichen
Erfindung des mädelischen und ordensfeindlichen Chronisten beruhen.
In Lower Saxony, in 1420, Jakob Bremer, of Vorden, a former Prague Magister, was brought before the courts as an adherent of heretical doctrines. A register of 34 heretical principles supposed to be defended by Bremer, were put together by the Inquisition court of law assembled in Magdeburg. Although a number of these principles plainly showed Wycliffian and Hussite influence, a part thereof, denying among other things the existence of Christ, of His Mother Mary, of the Apostles and other biblical dates and personalities, and characterising Jacob as God and Saviour and Judas Iscariot as Patriarch and Prophet, can not with certainty be determined as belonging to the individual religious teaching of Bremer or merely to the conclusions drawn by the Inquisitors from the Wycliffite doctrines. On 19th March, 1420, the death-sentence pronounced by the Inquisition against Bremer, as an obstinate heretic, was carried out in front of the walls of Magdeburg. (30)

On the Middle Rhine, to which subsequent events lead us, the conflicts between the spiritual princes and their clergy, on the one hand, and the inhabitants of the Imperial cities, on the other, had since the 14th century become ever more frequent and more violent. In 1384 a Mainz chronicle relates that because of the disturbances between that city and the clerical body the Interdict pronounced against the town had endured many years. The burgesses had taken no notice of it, but had thrown themselves into the arms of heresy, and certainly Mainz, at that time, became the scene of continual bloody persecutions of the Waldensians. At the same time, the fight between the town of Worms and its Bishop and clerical body was passionately waged, the latter, according to the clerical chronicles, being treated by the inhabitants worse than by Saracens. (31)

(30) "Corneri chronicon," bei Eccard, "Corpus historicum", Thl. 2, Col. 1233;
(31) "Chroniken der deutschen Städte", Bd. 18 (Mainz II) S.211 f., 213 ff
spiritual body, an interdict was pronounced against the town, the citizens defiantly named four stranger priests to hold divine service. In 1407 on the conclusion of peace it was specifically stipulated that these "sinful pastors" should be evacuated from the town and bishopric, and the churchyard of St. Arand, where one of the four, who had meanwhile died, was buried, was only re-consecrated after the corpses had been removed.(32)

In the year 1422 after the fire had long glowed beneath the ashes, and the clergy had many times removed from Speyer, it came to open war between the town of Speyer and its Bishop Rhébau for the rights of the town. When the Bishop and his adherents, with an army of 20,000 men, approached the town, the burgesses despoiled and burnt St. German's Monastery which lay in front of the town walls, probably to hinder the besiegers from establishing themselves there; the whole clerical body, excepting the begging friars, left the town in hasty flight, their remaining possessions becoming the booty of the wildly-excited townsmen. During the siege the rumour that the inhabitants of Speyer had become Hussite heretics spread ever more widely because they had burnt the churches and driven away the clerics, so King Sigismund sent the Margrave Friedrich von Brandenburg to Speyer to learn more details of the situation and he, it is said, spoke in favour of the orthodoxy of the town. The unfavourable royal decision concerning the disputes between the two hostile parties could not lead however to a change in the feelings of the burgesses towards the Bishops and clergy, when the inconstant Sigismund in 1426 pronounced his own judgment as unjust, and the town prejudiced thereby, and showed himself ready to reverse it.(33) A curious light is thrown on the reproach that the town

Lehmann: "Chronica der Stadt Speyer" (1662) S.386-390;
Kerih: "Deutsche Reichstagsacten", VIII, 430, Anm. 2.
of Speyer was heretically minded, by the fact that at this time its walls harboured two Hussite clergymen, one of whom was rector of a school in Speyer, while the other published audacious propaganda for Hussitism from that town, aimed at nothing less than a revolutionary upheaval of the German imperial towns against the worldly power of the clergy.(34)

Johannes Drändorf of Schlieben (south east of Wittenberg), descendant of a Meissen noble line, and Peter Turnow of Tolkemit (at the Frischen Haff) in West Prussia appear to have first become acquainted with each other at Prague University. Drändorf, born in 1390, was taught in Dresden by the Masters (Magistri) Friedrich and Petrus, of whom the latter is characterised as a Waldensian and principal creator of the Hussite cup-communion. Consecrated as a priest, he voluntarily discarded his riches and, after a long sojourn at his home, he journeyed to the Rhine, where we find him active as representative of the Hussite doctrines in Basle, Strassburg and Speyer. He worked in conjunction with a number of similarly devoted Hussite priests, of whom, however, he named in his examination only one Cologne clergyman, who was later supposed to have recanted before the Inquisition, School-rector Turnow of Speyer and a priest, friend of the latter. Together with Turnow, he composed a manifesto in Speyer against unreasonable excommunication, blind obedience to spiritual authority, and the worldly government of the clergy, framed in the most violent terms. This concluded as follows: "These are the chains by which they have bound not only the small men of the people but also the Kings. To the believers it must now be said: let us break the chains, and the unjust excommunication, and the blind obedience, and throw off as well their yoke and worldly government!" It may be supposed, that the manifesto originated during the Speyer Bishops' war which at this epoch played no unimportant part.

(34) "Über die religiösen," in "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Fränkischen Provinz vor der Reformation" (1882) 3.32 ff. u.
An equally favourable opportunity to enter into connection with the hierarchy of the hostile elements of the urban democracy appeared to open up to Drändorf and Turnow in the disputes of the Imperial territory and the town Weinsberg. Because of its opposition against the judgment of the Würzburg court of justice, which was in favour of the possession of the town by the Dynast Konrad von Weinsberg, the most hated enemy of the town Weinsberg was banned in 1422 and again in 1425 and beyond this was placed in Interdict by Bishop Johann II of Würzburg. The town was the less inclined to give up the fight in its own good cause, when in protection of their imperial standing 33 imperial towns formed a union, at whose head stood Augsburg, Ulm and Constance. It was sincerely hoped that teaching, such as that contained in the above-mentioned Manifesto, would fall on fruitful soil among the population of Weinsberg, deeply angered by the interdict. Once the town had taken up a definitely hostile stand against the authority of the Church, it would appear easy to win them over to Taborism. The correspondence begun by Drändorf with the imperial town, wherein he emphatically denied to the clergy the right "to judge worldly matters and to interfere in worldly affairs", had the greatest success. The Council of Weinsberg answered Drändorf's letters in the most gracious manner and invited him to come in person to Weinsberg. Whether the Inquisition had made it too hot for him in Speyer, or whether he thought the Weinsberg people had a warmer sympathy towards Hussitism than those of Speyer, it is certain that Drändorf planned to make Weinsberg the centre of Hussite propaganda, for which purpose he invited his other partisans in the faith to move to Weinsberg. Drändorf even considered going so far as to demand that the Council of Weinsberg should have their unreserved declaration against the Interdict and the spiritual jurisprudence read from the pulpit, and to send copies to other towns. In the midst of their high-flying plans, Drändorf, and with him his friend Turnow, were speeding towards destruction. On the way to Weinsberg Drändorf was
arrested by the bailiffs of the Inquisition, who had already taken the
person and the papers of Turnow.

The following examination of the two Hussites seems to have
cau sed a great commotion. At the first trial of Drändorf, which took
place on 13th February, 1425, at Heidelberg, the Elector Ludwig III
of the Pfals and the Bishops of Würm and Speyer were present in person.
Heidelberg professors of theology and canolaw acted as commissars of the
Würzburg Bishop to whose diocese Hailbronm and Weinsberg belonged. It
was not difficult for them to prove the guilt of the accused, who, with
candour and pride acknowledged himself an adherent of the Taborite
doctrines and with quiet determination, shaming his zealous accusers,
declared his repudiation of the oath, of indulgences, of the infallibil-
ity of the Councils, of the ceremonies of the Mass, blind ecclesiastical
obedience, degrees and titles at the universities, the carrying out of
temporal justice by the ecclesiastics, the papal primacy, excommunication
and the worldly domination of the clerics. He refused with decision
to bear witness against his fellow believers, especially Peter Turnow,
to whose virtuous course of life he called upon the latter's Speyer
acquaintances as witnesses. True to his religious convictions, shortly
after his trial in Würm, Drändorf died at the stake.

It cannot be established for what reason the verdict against
Peter Turnow should only have been published and carried out a year
later. Probably they were concerned in trying to obtain a declaration
from the School-rector about his fellow-believers in Speyer, about whom
Drändorf had already been questioned and some of whom we may probably
find at the end of the 14th century in the adherents of the Waldensian
Sect in Speyer. Bishop Rhaban of Speyer carried out the examination in
person/determined the points of accusation. Turnow, who declared
himself a cleric and bachelor of divinity (Baccalar) nevertheless admitted
to have stood in intimate relation with Drändorf "in and around Prague"
and later in Speyer and to have taken part in his agitation. He declared himself, further, an adherent of the Hussite doctrine of communion sub utroque, contested the infallibility of the Council of Constance and the right of the clergy to execute lay jurisdiction and worldly rights of dominion. His admission that he had undertaken a journey to Greece, is of interest, as we may perhaps connect it with the projects which repeatedly appear during the course of the Hussite movement for a coalition of the Greek church with Hussitism. As Turnow obstinately refused all attempts at conversion, Bishop Phabam, who had been on 3rd April, 1426, appointed by the Inquisitor of the Mainz diocese as his commissary, pronounced him an unrepentant heretic, whom he handed over to lay justice for punishment. The time and place of the carrying out of the verdict have not come down to us, so that we can only conjecture that in April, 1426, Turnow was committed to the flames. We may perhaps regard Fuyger, who at Lauda on the Tauber on 4th July, 1429, was burnt as a heretic at the stake, as an adherent of the Taborite doctrines, won thereto by Drändorf; he had fought against the invocation of the saints and the Mother of God. A priest and a tradesman were arrested in November, 1427, at the "Reichstag" at Frankfurt on suspicion "that they had come from the Hussites" but evidently no proof could be brought against the accused. (35)

Whilst the Provincial Councils held in 1423 by order of Pope Martin V, in Mainz, Troyes and Cologne, once more damned the Hussite doctrines and ordered the persecution of their adherents in those provinces, (36) the said doctrines began to penetrate beyond the German speaking frontier into the Roman part of the Netherlands and as we shall

(35) Kerler: "Deutsche Reichstagakte", IX, 123.

see later, into the Dauphine. We may assume with certainty, that, considering the close connections between England and the Netherlands, the doctrines of Wycliffe, who for a time had sojourned in Flanders, had not been without result there. At the time of the Council of Constance the affair of the Augustinian Nikolaus Servarius had attracted much notice. He had agitated in the most violent manner in the dioceses of Cambrai and Tournai against the profligate, and the growth of the adoration of relics and saints. As punishment he was incarcerated in the Metz Augustinian Monastery. A passionate opponent of the worldly cleric, among other things he took up the true Wycliffian attitude that sinful priests should lose their office and that his adherents should pray only to God and not to the saints. (37) Since the year 1416 the Inquisition had been very active in the Netherlands; in 1416 and 1417 persecutions of heretics took place in Tournai and Lille; in 1420 in Douai there were persecutions of "Turlupinon", under which name the most varied heretical systems were stigmatised in the Netherlands. On 4th September, 1427, Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy, empowered Guillaume Brunart, who had been appointed Inquisitor by the Pope, to take steps against heretics in Holland, Seeland and Friesland. We may connect with the arising of the Hussite movements in the Archbishopric of Cambrai, the fact that the notary of the diocese, Radulph von Borinshelm, was present in 1423 at the trial of Bründorf in Heidelberg. In the spring of 1430, it appears that a fairly extended investigation of the Hussites was carried out in Lille and neighbourhood, after heretics had been burnt in January of that year and in December of the preceding year in the diocese of Tournai. On 11th March, 1430, Duke Philip of Burgundy issued a mandate to his officials empowering them to arrest twenty inhabitants of Lille, Tourcoing, Soelin and the neighbouring villages, who had been accused of participating in the errors of the "false Prague heretics" (37) Raynaldus: "Annales ecclesiasticci", VIII, 1420, 17 fg.
and taking part in secret conventicles, and by flight had escaped answering the charge before the inquisitors. On 24th March of the same year the Duke gave a verdict concerning the confiscation of the goods of several heretics burnt in Lille, against which the assessors of the town had laid claim. That the Hussite sympathies in the Netherlands had not been stifled even by such energetic measures is shown by the communication of the Bishop of Arras to the Council of Basle in 1432, that he hesitated to leave his diocese, threatened as it was with the dissemination of the Bohemian heresy. In the year 1436, too, the sending of Inquisitors to Namur is noted, and according to the testimony of Adrien de But Hussite tendencies still remained in Flanders till the last decades of the 15th century.(30)

Returning from the observation of the ever more dangerous rise and spread of Hussite ideas in the several countries of the Empire (39) to a contemplation of the universal situation in the final period of the Hussite wars, we find in the internal disturbances in the Empire increasing more and more even to anarchy the effects of the Hussite movement in more than one respect. Measures to conquer it were in no way wanting. Papal and imperial monitory letters continually demanded warlike and pecuniary efforts for the expedition to Bohemia. The electors had formed a union of all the Empire's subjects to fight Hussitism. In the whole Empire the populace had been obliged to take a solemn oath to observe orthodoxy and to persecute the heretics; and

"Monumenta conciliorum general", II, 150;
"Chroniques relat. 2 l'hist. de la Belgique sous la domin. des duca de Bourgogne, textes latins". (1870) S.635-7. (ad. a.1495).

(39) Die Stelle ans den Erlasse König Sigmund's vom 10 April 1429 (Reichsabgaben, IX, 290);
"Dieselb Foczeroy schleicht auch täglich je verrer je verrer".
after the defeats at Mile and Tachau, the Reichstag was convened in 1427 in Frankfurt, under threat of punishment of heretics by the papal Legato, and at the same time the well-known Imperial war-tax to raise a large force against the Hussites was decreed. But in what great contrast these measures stood to the results gained thereby! It did not lie only in the ill-will and egotism of some Princes and imperial towns that the number and equipment of the troops going into this campaign was in every way insufficient, that the returns from the imperial war-tax were unbelievably small— but among the whole population, the war against the Hussites, once they were convinced of the invincibility of the heretic army, became in the highest degree unpopular. The Bishop of Lebus in 1423 notified the Elector Friedrich of Brandenburg of "useless speeches in the matter of Christendom", which were heard in connection with the Hussite tax in the Mark of Brandenburg, and feared through strong measures "revolt and alienation". The Archbishop of Cologne likewise, in collecting the tax had found obstinate resistance on the part of his subjects and had to use force; the rich town of Cologne had not given a "Pfennig". In the town of Brandenburg the burgesses threatened to "overturn the Temple" so as to become rid of the tax and the importunate priests. In Stettin, too, the Hussite tax caused a wild revolt of the citizens, which drove Duke Kasimir and the Council out of its walls. When in 1431 after the battle of Tausa, in the midst of the general panic, the Knighthood aimed at founding a union of Knights to fight Hussitism, the Swabian town emissaries assembled at Ulm declared "their disgust at such an enterprise, begun by a deep purpose and aimed against the town." As here against the knighthood, in other cases distrust was shown against the imperial princes; Friedrich of Brandenburg, Ludwig of Bavaria, even Sigismund himself were regarded as secret helpers of the Hussites. (40)

The more such change in the feelings of the national opposition to the Czech State lost for the political parties in Germany its meaning as a uniting moment, the more violently inflamed became the inner struggle while all frontiers of Bohemia stood open. The ever increasing prominence of the socialistic and anti-clerical tendencies in these struggles was considered by contemporaries, in part justly, as a consequence of the "heretical poison" of Hussitism.

In Magdeburg, to name only the most important of these struggles at the erection of a new town-fortification in 1432 it came to a dispute between the town and Archbishop Gunther II of Schwarzburg, which lasted until the year 1435, in spite of the interdict laid upon the town by the Archbishop, the ban of the Empire and finally the ban of the Council of Basle. The whole passion of the controversy is portrayed in the contemporary folk song about the quarrels of the monasteries, the author of which calls himself the "enemy of the priests" and overwhelms the clergy with the worst reproaches and invective. He says of the "loose priest":

Sie schonden frauen unde man,
dor jungfrauen nicht vorschonen,
sie dienen dem teufel fru und spät;
dor wirt in auch recht lonen
ist ior sel ein schwere pain,
dass sie nu strassenfuher sein
an aiern letzten ende;
an or und tugend seind sie krank
wo sie sich nur hinwendet,
---------------------------
ir platten müssen sie decken
dass sie das heilip; gottes wort
nit frovel wolten erstechen.

It is not at all improbable, that, as Cardinal Julian Cesdrini in 1432 notified Pope Eugen IV, the Magdeburgers contemplated obtaining a Hussite Commander in chief, perhaps, too, Bohemian auxiliaries, and, in this case they did not stand alone in the fight against the hierarchy. In connection with the Magdeburgers' opposition in the scandal of the Wilsnack miraculous blood, a minorite made the complaint that the
the Magdeburgers harboured worse errors than the Bohemians. (41) The Council of Basle regarded with equal disquiet the feuds between the Bishops of Passau and Bamberg with their towns, in which a union with the Hussites was feared. In Bamberg indeed, in February, 1430, whilst the Council was treating with the Hussites regarding capitulation, "impudent boys" ("Kühner Baben") stormed and plundered the town hall, the dwellings of the rich and the monasteries, and raped and ill-treated the nuns. In the course of the dispute about the fortification of the town of Bamberg, the burgesses, lying under the Interdict, rose against the ecclesiastical dominion on 25th May, 1435, stormed the monastery of Michaelsberg, ejected clergy and Bishop, who only eluded his persecutors with great difficulty. (42) In connection with the feeling of enmity towards the priests in the town and diocese of Mayence, a folk song warns the Archbishop of Mayence about the Wertheim feud in 1437: (43)

But the towns too had become acquainted, in bitter internal feuds, with that "damaging fire" and the consequences, which the socialistic-democratic ideas, proclaimed in the Taborite manifestos had had on the lower ranks. In Mayence, Bremen, Constance, Nismar, Stettin, Holberstadt and other town risings of the guilds against the rule of the citizens (Geschlechter) had taken place, and the patricians of Ulm were doubtless not much in error when in 1431 they invited their

(42) "Monun. Concil. general, saec.XV.", I, 100; "Die religiösen Sekten in Franken", S.39.
(43) Liliencron: I, 359. "Historische Volkslieder".
confederates to take part in the expedition against the Hussites, particularly in regard to the threatening internal danger, "as such courses and rascalities" as now reigned in Bohemia would continually spread and effect "no-one more than that of the honesty of the town". Only too quickly these fears were realised by the revolt of the peasants of the Pfalz in December, 1431, which, although apparently only made against the Jews of Worms, in reality bore a very communistic-socialistic appearance. Whilst the Ulm people again drew attention to the similarity of the revolutionary elements in Germany with Taboritism, and to the danger of a further spreading of the movement as even more threatening than the Hussite disorders, the Council of Basle followed these proceedings with the greatest anxiety. A spread of the revolutionary movement amongst the peasants throughout the whole of Germany was seriously feared as well as the union of the agitators with the Bohemians. On the other hand at the same time the French clergy regarded the uprisings of the peasants, which broke out in Burgundy and the Lyonnais against the nobility and clergy as connected with the universal Taborite manifesto. The war of the Appenzel people against the Abbot of St. Gall, the Bishop of Constance and their adherents had in any case long been regarded as "heretical malice and profanation" and the intractable Swiss peasants were stigmatised as worse than the hardened Bohemian heretics. The sultry and oppressive mood of suspicion in Germany at the end of the period of the Hussite war, is particularly expressed in a well-known paragraph in the "Klingenberger Chronik": "The Bohemians now became so strong and powerful and their exuberance so great that they were feared in all parts, and all pious people were horrified that the mischievousness and misbehaviour had arisen in other lands and pressed upon the pious and the just and the rich. For it was indeed a course of action for the poor, haughty, arrogant and barren; for one found many people in all lands, who were coarse and contemptible and regarded the heresy and want of faith of the Bohemians as leniently as they could; and where they dared not do it openly, then
they did so secretly, for they had to fight shy of the pious and the just. In consequence the Bohemians had many coarse (grob) people who were their secret benefactors. At the same time people were inclined against the priesthood and rather listened to the common people than to the priests, when they expressed the view that every one should share his possessions one with another, which would have pleased many worthless people and might have occurred. In this way the old hate the peasants and priests had for one another became active." (44)

The acts of the Council of Basle, too, as already in part quoted, give us an instructive view of the wide-spread fears, which the sympathies for Hussitism in Germany evoked on the part of the clergy at the time immediately preceding the negotiations with the Bohemians, and which above all were connected with the threatened dissolution of the Council. Again and again we hear it decisively declared that if the Council did not proceed energetically with the peace-pact with Hussitism, the secession of the German people from the Church, and their union with the Hussites against the clergy was possible. The laity in Germany, in any case intensely irritated against the clergy and their opposition to reformation, would, on the dissolution of the Council, remorselessly seize the clerical possessions. It was already evident everywhere, especially in Franconia, that there was an inclination to form a pact with the Hussites, even without the consent of the Empire and the Church. Concerning the fatal results of such peace-treaties we need only remember the above-mentioned proceedings in Silesia, in order to understand the anxiety of the Council. At the "Reichstag" at Frankfort in November, 1431.

"Monumenta conc. general saec. XV", I, 78, 215; II, 83, 102, 133;
Von Bezold: "Die armen Leute und die deutsche Literatur des südlichen Mittelalters", in der Historischen Zeitschrift, Bd. 40 (Neue Folge, Bd. 5, 1879) S.16 fg.
the ambassadors of Friedrich of Brandenburg and the Elector Johann of Neumarkt gave expression to their fears that "their countries and people were veering round towards the Böhmer Wald". The Franconian Knights might too, at that time, have capitulated to the Hussites, on account of Hussite doctrines having been introduced, or, at least, allowed, in their possession in the Huggendorf mountains. (45)

The importance of the Basle Compacts in the history of Hussite Propaganda cannot be sufficiently acknowledged by the conditions described. Although Hussitism had procured through the Compacts of the Council the surrender of the dogma of the unity and infallibility of the Church, the peace treaty at the same time meant for it that it must now renounce the conversion of the whole Christian world to the four Hussite articles characterised by Prokop the Great in 1433 at the Council of Basle as the ultimate aim of the holy war instigated by the Hussites. By the overthrow of the Taborite party in the civil war immediately following between the Utraquists and the Taborites, the Hussite reform movement was brought wholly to a standstill, or rather, the backward movement to Catholicism began in the Utraquist Church. No further endeavour to make propaganda for Utraquism was made after this outside Bohemia. The influence of Hussite ideas was not at once cut off in Germany by this gradual transformation of Hussitism - the complete disintegration of the Taborites, as is well-known, took place in 1452 - but was made easier by the resumption of friendly relations between Bohemia and its neighbouring states. As in the last years of the Hussite wars the "bad people of all countries" crowded to the triumphant Hussite army, so, in the following decades, few German countries were free of troops of Bohemian mercenaries who, wherever they came, were decried as

(45) "Monumenta concilior", I, 74, 120, 139, 141, 151, 175, 177, 181. II, 83, 92, 102, 103; Kerler: "Deutsche Reichtagsacten", IX, 643; "Religiöse Sekten in Franken" S.41.
church-robbers and conscienceless heretics, but who were nevertheless desired as allies. Whilst these wild bands, often in the pay of spiritual princes, went through the land, destroying and burning, or, as was the case in Austria and Hungary, settled permanently as independent dictators, the lowest ranks of the oppressed people without rights, the "poor people", became rapidly permeated with the "Bohemian Poison", as the revolutionary socialistic ideas (which in the following period did not disappear) came with preference to be called until the beginning of the 16th century. In Thuringia, where at the same time, Bohemian auxiliaries were thronging like vandals, there were assembled in 1447 from among the peasants in the neighbourhood of Erfurt at Kranichfeld and Daberstadt "a strange people, called Taborites, who committed acts of brigandage". Strengthened by other "companies", they stormed the castle of Tannroda and by their approach brought terror to Erfurt.

The "Trumpets of the Civil War" von Bezold rightly named the "Reformation of the Emperor Sigismund", that remarkable writing of the time of the Council of Basle, permeated with the Taborite spirit, which then made the same claims as those contained in the religious-socialist programme of the great civil war, which were to be accomplished by the overthrow of the existing state under the flag of the Emperor Friedrich, once more in the ascendant. "The spiritual law is sick", it said, reminding one very much by the energy of its expression of the Taborite Manifestos, "the Empire and all thereunto belonging stands for wrong. It must be penetrated by force. If the great desire to sleep, the small must remain awake". (46) Only a few decades later in Franconia, where, from the beginning, the Hussite influence had made itself felt imperatively and strongly, we hear of the appearance of the "Holy Youth" of Nicklashausen.

Stolle: "Thüringisch Erfurtische Chronik", herausgegeben von Hesse ("Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins" XXXII) S.19, 21 fg;
Von Bezold: "Die Armen Lute", in der "Historischen Zeitschrift", X, 41, 24 fg;
in the Tauber valley (1476), who made most earnest attempts to proclaim the republic on a communistic basis. And that was only the preliminary of a series of revolutionary risings of the peasants and urban proletarians, which only concluded in the civil war of the year 1525.

Priests in Franconia and Bavaria were called to account as adherents of the theological doctrines of Hussitism until the middle of the fifteenth century and even later. In Bamberg the Synod of the diocese in the year 1448 had called upon the Cathedral-preacher Master Heinrich Steinbach to abjure his Hussite errors publicly stated in the pulpit, and condemned him to a public denial in the cathedral. In the bishopric of Regensburg during the reign of Georg Podiebrad, three priests, Andreas Luzgerncr, Wolfgang Gfieder and Michael Schmatzl, the latter of Abensberg, were imprisoned for heresy, and later expelled. In 1470 and 1472 an interdict was laid upon the people of Straubing and Regensburg, on the latter because they had received partisans of Georg Podiebrad and on the former because they were accused of supporting the Hussite King.(47)

Of considerably greater importance than these single examples of the continuance of Hussite influence in Germany, was the remarkable union of the religious opposition parties in Bohemia and Germany, occurring only in the final period of the Hussite war, and having no less an aim than to bridge the chasm between Czech and German, occasioned by the national disputes, and to initiate a propaganda embracing all German lands, for the Taborite doctrines.

(47) "Religiöse Sekten in Franken", S.40;
Janner: "Geschichte der Bischöfe von Regensburg", III, 563;
Gemeiner: "Regensburger Chronik", III, 572;
Lechtir: "Johann von Wiclif", II, 437, gemacht Angabe, dass der 1456 begründete Ritterbund der 38klor des Einhorns sich husitischer Ansichten verdächtig machte, beruht auf einem Irrthum in der Stiftungsurkunde haben vielmehr die bairischen Ritter die Bekämpfung des Hussitismus als die Hauptaufgabe des Bößlerrbundes bezeichnet, und es liegt kein einziges zeit-genössisches Zeugnis vor, welches jenes Verdachtses Erwähnung that.
The German Waldensians had been much weakened and robbed of
the greater part of their leaders by the great persecutions which befell
them at the end of the 14th century. During the period of the Hussite
disorders it was impossible for them even to think of making good their
losses. On the contrary the fanatical religious zeal of the reaction-
aries against the Bohemian heterodoxies in Germany had led to renewed
persecutions, as, for instance in "Switzerland" in 1429 and 1430, once more
upsetting the somewhat loose organisation of the sects, and putting their
very existence in jeopardy. From the proceedings of the Inquisition
in the acts of Freiburg in "Switzerland" against the Waldensians in 1430,
it can be seen that at that time Bohemian influence was beginning to be
felt in connection with the sects; the "Apostles", that is, Waldensians
who had taken up the profession of wandering preachers of repentance and
confessors in contradistinction to the "Friends" and "Believers",
according to the confessions of the accused, came from Germany and
Bohemia, and one of the examined alleged the doctrines of the Waldensians'
war to be identical with that of the Hussites. Even if this declaration,
in conjunction with the results of the Freiburg examination, cannot be
regarded as conclusive, there is nevertheless, no doubt that at that time
there were the closest connections between Hussitism and the Waldensians.
We meet the tenets of faith of the Waldensians even in apparently
negligible points in the confession of faith of the Taborites, influenced
indeed by the reform ideas of Wycliffe. We may assume that a great
many of the Bohemian Waldensians were adherents of the Taborites, to whom
as well as to the "Waisen" (Orphans) many partisans of German
nationality had attached themselves.(48) The obvious idea of the
fusion of the weakened and disorganised Waldensians in Germany into the
Bohemian Reform-party, originated, according to a not altogether reliable
source, with the very important Wycliffe, Payne, when at a conference
of Waldensian Masters in Nuremberg he endeavoured, but in vain, to win
them to Hussitism. In the following year, as already remarked, rumours
were rife in Austria too as to a union of the local Waldensians with the Hussites. A closer and more enduring junction of the Waldensians with the Taborites was only effected, however, some years later, about the year 1432, through the Swabian Waldensian Friedrich Reiser, who for more than twenty-five years thereafter was at the head of Waldensian-Taborite propaganda in Germany. (49) Reiser, born in 1401 came from a Waldensian family of the village Deutsch near Donauwörth and was trained as an itinerant preacher in the house of the Nürnberg merchant, Hans von Plauen, who likewise belonged to the Waldensian Sect. Whether he had received consecration as a Waldensian Master in Nürnberg or whether he had accompanied a Master as deacon, he wandered, during the third decade, through divers provinces of South Germany, devoting himself at one and the same time to commerce and to the care of the souls of the Waldensians distributed in those provinces. He settled later in Heilsbronn near

(49) Coll: "Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder" I, 22, 30, 32, 109, 110, 136; II, 37 fg.
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Flacianus Illyricus: "Catalogus testum veritatis" (1606) S.638 fg.

(49) Für das folgende fg. namentlich Jung, "Friedrich Reiser", in der Zeitschrift "Timoteaus" (Strassburg 1822) II, 37 fg.
W.Boehm: "Friedrich Reisers Reformation des K.Stifts", S.78-96;
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Nuremberg, where he had collected a large circle of followers. If we may believe Reiser's later confessions before the Strassburg Inquisition, which, however, in many important points may have been extracted by torture or the fear of it, it was not a voluntary decision, but war-imprisonment, which led him in 1430 out of Austria to Tabor and Prague. Here it was that he learnt the Latin tongue and possibly also for a period pursued his studies at the University. It meant an open break with the traditions of the Waldensian sect, that in 1432 and 1433 through the influence of Peter Payno, he, together with another Waldensian, Johannes von Walschen, received consecration as priest from the Taborite bishop, Nikolaus von Pilgrim; and his connection with Taboritism was not limited to this consecration. We learn from his confessions before the Inquisition, that he had taken to himself Hus's doctrine of the church as the totality of those predestined to salvation, which was in no way in accordance with Waldensian ideas. Reiser's denial of the presence of Christ in the altar-sacrament is probably taken from Taborite tenets and this, in one source from the outgoing 14th century, was attributed to the Beguine Waldensians, along with the demand for the lay communion-cup, as well as the stipulations of Reiser's adherents, that the verdict of the death sentence by a judge burdened with mortal sin was void, and obedience and payment of taxes should be refused to all sinful superiors. Whilst the Waldensian Masters in the course of the 14th century had gradually given up entirely the independent administration of the altar-sacrament, and had confined themselves to the sermon and the administration of the repentance-sacrament, we hear of Reiser and his scholars reading Mass in German, although without clerical garments, and giving their adherents the sacrament under both kinds. In spite of this inclination towards Taborite doctrines, Reiser remained a Waldensian, having founded his claim to the practice of priestly functions on its connection with the true and aspiring priesthood of Pope Sylvester, renewed by Petrus Waldis, which plays so great a part.
in the Waldensian legend. After his consecration as a priest, Reiser remained for some time in Tabor and is supposed to have then accompanied the Bohemian ambassador to the Council of Basle and, subsequently called thereto by Prokop, deputised for one year as a priest in the little German-Bohemian town of Landakron, near to the Moravian frontier, where fifty years later the persecuted Moravian Waldensians found a refuge. According to a source which, in spite of the stamp of certainty which it bears, is not very authoritative, Reiser, together with his companion, Johann dem Welschen (? the Welshman), received the Bishop's consecration from a Catholic Bishop in 1434 in Basle, to which he had returned at the outbreak of the Bohemian civil war. Reiser, in consequence, regarded himself as in possession of official episcopal authority and in his turn ordained Waldensian priests. In conjunction with his disciples Reiser entered on a period of great activity during the following decade. From Switzerland he went to Alsace, then to Franconia and North Germany, everywhere getting in touch with the Waldensian congregations and seeking to win them to his plan of fusing them with the Taborites. The great majority of German Waldensians seem to have adopted his doctrines, only in a few cases he met the antagonism of a conservative element opposed to Bohemian influence. Reiser's personal influence was particularly sustained by introduction of his scholars to the reading of the Bible and other instructive books which he distributed to them in a German translation. Encouraged by the resultant success, in 1450 he entered into a new union with the Taborites, who offered to receive all German Waldensians, persecuted for their beliefs, and promised him too, pecuniary support for further propaganda. Twelve priests were to go to Germany as travelling priests, and over them four Bishops were to be placed, over whom Reiser was to have superior direction. For this movement, so hopeful in its beginnings, the fall of Tabor and its subjugation by Utraquism in 1452 was of decisive importance. Thereafter Sezg took the place of Tabor. It had been formerly closely
connected with Tabor, and, after the dissolution of the Taborite party, it became the centre of a similar radical sect, the "Brüder von Saaz" (the brotherhood of Saaz), which supported the union with the German Waldensians in particular giving its candidates for the priesthood opportunities for their education in Bohemia, and supplying Reiser with money. Nevertheless the support which Reiser had had till then from his Bohemian associates was much weakened, and when persecution by the Inquisition continually placed new difficulties in the way of the activities of his mission in Germany, and tore from him one colleague after another, then, "it seemed to him that their affair was like a fire that would soon be extinguished." At the last meeting which Reiser had at Saaz presumably in 1456 with his two surviving co-bishops, it was settled to have a new assembly in 1459 in Strasburg, but as early as the beginning of 1458, Reiser, together with several of his adherents, was arrested by the Inquisition in Strasburg, where he had thought to take up his quarters for a longer stay, and, after torture had drawn far-reaching confessions from him and his co-accused, he was burnt at the stake with his faithful companion Anna Weiler of Franconia.

We learn from many statements in the Acts of the Inquisition, following on the persecution of Reiser and his adherents, about the distribution of the Waldensian sects in Germany in the middle of the

15th century and they testify at the same time to the universal Taborite influence which permeated the Waldensian doctrines. An important centre of the movement was Franconia. Here we find a large circle of "Kunden" (customers) - they named themselves thus amongst themselves - in Heilsbronn near Würzburg. Other adherents of the sect are mentioned in Würzburg and neighbourhood, also in Minden, Schweinfurt, Ansbach, Rothenburg on the Tauber and Neustadt on Alsch.

In the spring of 1447, no fewer than 130 "Hussites" from the Alsch and Tauber districts were put on trial at Würzburg and forced to abjure their principles. Probably because of the anarchic state of the German church, and encouraged in Würzburg bishopric, the Waldensians there had held divine service quite openly and won many spectators, originally drawn by curiosity, to their faith. At the Synod of the diocese of Eichstätt in the year 1447 loud complaints were raised about the swift spread of the Waldensians, Wycliffians and Hussites, and on the occasion of the visitation of the diocese ordered in 1452, it was impressed upon the clergy that they should pay particular attention to the adherents of these Sects in the several parishes. Between 1448 and 1458 many persecutions of Waldensians took place in the district of Eichstätt.

The Acts, after one of these persecutions, give as the home towns of the accused Weissenburg an Sand, Freucht, Ingolstadt, Kärnsheim, Nörn, Hühlheim, Schönau, Neuheim (Neuhausen?), Hubenheim, Neuendern (?), Heinheim, for the most part lying in Altvorderthal. In most cases, the proceedings probably ended with the abjuration of their tenets by the accused, of whom, however, several were burned. An inventory of their beliefs, in part true Taborite, was sent by Bishop Johann III of Eichstätt to Bishop Arnold of Basel (1451-53) who, no doubt, made use of it in the examination of the Waldensians in his diocese. The hidden valleys among the mountains in the Fichtelgebirge, the Frankenwald and Voigtländ were regarded, until the end of the 15th century as the chief seats of the Hussite heresy. To combat this severe measures were
resolved upon at the Bomberg diocesan Synod of 1491, against the heretics of the Bamberg diocese, which had repeatedly condemned the Waldensian-Taborite idea of a subjective limitation of the efficacy of the means of grace.(51)

Swabia too, (Reiser's home) the Upper Rhine districts and "Switzerland", where already at the end of the 14th century the Waldensians had a strong following, were fruitful territories for his missionary activity. Pforzheim, Biberach, Strauburg, Andlau near Schlottstadt and Basle are especially mentioned as the domiciles of Reiser's adherents. Reiser took from Pforzheim to Saaz the daughter of a Waldensian family, and he was many times reproached for transporting German girls to Bohemia (probably for purposes of religious instruction). As to the presence of a large Waldensian congregation in Augsburg, where in 1393 a Waldensian persecution on a great scale had taken place not without danger of life to the Inquisitor, the curious but not chronologically true statement indicates, that "in 1451 the transept of St. Ulrich's Church in Augsburg was fitted up for their divine service." This statement no doubt applies to the more or less public meetings of the Waldensian congregations in Augsburg who were influenced by Taboritism, as seems proved by those held at the same time in Würzburg and, several decades later, in the Mark of Brandenburg. The temporary toleration of these meetings on the part of the town of Augsburg may be explained by the hostile relations existing at that time between the town and its bishops. When the latter threatened them with papal excommunication and the ban of the Empire, "the Augsburgers would not let themselves be intimidated either by Pope or Emperor, and would rather lose life and property than surrender," and in 1451 all the citizens swore "to resist

the bishops and fight them, even to the giving up of life and property."

In the Empire the feeling of hatred towards the priests of Augsburg was well-known as is demonstrated by a contemporary folk-song:

Augsburg hat einen weisen Rat,
Das prüft man an ir kecken Tat
Mit Singen, Dichten und Klaffen,
Sie hand gemacht ein Singschul
Und setzen oben auf den Stuhl
Wer übel redt von Pfaffen.

An example of the productions of the "Augsburger Singschule" (The Singing School of Augsburg) is given by the Augsburg folk-song about the Margrave war of 1449-50, which launches forth in the most violent attacks against the spiritual princes and prophesies a general blood-bath for the clergy:

Ich hab gehört, man fand durch die Weissagen
Es kunt dazu, dass Pfaffen werden erschlagen! (52)

In Freiburg in Nechtland Waldensianism was not uprooted by the verdicts of 1430. In 1437 and 1438 several persons were burnt for "voudesie" under which name the Inquisition very unreasonably preferred to prosecute the alleged crimes of witchcraft and sorcery, and in 1447 the Freiburg Waldensian Marmeth's daughter, who was a close friend of Reiser, was condemned, with others, to carry the penitential cross, the punishment for repentant heretics. About the year 1440, Felix Hemmerlin relates of certain heretics (he calls them "Begharden") who, coming annually from Bohemia won over to their heresies innumerable people in Berne and Solothurn - both towns known to us as former seats

(52) Stotten: "Geschichte der Stadt Augsburg", S.175;
"Deutsche Städtechroniken", V. ("Augsburg", II) S.206 fg;
Liliencron, I, 415 fg. 418.
of Waldensian sects. (53) Reiser's untiring activity and his close relations with the half French Waldensians in Freiburg in Oechtland, can obviously be brought into line with the influence exercised by their German and Lombard co-religionists in the matter of Hussitism in 1430, although they had been completely separated from the Roman Waldensians in Dauphine and Piedmont. As early as February, 1432, at the Synod of the French clergy at Bourges discussions had taken place on the fact that the Hussites had followers in Dauphine, from whom cash remittances had been sent to Bohemia. (54) In the period immediately following there probably occurred the revision of an old Waldensian manuscript, under the title, "Tresor et lumiere de la foi", which received a decisive transformation through contact with the so-called "Confessio Taboritarum" that is, the tract in which the Taborites on 30th April, 1431, defended themselves against reproaches made by the Prague Magisters concerning their erroneous teachings. Possibly Reiser's aforementioned co-bishop "the Welsh" (der Welscher) had the task of mediating between Bohemia and the Romanesque Waldensians, to whom the Bohemian brethren, through their delegate, the German Thomas von Landakron, who had formerly been


In communication with the Mark Waldensians, later became annexed in 1489. (55)

A second co-bishop of Reiser we find in Lower Austria, the Waldensian bishop Stephan, who was held in high repute by the Bohemian Utraquists and by Hoksanga, who played a part in the foundation and senior-dedication of the unity of the Bohemian Brethren. Whilst the negotiations between him and the Unity concerning the amalgamation of the Waldensians with the Bohemian Brethren was still under way, the arm of the Inquisition caught him. He was burnt in Vienna in 1467. That he was not a representative of the original Waldensians, but an adherent of the Taborite-Waldensian doctrines of Friedrich Reiser (this is certainly not unimportant in judging the influence of Waldensianism on the United Brethren) is made probable by his communication about Reiser's death to the Utraquist Magisters, wherein he characterises him as a Waldensian Bishop. Part of the persecuted Austrian Waldensians are said to have found temporary refuge in the Mark of Brandenburg. (56)

The information taken from the proceedings at Strasburg trials leave us, alas, no revelations as to the success of Reiser's

(55) "Monus, concil." II, 130; Montet; "Hist. litt. des Vaudois du Piemont", S.165 fg; Goll; I, 27, 66.
Ob die Angabe in der Jüngschen Biographie Reiser's auf Richtigkeit beruht, dass der freiburger Waldenser Martin um 1418 durch Seinen Glaubenselifer nach Toulouse geführt worden und dort von der Inquisition festgenommen sei (Timotheus, S.71) ist leider nicht festzustellen.

propaganda on the Middle Rhine, and from other sources concerning the persecution of heretics on the Middle Rhine in the second half of the 15th century, we can only presume with some probability that a circle of adherents of the Waldensian sects once widespread here, still continued. We hear in 1476 of a remarkable conflict between the Clergy and the vassals (Burgmannen) of Friedberg in the Wetterau, unfortunately, however, not clearly depicted in the above-mentioned sources. The former gave notice of an Interdict on account of the "Bohemians" then in Friedberg. As Friedberg was characterised in the Strasburg Waldensian trial in 1400 as the seat of the Waldensians, it is obvious that the cited notice about adherents may be taken to refer to Waldensian-Taborite doctrines.(57).

We would also like to trace some heretical movements we meet with in North West Germany in the second half of the 15th century to the influence of these doctrines. In Dortmund in 1477 a certain Kovet was persecuted by the Inquisition, because he had combated auricular confession, the varieties of spiritual consecrations and the cult of the images of saints. In Göttingen in 1453 two heretics who had denied the doctrine of transubstantiation and permission of the oath were put on trial. In Haarlem in 1458, the layman Epo and the priest Nicolaus van Naarden of Amsterdam were forced to abjure many heretical articles.

concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Mass, and against the worship of saints and requisita. (58)

Waldensian-Taborite doctrines had thrust particularly deep roots in the Mark of Brandenburg, where, as before remarked, since the beginning of the 14th century, proceedings had repeatedly been taken against the adherents of the Waldensian sect. Almost at the same time as the examination of Friedrich Reiser was started, there began in April, 1458, in Berlin a trial against Reiser's pupil, the tailor Matthäus Hagen of Solchow, and three other Waldensians of the Mark, which ended in the abjuration of his principles by the last-named and the condemnation of Hagen to the stake. We learn from the "Processacten" (records of lawsuits) communicated by W. Wattenbach, that at that time in Brandenburg, Waldensian beliefs were permeated with Taborite influence. Hagen had received ordination as a priest in Saaz by Reiser, who was frankly named as head of the sect, in the presence of a second bishop Nikolaus (possibly the Taborite bishop Nikolaus von Pilgrim). He read the Mass in German to his followers and administered the sacrament to them in both kinds. Wyclif, Hus, and Hieronymus, according to his belief, were already participant in salvation. Besides Hagen other Waldensian priests are mentioned as being sent from Saaz to the Mark. Hagen's spiritual activity extended to a great number of the villages in Neuemark and Ukermark, against which the great inquisition against the Waldensians had been directed in the year 1393. Bärwalde, Mohrin,

Havenmann: "Geschichte der Lande Braunschweig und Hannöeburg", II, 79;
Von Reinemann: "Geschichte von Braunschweig und Hannover", II, 250;
Loil: "Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland", II, 3, 97 fg;
Einzelne Artikel Epos von Haarlem, voz z.B. über die Wirkung des Weihwassers, stehen allerdings mit dem waldensischen Glauben sätzlich im Widerspruch. Im Jahre 1521 klagt der Kuntius Aleander, dass, durch das Beispiel Luthers ermutigt, die Bevölkerung Plandorns bereits öffentlich bekennen, dass im Albsacrament Christus nicht wirklich regewichtig sei, nachdem man diesen Irrtum bereits viele Decennien dort heimlich gehabt habe. (Friedrich, "Der Reichstag zu Worms 1521", in den "Abhandlungen" der münchener Akademie, Historische Klasse, XI, 3, 98.)
Kloinwubisor, Klemnrow, Selchow, Zolin, Zohden and Korkow are specially mentioned. According to the examination in June, 1450, directed against the inhabitants of the last two named villages, it was found that in Korkow no fewer than twelve families adhered to the Waldensian Taborite profession of faith, while in Zohden all the inhabitants did so, excepting two who had recanted. In both villages the accused voluntarily abjured, from which, however, one can in no way deduce a serious change of faith. Another violent persecution of the Waldensians of the Mark began in the year 1478, apparently owing to the spread of the sect, which had encouraged them to hold public divine service. In contradistinction to the relatively mild practice of previous heretic trials in the Mark, many death sentences were now carried out. Hundreds of fugitives from the Mark took refuge with their priests in Bohemia and Moravia, where they were helpfully received by the United Brethren, who had already been in touch with them, and settled down in and about Fulnek and Landskron, the former dwelling places of Reiser. Concerning those remaining in Brandenburg, we have every reason to believe that up to the beginning of the Reformation they remained inwardly faithful to the Waldensian-Taborite professions of faith. (59)

We are, alas, insufficiently informed as to the influence which the Bohemian United Brethren (in which the majority of Bohemian Waldensians as well as part of the adherents of Reiser in Bohemia's neighbouring German districts had become absorbed) exerted in Germany. From the astonishing literary activity of the Brethren, who, since the year 1468, have published one confession of faith after another in the Bohemian,

(59) Wattenbach: S.71 ff. Auf niede deutsche Waldenser des 16 Jahrhunderts bezieht sich wohl die Stelle eines Briefes Blahoslaw's an Georg Israel vom Jahre 1557: "Vorun quia Waldenser non correxorunt vitia sua admoniti a nostris...(nam adhuc vitio hoc sunt obnixi multi corum, sicut ante annum cum Wichermarz suissan a quodam docto viro, qui unus corum fuerat, et tua primum exinferiori Germania venerat, audivi)ideo nostri" (d.h. die Bruderunität) "non adiunxerunt se Waldensibus" (Coll: S.132).
Latin and German languages - their apology was printed in 1507 in Nürnberg in Bohemian, 1511 in German - and from their characteristic propensity to try to instruct foreign countries concerning the purity of faith of primitive Christianity at which they aimed, we may assume that they did not use the relations begun by Reiser between Bohemia and the religious opposition in Germany for their propaganda. By 1479 four leaders of the Unity, among them the already-mentioned Thomas der Deutsch (the German) of Landikron had been arrested in Silesia, and had been banished from the country by the Inquisition. In the same year the accusation was made by the Mayence Inquisition against Johann Richrath of Wesel, former professor at Erfurt University and later preacher in Mayence and Worms, that he had had secret dealings with a Hussite emissary, Nikolaus of Bohemia or Poland, who had also been taken prisoner, and that he had composed a heretical missive for the Bohemians. Even if Johann von Wesel was in no way, as his accusers maintained, a "Bishop of Bohemia", he had to confess to communication with the Hussite emissaries and the dogmas of his faith undoubtedly display the influence of Hussitism. (60) At the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries the Rostock priest, Nikolaus Rutze, was in close relation with the Bohemian sectarians. His printed writings in the last decade of the 15th century combated with great violence the degenerate church doctrines and customs of his time. The contemporary statement that he often received visits from heretical Bohemians, who united with his adherents in Rostock in secret worship, is confirmed by Hussite writings found among his possessions after his death. The two emissaries of the United Brethren to Erasmus of Rotterdam entered into communication with Rutze, whom in 1511 they took their apology to Erasmus with a view to getting him to publish a proof of it.

making use of the journey to Antwerp to visit many towns of Lower Germany. These proceedings of the Brethren, however, had as little success as the later efforts to bring about a union between Luther and the Unity. (61) In the years 1515 and 1517 Winpheling and Willibald Pirkheimer were still emphasizing the spread of Hussitism. (62) The Waldensian-Taborite doctrines acquired an unforeseen importance for Germany as a result of the appearance of the Anabaptists who, from their first distinguished representatives (Storch and Münzer), as well as their ethical-religious programme, point to a close connection with the Bohemian sects, even if it is very unlikely that we will ever be able to demonstrate the factors which brought about such a connection. The scattered and depleted remnants of the Waldensian-Taborite sects in Germany may, too, under the influence of the religious impetus given by Luther's appearance, have worshipped and strengthened themselves by union with the Anabaptists. At least in this way the similarity of the practical-ethical postulates peculiar to the Baptists, which are only superficially in accordance with their mystical enthusiasm and their wonderfully quick spread in all German districts, can most easily be explained. (63) Among the German Reformers the importance of Hussite ideas as a preparation for the Reformation of the 16th century, and its

(61) Eirgens: "Nikolaus Huss", in "Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie" 22.20 (Neue Folge, Bd.14, 1850) S.171 fg.
Cindely: S.149 fg. 197 fg.

(62) Häfen: "Deutschlands literarische und religiöse Verhältnisse im Reformationszeitalter", I, 430, 463. In der Einleitung zu Winphelings "Soliloquium pro pace christianorum" heißt es: "tum" (dirich zeitgemässe Reformen) "divinus cultus auctor, scandalum murmur odium populii in eum clericum propter illos beneficiosos sedari...Boemicum virus a Germania arceri...posseit."

effect on the masses of the people have been acknowledged. Whilst Luther in the year 1520 wrote to Georg Spalatin: "We are all Hussites, without having realised it", Capito, whose native town Hagenau was once the seat of a Waldensian "Heretic School", remarks in the year 1524: "They were men of God, Johannes Hus, and Hieronymus von Prag, who were burnt at Constance by members of Antichrist, but out of the ashes others grow". After their blessed death, the whole of Bohemia and the Margravate of Moravia, with many powerful towns adhered to the word, preached by them. "The seed is still in Europe, but not much among Abbots, great clerics and mendicant monks. In the German nation it was and remained in the old laymen." (64)

This chapter about the Hussite influence in Germany was and is of great interest to me, and I was very glad to discover that though the Hussite wars were waged with great savagery in Germany, yet the teaching and the doctrines of Hussitism prevailed to the time of Reformation.

(64) Do Witte: "Luther's Briefe", I, 426; Bährich: "Die Gottesfreunde und die Winkler am Oberrhein", in "Zeitschrift für historische Theologie", Bd. 10 (Neue Folge Bd. 4 1840) S.160 ff.
THE HUSSITE INFLUENCE IN BASLE.

The appearance of the Bohemian messengers at Basle, and the certainty that the plenipotentiaries of the unconquered peoples would follow them in discussing peace and concord, caused great joy not only in the Council of Basle, but in all Western European lands. Foreseeing how much this happy event would contribute to the increasing and strengthening of the Council's power, not only among the nations, but also in particular, against the not yet reconciled Pope Eugenius IV, Cardinal Julian Cesarini, President of the Council,(1) immediately after the first hearing of the Bohemians on 10th October, ordered all those present at the Council not to count the cost but to spread this joyful news in writing in their country; and through a special decision, public prayers were appointed to be offered in all the churches of Christian lands, for the happy return of the Bohemians to the unity of the Church.

The Protector of the Council, Duke William of Bavaria, appointed by King Sigismund, expressed the wish to the assembled fathers that not only the spiritual, but also the temporal lords of all lands, especially of Germany, might be called to Basle in the greatest numbers possible in order to see with their own eyes and hear with their own ears, what great trouble the Council had spent on the conversion of the Hussites; as all would be in vain, which God forbid, if the people were so much the more driven and incited to struggle by force against the obdurate heretics, and the Council praised the Protector's carefulness, and began to write to all the temporal lords and princes on the subject on 15th October. Soon, also, four of the most prominent theologians were chosen by the Council to prepare the defence of the Catholic doctrine against the Four Articles of Prague: M. Johann Stojkovic of Ragusa (2) who was a Slav, and was against communion in both kinds; M. Aegidius Carler, a


Frenchman, Dean of Cambrai, against the article on the punishment of sins; M. Heinrich Kalteina, a German, a Dominican and Professor of Theology and Inquisitor at Cologne, against the free preaching of the Word of God; Dr. Juandi Palomar, a Spaniard, Archdeacon of Barcelona and Auditor at the Papal Court, for the lordship of the clergy in matters temporal; and, in order that each might find himself at home in his subject, commissions were set up, consisting of members of the Council, with which they had to have preliminary practice in arguing over the Hussite points, just as fencers practise before a duel. Other commissions were nominated with the object of introducing a strong police force in Basle with the help of the civil authorities, so that the newly arrived Bohemians would neither be offended themselves, nor could they harm the spiritual welfare of the faithful; (3) in particular they forbade, for the duration of their presence, all public sins censured in the Four Articles of Prague, and ordered that no prostitute was to show herself in the streets of Basle during their whole stay, diceing, music and dancing in the inns was suspended, and so on. The common folk were taught to behave respectfully and kindly to the arriving Bohemians, but to let themselves in for no familiar intercourse with them; dwellings in the town were assigned to them, and people appointed not only to serve them, but to guard them, so that they would not be able to talk over the common people to their doctrine. (4)

After the return of the aforementioned messengers, the Bohemian envoys, selected by the Kuttenberg Diet, agreed to meet on 6th December, at Tauss; those from Prague told those from Eger as far back as 5th November, to take care that the German Princes and Lords who were to form the escort for the Bohemian envoys, were awaiting them on the stated date, 6th December, at Cham in Bavaria. Not all who were elected

(3) Johann Stojkovic of Ragusa Tractatus de Reductione Bohemorum in Mon. Con. I, 258; John of Segovia II, 298.

(4) Joh. de Ragusa, Joh. de Segovia, Aeneas Sylvius, etc. Hist. Bohem. Chap. XLIX.
by the diet set out, however, since the Lords Meinhard from Neuhaus, Wenzel from Krawarč and Příbík from Kleman remained at home for reasons unknown to us. The dead envoys were:

Vilem Kostka from Postupic, Gentleman z Burglitz, Capt. z Litoníšl (Leitomischl),
Benoš from Novakova and Hustyán, Gentleman z Ulibic,
George from Hečic, Gentleman z Klux,
Jan Belvar, Prager Bürger,
Mátyá Lauda from Chlumčany, Capt. zu Pisek,
George from Mähnshof (Králový Dvůr),
Laurin from Tábor,
Jan Krycans,
Mag. Peter Payne from England,
Prokop the Great,
Niklas Diskapoc from Pilgram,
Markolá from Zbaslawic,
Martin Lupčič from Chrudim,
Peter Němec from Saaz (Sazava),
Ulrich of Znaim (Znojmo). (5)

All these met with their retinues at Tauss on 6th December, numbering in all some 50 horsemen (6) and on Sigismund’s orders there accompanied them the Burggraves from Karlstein, the knight Zdešlaw Tluksa from Buržim, so that someone from the imperial party should also be present at Basle.

On the same day some nobles came from Germany, 32 horsemen, who were to accompany the Bohemians to Cham; here Bishop Conrad of Regensburg was awaiting them, and personally escorted them with still more lords to Nuremberg. As they neared this town Matthias Lauda had a Taborite flag stuck on his waggons, the flag had Christ on the Cross on the one side, and on the other the Holy Grail, and over it the Host with the inscription painted over it "Veritas omnia vincit"; the other Hussite waggons had awnings with similar badges. This appeared to many of the Germans as petulance and a breach of the peace, and caused great fermentation amongst the people, and so Lauda was requested by the Princes and lords to take off the sign in Nuremberg, and did not show it again during the whole journey. The people of Nuremberg evinced great honour to the Bohemians

(5) Palacký: Geschichte von Böhmen. Achetes Buch. GG.
(6) Aeneas Sylvius speaks of at least probably 300, Joh. de Segovia only of 50 horsemen.
in their town, and brought them all kinds of presents. From here Albert, son of the Margrave of Brandenburg, accompanied them to Gunzenhause, further, the Count von Ottugsen escorted them via Nordlingen to Ulm, and the people of Ulm via Bibra to Fussen; here their protection, from Stockach, the retinue of Duke William of Bavaria took over till they arrived at Steffhausen. At many places the inhabitants strove with one another to pay the Bohemian envoys special honour.

The news of the unexpected splendour and praise wherewith the Bohemian envoys travelled through Germany, went before them to the Council, and caused great excitement there. The Legate Julian, in the fear that something unpleasant might happen when the Bohemians arrived at Basle hastened (although he had already nominated a solemn and numerous deputation to go out to meet them and receive them with honour before the town) to send Brother Johann von Geilshausen, who was already known to the Bohemians and loved by them, with the request that they should avoid any kind of demonstration in order to avert any undesirable occurrence. They had decided, however, before this request reached them, to board a ship, and they entered Basle by water, quietly and unexpectedly, before sunset on Sunday 4th January, 1433. And, as no-one was expecting them at this time or by this route, no solemnities took place for their reception. Nevertheless, as the news of their landing flew through the town in a moment, the Town Councillors came hastening to them as they stayed on the ship; the curious householders streamed onto the streets through which they were to pass and as an eye-witness describes, (7) "Women, children and girls looked out from the windows and from the roofs, pointing their fingers at this and that, wondering about their foreign ways and their costumes never before seen in the town, and gazing at their fearful faces and wild eyes." Nothing of what rumour had told of them was impossible, they said. In particular every eye was turned on Frokop.

However. It was he who had so many times defeated the great army of the faithful, destroyed so many cities, ruined so many thousands. His fellow-countryman as well as his foes feared him as an unconquered, keen, restlessly active army leader, shunning no danger.

At first four public inns were appointed as their dwelling but after some days they themselves rented four houses in Basle; in one lived Wilhelm Kostka and Priest Prokop, the leaders of the delegation with their servants; in the second the men from Prague, Jan Wolwar, Jan Rokysoha, Martin Lupač and Beneš von Mohrwaus; in the third the Taborites, Kateř Lauda, Niklas Biskupec, Markol and Laurin; in the fourth George von Rečic, George von Kônichof, Mag. Peter Payne from England Ulrich of Znaim and Peter Nemeč of Saaz (Sazava). Immediately after their arrival Cardinal Julian sent M. Johann from Paloncér and Johann Stojkovic from Ragusa to greet them, who when they came, expressed in the name of the Legate their joy at their happy arrival, placed themselves and their servants and goods at their service, and instructed them to live a happy carefree life in Basle as if they were among their own people in Prague; the Legate and the assembled Fathers had wished to see them on landing since they wanted to meet them and to receive them with honour. The Bohemians were highly delighted at this and thanked the Legate heartily. The next day, 5th January, before lunch a great company of prelates and clerics came to the newly assembled Bohemians, the Archbishop of Lyons at their head, who greeted them in the name of the whole council in a long and very affectionate speech, in which he also alluded to the disputes between the Council and the Pope, and expressed the hope that the Bohemians would unite with the Church and the Council and so contribute powerfully to the wish for termination of these disputes.(8)

On the feast day of the Three Kings, the Bohemians held services in their inns, each sect after its own manner and custom. Many Basle people went in order to look on, and the entry was not forbidden to them. They saw nothing unusual in the service of the Utraquists from Prague, since they read the Mass in the usual way, except that they also allowed laymen to drink from the cup. Much greater was the interest shown in Priest Prokop and other Taborites who used neither altar, holy vestments nor any kind of ceremony; limiting the whole devotions to short prayers, the sermon and Communion in both kinds. With the "Waisen" (Orphans) the sermon was that day in German, and there were many townspeople among the congregation. A great commotion arose over this, and the Legate Julian was besiegelt with requests to restrain the disorders. He called some of the Bohemians to him and requested them to leave off preaching in German in Basle. He did not forbid their preaching in Bohemian. They gave as their excuse that they had many German servants who did not understand Bohemian, and that they could not neglect to preach in German, to which they were allowed in conformity with the Eger Treaty; they did not entice the people of Basle to come they said, although they would not send away those who did come. The people of Basle might themselves take the trouble of seeing that no-one came. They would be content. To expect more of them was not possible. The people of Basle were, therefore, forcibly told that they were to take care not to visit the Hussites, and the clergy complained bitterly over the carelessness of the Town Councillors in this respect; the people soon wearied, however, of attending a Church service which flattered neither the senses nor the fantasy, and this soon ceased to attract the curiosity of the public, so that no further prohibition was necessary. On the other hand, the Hussite priests wished to be allowed to hear the sermons preached for the members of the Council; this was granted to them later when the public discussions began, and then they were allowed into the Churches only after the Gospel, and had to leave again after the sermon, so that the Mass would not be read in their presence.
At mid-day on 7th January, when the Bohemians were already installed in their own inns, Prokop the Great invited to lunch not only the most distinguished Bohemian delegates, but also M. Johann Palomar, Johann Stojkowic von Ragusa and Johann von Geilhausen. Already many fierce disputes were beginning, especially between Mr. Peter Payne and the Basle guests, in which, as Stojkovic says, "this English Hussite is like a slippery snake, the more he was pressed, the more nimbly he twisted out!"(9) Still, they did not yet overstep the bounds of respectability and politeness. Johann von Geilhausen was requested to be mediator between them and the Council.

On the 8th January, there were important religious devotions in Basle, a solemn procession through the town, and High Mass, read by Johann Cervantes, Cardinal of St. Peter, at which forty nine Prelates and eight hundred clerical and lay members of the Council attended, beseeching God for a happy outcome of the Bohemian affairs. A general fast was also appointed for every Wednesday and Friday as long as the discussions with the Bohemians continued. At the same time they asked the Bohemians to hold solemn devotions of their own with the same object; they answered, however, that this had already been taken care of in Bohemia by a national decree before their departure, and that prayers had been held according to instructions in the whole land. On the same day a Bohemian deputation four laymen and four of the clergy, went to Cardinal Julian to thank him for his honourable and kind conduct towards them, and to ask him about the date and place of the public hearing. Julian offered them the following day, and the usual meeting-place, namely, in the Dominican monastery.

On the 10th January, the Bohemians were, for the first time, introduced to the general assembly (General Congregation) in the Dominican Monastery, and two benches in the middle of the Hall were

(9) John Ragusio: Ipse Anglica tamquam aegniss lubricus quattuor strictius teneri videbatur et concludi, tanto citius ad importinentes dilabebatur materias.
assigned to them, just opposite the seats of the Legate Julian and the Cardinals; it is to be understood that not only Duke William of Bavaria, as Protector of the Council, but also distinguished persons of the estates, spiritual and temporal, were present, as many as the Hall would hold. The sitting began with a fine speech from Julian, which lasted more than two hours, and through its loveliness and sincerity frequently moved not only the members of the Council, but also some of the Bohemians, to tears; its content was a shrewd and learned glorification of the supreme authority of the Church, for the necessity of which evidence was produced, in order to make them obedient. The speaker, as was then the custom, had chosen a text from the Bible, the words of the Apostle Paul to the Philippians (see Philippians, II, 1-3) and addressed the Bohemians in the name of the Mother Church as sons, whose return she had awaited with longing, admonishing them that in her voice they might hear the voice of the Holy Spirit. After him, M. Johann Rokycana stood up in the name of the Bohemians, and, taking as his text the words in the Gospel according to St. Matthew: "Where is the new born King of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East and are come to worship Him."(11) he explained the reasons why the Bohemians had come and particularly the injustice under which they had till then suffered, being considered as heretics by the whole world, although the curses of men had worked more for good than for ill to them, as Christ had said it would. He requested the fathers not to get excited if they heard strange things from the Bohemians, through the examination of which the truth might be ascertained, wherefore they had come here, seeking Christ, who is the Way, the Truth and the Life; he praised the one-time conduct of the first Christian Church, deplored its disfigurement in recent years, and desired that it might be led back to its original purity with the assistance of the Council; then he thanked the Council for the zeal with which they had been received both on the

(10) Julian's speech printed by Mansi XXIX, 492-512.
(11) St. Matthew's Gospel. 2.2.
journey and in Basle itself, and finally he requested the fixing of a day on which they might speak on their affairs in the full Assembly. (12) Julian replied that it depended on them when they should be heard, the Council was ready any day at any time. After they had discussed among themselves, they fixed the next Friday, 16th January, which was accepted by the Assembly with approbation.

II

It is hardly believable that the Bohemian delegates, when they came to Basle, did not know themselves which of the Articles of Prague each of them was to represent publicly before the Council, but disputes arose among them as late as 13th January, particularly with regard to the article on the Freedom of the Word of God, appointing himself by the will of the Bohemian lords. This Article, however, had been awarded by the majority of the delegates, to the Orphan priest, Ulrich von Znaim (Znojmo). From this it may be seen how little time the Hussite theologians had for preparation, in contrast to their opponents in the Council who had already been practising for four months against them. The Bohemian delegates made use of the free days and hours before the beginning of the disputations to get to know the most excellent members of the Council, to which they both paid and received numerous visits and were frequently both hosts and guests at meals. In such intercourse there arose, particularly between the French clergy and themselves a close friendship, to which the French King himself had urged his prelates. The Bohemians had no luck with the Cardinals; when they paid their first visit to some of these, the usual courtesy was not once evinced, whereupon they departed without exchanging greetings. Archbishop Bartholomew of Milan, who in 1420 had been present with King Sigismund in Bohemia at the siege of Prague, behaved in the most unfriendly way to them. Only through Julian's good offices, it appeared, did the matter take a turn for the better so that friendly behaviour to the Bohemians became universal in

12) John Rolycana's speech printed by Martene, collect. ampl. VIII, 54-282; also John de Segovia; and John de Ragusio.
Basle, and even the Cardinals anticipated them in kindness. In a short time a kind of familiarity developed between Cardinal Julian and Prokop the Great, as the diary of Peter von Saaz shows in several places, for example, on 27th January: "We four priests went," he reports "to lunch in the Dominican Monastery, to see over the library there, which we found far richer and more costly than that of the Minorities; we saw there, besides other good books, one on the game of chess, and in the second room very many writings on canon and civil law. Then we visited Cardinal Branda, who lived in the same house, and received us kindly. Prokop said to him: 'We wanted some books from the library of these monks, but they refused, saying they were forbidden to let books out of the premises on loan.' The Cardinal replied: 'You shall have everything you wish;' whereupon the Dominican Prior Nidor amended his previous statement and said, 'Now I do not refuse you everything.' And after we had been entertained by the Cardinal to a glass of wine, we repaired to the Legate Julian, who welcomed us, put his arm round Prokop, and took him into a room apart, where they spent almost half-an-hour together. And, as Prokop told me, they yielded to tell each other everything they had on their minds, without the other taking it amiss. So Prokop said to the Cardinal: 'All is not well with you; you appeal to the authority of the primitive Church, and whilst you deviate far from the Holy Spirit, you say that everything you do happens through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, which, however, before God, is not so; if we consider the Christian Church, we find that they observed our Four Articles.' (13) The Legate did not contradict him, and changed the subject. Some days later, on 14th February, Julian said in a similar conversation that the more he associated with the Bohemians, the more his heart inclined to them, and it was to be hoped that they would remain in Basle until a perfect

(13) The words of Peter z Sazawy are: Procopius cardinali dixit: "Pessima statis, respicibus primitivam ecclesiam cum auctoritate, et nimia remoti estis a spiritu sancti conversatione; et acessimatis quod quidquid facitis, spiritus sancti instinet faceretis, quod tamen ordine non est; nos recupercio primitivam ecclesiam repetimus, comed nostrae quatuor articulos teniisse." "Cui tamen legatus non multum contradixit; et plura interlocuti sunt." Mon. Concil.I, 330.
agreement came into being. Prokop replied that this was not possible because of the heavy expenses; and, as the Legate would not believe it, he thought the Bohemians rich, Prokop explained his financial position, and in strength of the Bohemian party, about that of the whole Bohemian strength, whereby he let himself in at the same time, for a description of the whole war strategy of the Hussites. Thereupon Julian said laughing: "You, my Lord, are Prokop the Great; but where is Prokop the Little?" When he received the explanation that he was one of the "Waisen", he asked: "You are different from the "Waisen" then?" "Yes," answered Prokop, "in some things." "But you are still more different from the men of Prague?" said Julian. "Let us rather drop all our differences and unity," "But we must first agree, at least on the most essential points," answered Prokop. "Certainly," said Julian, "May it be so! Otherwise all our effort is in vain."

On the 16th January, the Abbot of Ebrach, the Dean of Regensburg, the town Councillors of Basle and Johann von Seilhauen came to escort the Bohemian envoys honourably and solemnly to the general assembly of the Council. There Nathias Lauda from Chlumu, Captain of Pisek and treasurer of the Bohemian delegation, spoke in the name of his fellow-countrymen, turning first to Duke Wilhelm as Protector, then to the Legate Julian as President, and then to the Council in general: he thanked God and them that the long wished for hour had at last come when it was granted to the Bohemians to clear themselves before the whole world of false accusations, and to unveil the hidden treasure of blessed doctrine, on whose account they had so often been persecuted and hunted as heretics, still, God often permits quarrelling and strife among men, so that reconciliation and peace will be all the more prized; he apologised for the war which the Bohemians had unwillingly waged for their defence, and declared their willingness in future to fight only with words and evidence from the Holy Scriptures, whilst he asked for a good hearing for himself and his companions. Then he read the documents of the Treaty of Eger on the way in which the Bohemian affairs were to be handled by the Council.
and asked if the Council acknowledged the Treaty? The Legate answered
that he, foreseeing the necessity, had brought the original to the
assembly with him, but it seemed to him that the extracts read agreed with
it. Then the powers given to the delegates both by the Hattenberg
Landtag of 5th September, 1432, and those of Prague University of 1st
December, 1493, were read, and the verbal assurance added, that though
Laurin from Tabor had been left out of the document through the carelessness
of the scribe, he had nevertheless been nominated by the Landtag, and was
to be taken for an accredited delegate like all the rest. Then M. Peter
Payne gave a talk on the words of the Psalm: "When the sun, they assemble
again," (Ps. 104, 22) and began to praise the Hussite doctrine in general
in flowery language, comparing it to the sun, expressing the hope that if
men only fittingly recognised it, they would gladly and voluntarily accept
it. Finally M. Johann Rokycana began his defence of the necessity of
communion in both kinds. After having assured them in the name of the
Bohemians that they did not want to carry through anything obstinately
against the determination of the Mother Church - to which he ascribed
another meaning, as was customary in the Council - he announced that he
was ready to prove that that Communion was not only instituted in the
Holy Scriptures, and strengthened in the sayings of the holy Fathers of
the Church as also in the example and practice of the early Church, but
that it was accepted by the old Councils; it agreed with all the
stipulations which had been set between the Bohemians and the Council
by the treaty of Eger, with reference to the highest and most impartial
judges. As it was already late on that day, he postponed his further
exposition till the day after next. But even then he did not finish,
and had to be heard further on Monday, 19th January. His long speech
had the merit of not exciting its hearers to passion, and was listened
to not only with patience, but with strained attention; but he had such
great faith in his victory that he invited the whole Council to name

him only a few doctors who had found fault with the Communion in both kinds as heretical, erroneous and offensive before the Edict of the Council of Constance. (14) When he had finished his speech, Prokop the Great could not restrain himself, and began to speak too; he admonished all those present to listen to the foundations of truth, and, invited to the feast, not to fail to appear, as God after the example in the Gospel (15) would pursue those invited with his anger if they did not appear, and would call others to his blessed supper; as he spoke in this way for some time, he gave many proofs of his biblical learning, but received no such recognition as Rokycana, some even replying to him with laughter. Hereupon Julian expressed his opinion that it would be better before answering the individual articles of the Bohemians if they were all spoken of in turn by them, which was agreed upon not only by the Council, but by the Bohemian envoys, so they decided to continue next day with another article.

On the 20th January, Niklaas from Pilgram, the Taborite bishop, began to speak on the prevention and punishment of public sins in the Church, and continued on that subject the next day. His speech was not so forbearing and moderate as that of Rokycana; repeatedly he spoke sharply and bitterly, and found fault in particular with the way in which men had acted towards the Bohemian teachers Hus and Jerosme (Hieronymus) at Constance. When he laid the most sweeping reproaches at the door of the hierarchy, great excitement was caused in the Assembly: some laughed, others ground their teeth, yet others began to grumble aloud. Julian, with folded hands looked up to Heaven. Then Niklaas from Pilgram asked with emphasis whether he would be allowed to continue speaking, in accordance with the Treaty of Eger or not? Julian answered: "Just stop now and then, so that they can clear their throats; otherwise you shall have full freedom." So he finished his

(14) Hartene, VIII, p.262-305 (Rokycana's speech); and Hansi, XXV, p.269-306.

discourse without hindrance, and, in the opinion of his fellow countrymen, very beautifully, and honourably. Nevertheless Rokycana complained to Biskupec, as the delegates were leaving the assembly, that he had allowed himself to speak against the prelates with such a lack of forbearance in public; only the majority of the Bohemians appeared to be content with the speech, and did not consent to everything that happened in the Council being censored in future.

When three days later, (23rd January) Ulrich von Znaim (Oldřich ze Znojma) was beginning to defend the Article on the free proclamation of the Word of God N. Rokycana interrupted his speech, saying that complaints from some members of the Council had come to the ears of the Bohemians that one of the servants of the Bohemian envoys had thrown snow at a crucifix standing on the bridge, and another had struck the statue of a saint with his fist. Nothing of this was known to the Bohemians, but it did not seem to them improbable; if it was proved they would not fail, he assured them, to punish emphatically the servant who was found guilty, whoever he might be. Julian pledged that the members of the Council heard of all kinds of unpleasant happenings, as well as speeches, which, however, they bore with patience. In particular it appeared that Bohemian grooms were going round in the surrounding villages spreading their faith in all kinds of ways. It would be as well, therefore, if the Bohemian envoys, in order to avoid all irritations of their people, would strongly forbid such things. To this it was replied that these men went into the villages in order to buy hay and oats, and that they were quite incapable of holding forth on any doctrine whatsoever; but if the German people out of curiosity asked them about their beliefs and Church services, and they told the truth, it could neither be taken for preaching nor for a spreading of the Hussite faith. Notwithstanding this, the Bohemian delegates explained their readiness in this matter also to take care that it happened as little as possible. Ulrich von Znaim then carried through his thesis on this day and the day after next without
any further notable occurrence. (16)

The last Hussite priest and master, who spoke from 26th to 23th January on the temporal dominion of the clergy was the Englishman Peter Payne. The contents of his speech also were no less unpleasant to the Council than the way in which he delivered it; since he let himself be a eulogy not only of Hus, but also of Wyclif, while answering the condemnation of both at the Council of Constance; he told further of the disputes he had had at Oxford University regarding Wyclif's doctrine, because of which he had left his fatherland and had had to seek refuge in Bohemia. On this point there arose a long exchange of words between him and his fellow countrymen present at the Council. At the end he handed over a note (17) in which a shortened form of the contents of his speech was written down, that the usufruct of worldly goods, as long as it did not degenerate into excess and superabundance, should not be forbidden to the Priests, the administration of Governments and dependencies as it injured the clerical office, should be taken from them, and where sinning by the clergy was customarily overlooked, justice and duty demanded all the more that the cause and susceptibility to sin be set aside; at the same time he wished that the note should be entered in the Acts of the Council.

After the passing through of all four Articles of Prague, M. Rokyca again spoke, on 28th January, and expressed in the name of all his fellow-delegates his joy and thanks for the friendly, patient and free hearing that had been granted them; he added that if any of their words had hurt the Fathers, they begged to be excused, and if they had said anything in their Articles which was contrary to faith and truth, they were ready to improve on it if it were proved on adequate grounds; as they longed, he said, not less than the Council itself for peace and concord.

(16) Martene, 305-310. (Ulrich's speech); and Vansé, XXV., 306-337.
(17) Martene, 251-252.
Further, he desired that those who were to answer them would do so in as short a form as possible, in order to save time, only taking into consideration controversial matters, and that they would give them their thesis in writing without delay, as they themselves had already done. After him, Wilhelm Kostka spoke in German to Duke William, as Protector of the Council, thanking him in a similar way; whereupon William explained that, if the hearing till then was not sufficient for the Bohemians, he would endeavour to procure a further one, and that he would help them in everything that might lead to peace and concord, having had special instructions to that effect from King Sigismund. Cardinal Julian asked first whether all the delegates confessed unanimously to what their four speakers had said in their exposition of their four articles? And when all the envoys had answered this question in the affirmative, he began in a detailed speech to cite everything that the Fathers in their ten days of discourses had heard to rejoice them, and to guarantee a hope of peace. He praised the readiness for concord which had been expressed, said that the will must pass for the deed, and that the fathers in this regard did not lay some rough words that they had heard too heavily in the balance, and desired that the envoys, adhering to their intention, should also seize the means which might lead to the desired goal. "If we wish," he said, "that eternal unity and peace should reign among us, we must mutually disclose our minds, and be of one way of thinking, and nothing must remain which might be able to disunite us later, the Council is like an annealing furnace, in which, through the flame of the Holy Spirit all the dross of different opinions is melted and refined; and as in worldly peace negotiations all points of difference without exception are brought to decision, so must it be here too; so that not a single unquenched spark may remain to kindle the fire again." Up till then only four articles had been discoursed on by the Bohemians; but the Fathers had been informed, that besides those four articles the Bohemians held many other tenets which differed from the doctrine of the Council; the Fathers had
heard with their own ears how one delegate had called Wyclif an evangelical
doctor, from which it could be seen that they approved of his articles,
rejected by the Church. And after he had had twenty eight such articles,
in which not only the doctrine of Wyclif, but also the faith of the
Taborites and Orphan (Waisen)(Sirotci) priests was revealed, read publicly,
he asked the envoys to answer whether they also confessed to these
articles? Further, he wanted to know what words the Bohemians used in
the consecration of the body and blood of Christ, and what they thought of
marriage between blood relations and of the power of general assemblies
of the Church and of the popes of Rome? Whether the Bohemians believed
that the Holy Spirit came from Father and Son, and whether they held anyone
a heretic who opposed the Councils of Nicaea and of Constantinople, and
first Council of Ephesus, and that of Chalcedon? This was the first
attempt on the part of the Council to disunite the Bohemians amongst
themselves, and to blast their solidarity; but it was too previous and
hasty, and led at that time to no result; the Calixtines not yet recognised
by the Church and taken to her bosom, could not and would not yet part
from their fellow-countrymen. The Bohemians, therefore, requested to be
allowed to retire for a moment's consultation on the matter, and on their
return to the Assembly they gave no further answer than that it was
necessary to give them the foregoing points in writing and to grant a
longer time for consideration. They could not refuse them these things,
and it was decided that at the next sitting they should proceed with the
answer to the discourses of the delegates.

On the last Sunday of January when the replies by the Council
to the Articles of Prague was to begin, the Cisterian Abbot and Professor
at Paris University, John, arose and admonished the Bohemians, to renounce
all disputes and to submit themselves entirely to the Council, whose
Leader was the Holy Spirit Who could only lead it in the paths of truth.
In his speech the same reasons were repeated which the President Julian

(18) These Articles are in Martene, 249-251.
had long ago brought forward, only they were repeated with less moderation and caution, since he described the Bohemians as if they had been separated from the Church and were opposed to her, which angered them greatly. (19) Immediately after him, however, M. Johann Stojkovic of Ragusa spoke, which he had been longing to do for a long time, in order in his own name to refute the opinions of the Bohemians on the necessity of Communion in both kinds. His discourse, rambling in all directions, was exactly the opposite of what Rolycana had recently desired, since it entered into a number of side issues, and was protracted to 11th February; and as he frequently sought to compensate by railing against the Bohemians for what was lacking in the contents, he not only bored them, but angered and irritated them. At the sittings of 4th and 7th February in particular a great storm arose over it. The first to complain in the name of his fellow-countrymen was the Taborite Priest Prokop. He designated it as a breach of the Treaty of Eger that first the Cistercian Abbot John and now John Ragusa heaped abuse not only on the heads of individual Bohemians, but on the whole Bohemian nation. "You insult us," he said, "by ordering us to return to the Church, as if we had ever left it, but very far from leaving as we are endeavouring to lead all Christians into it, you too. You want us to submit entirely to your decisions: prove to us then, that what you call true, is true, and we will submit. If, however, the truth is on our side, you will not, please God, thrust it from you. Dr. John Stojkovic of Ragusa constantly turns aside to things which do not concern us here; only yesterday he spoke of the presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, as if we denied it, only wishing to blacken us. We ask: was he only speaking in his own name, or in the name of the Council? It is said that he was only speaking in his own name; but we have not come to Basle to meet some Doctors, nor have our people sent us to them; we therefore demand that from now on we are answered only in the name of the Council." Rolycana added that the desired submission

(19) Martene, VIII, 340-351; Consil., XXIX, 1271-1280.
would run contrary to the Treaty of Eger, and that the delegates had no powers in that respect. He would not deal with the question "where is the Church?" and would postpone it to another time. "You think", he said "that the Church is in this Council; still, although we know well how even your head, Pope Eugene IV, thinks of you, and what he calls you, we do not pay much heed to it, but still hope for peace and unity, for the sake of which we have come here, since we honestly desire them." After much bandying of words the Cardinal said that patience and indulgence were needed from both sides; the Bohemians also had said bitter and unfriendly things, and had nevertheless been heard, so they should now show love and moderation in their turn; M. John Stojkovic should, however, continue and finish his speech before the Council, no matter whether it was long or short, or whether the Bohemians heard it or not. With this, the first day's storm was somewhat calmed. Only when on the 7th February, the same John, after praising the guilelessness of the Roman Church, called all her opponents heretics, and when the name "heretic" although only indirectly directed against the Bohemians, was heard from his mouth sixteen times in a short space, Kinsky arose and said that such speeches did not lead to peace and concord, but in the very opposite direction, and ran contrary to the Treaty of Eger; the Bohemians like every other people abominated heresy, and said he "if there is any one who will accuse me of heresy, let him bind himself under the law of requital, and then produce proof." Also Prokop said that no-one had proved and no-one could prove that the Bohemians were heretics, "and yet," said he, "this monk taxes us with heresy incessantly; in truth, if I had foreseen this in Bohemia, I would never have come here; and I ask you, M. Tabe, if this is the way in which you promised to act with us at Eger?" When John Stojkovic perceived this new storm he swore that in speaking of heretics, he had by no means had the Bohemians in mind, nor had he wished to designate them by that name. "Damn me", he shouted, "if I wanted to offend you or insult you!" Others of the Fathers too excused him, that he had only spoken in general terms, and neither accused them of any evil intent nor
persecuted them because of it; and next day a deputation, the Archbishop of Lyons, at its head, came from the Council to the Bohemians assembled in the inn occupied by the "Vaisenfl" expressly to request forbearance and pardon for Stojkowic. The delegates did not refuse, through veneration for the Bishop of Lyons, only from that time onwards neither Prokop nor Wilhelm Kostka visited the sittings again, as long as Stojkowic was speaking; and when Julian later entreated Prokop to invite John Stojkowic to a meal as a sign of perfect reconciliation he could not bring himself to do so.

As the Bohemians insisted that they should be answered in the name of the Council, and not by single individuals as such, just as they were acting in this affair in the name of the whole Bohemian people: therefore Legate Julian announced on 13th February, that accredited speakers would answer them on the remaining three articles in the name of the whole Council with the stipulation, however, that the Council be free to expand or improve on their words if necessity demanded it. That day the Paris Professor Aegidius Carlier from Picardy began a discourse against the Taborite bishop Niklas' article on the abolition and punishment of public sins, which he continued till 17th February. After him, on Wednesday, 18th February, the Dominican Inquisitor of Cologne, Heinrich Kelteisen, began to refute the article on the free proclamation of the Word of God, with which he busied himself till 21st February. Lastly, on the 23rd February, John from Palomar spoke till 28th February defending the temporal dominion of the clergy. Thus the whole month of February was spent in the defence of the Catholic faith against the Hussites; still the three last speakers gave the Bohemian envoys no further cause for complaint.(20)

When the first speeches of both sides were thus ended Cardinal Julian reminded the Bohemians that they should now express their views on the twenty-eight articles which he had put before them a month before.

(20) Mansi, XXIX, 699-1168. This Document was also kept in MSS. in Prague.
Rokycana following a general decision of his fellow-countrymen, answered that the Treaty of Eger expressly said that the Four Articles of Prague must be finished before everything else; therefore the delegates must strongly point out, as commissioned by their Landtag, that only when they had reached the desired conclusion with the articles, it would be time to proceed to further negotiations. Then Julian brought a motion that a special Commission be elected, with four persons from each side, to write down on which points they were agreed, and on which points they were not. Rokycana, however, desired that before anything else his reply to Stojkowic be heard, in which he explained that the latter had not contented himself with a mere answer, but had mixed a number of new factors into his speech, and had been guilty of frequent mistakes and errors, which even the Council could see; for the rest, a hearing had been promised to the Bohemians, how and where they desired it, and it could not be refused to them. When Stojkowic heard this, he demanded that he should be free to answer Rokycana, since the Council could not commit the injustice of not hearing both parties with equal readiness. From this new disputes arose, which did not fully end that day; only in the evening of the following day Rokycana received instructions from the meeting of Cardinals, that he would be allowed to reply next day.

So after Rokycana had begun again on 2nd March, he stretched his discourse against Stojkowic out until the 10th of that month, although on 5th March when the delegation from Eugen IV came to Basle, and on 9th March, when they were publicly heard, no negotiations on the Bohemian question took place. For at that time the pope was already inclined to acknowledge the Council of Basle, and certainly chiefly because there appeared to be hope that through co-operation with it the Bohemians would again be reconciled to the Roman Church; only the Council began to appear prouder towards the Pope than was to be desired for the good of the Church. For the rest Rokycana's reply, though often touching and sharp, caused no excitement until he came to the end and shouted with raised voice: "By
opponent declares, that mortal men, that the Councils, can change Christ's commandments, and Christ said: 'Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.'" (21) Then Stojkovic with great heat began immediately to speak again, and said it would be a disgrace for the Bohemians if they would not hear him again; at which Rokycana pledged that he was ready to listen to him for a whole week, but he stipulated for the right according to the Treaty of Eger to answer him again if necessary.

The Council recognised that such endless wordy disputes would lead away from the desired goal rather than towards it; hence they took other means from that day on, without allowing Stojkovic to speak again. The Protector of the Council, Duke William of Bavaria, was approached, to undertake the mediation between the parties, and for this he made excellent use of the help of Dr. Nicholas of Cusa, (22) a distinguished German theologian. A committee of 30 people was also constructed, 15 from each side, which held many consultations between 11th and 18th March as to how a settlement was to be reached; Cardinals Julian, Branda and Cervantes were on this committee, and also the Archbishop of Lyons, the Bishops of Regensburg and Meissen, and others. Julian arranged that every such conference should begin with a prayer, but the hearts of the negotiators did not thereby become milder in tone, nor did they approach one another. Their chief attention was directed to the moving of the Bohemians to unite with the Council, and, as it were, to incorporate themselves in it. On 11th March, Julian said to them: "We declare that the Church is with us, you, on the contrary, say she is with you; let us unite then, let us be one body, and there will be no doubt where the Church is. The Pope has already come to an understanding with us, the Emperor is on our side, and so are other kings and nations; join with us, so that the union may be whole and entire, then you will together with us

(21) St. Matthew, 24. 35.
(22) H. Bet: Nicholas of Cusa.
direct the affairs of Christendom, and together with us will strive to improve the Church." The Bohemians knew well that to incorporate themselves in the Council was as much as to give up their own particular position and to submit to the decisions of the majority unfavourable to them; and although they were already beginning to resign the hope with which they had come to Basle, that the Council would be moved to recognise and accept the Hussite dogmas, their views of the right of the Council to judge them remained unchanged; all speeches and enticements attempted with this end in view failed in their effect; "Your judge", they declared, "is solely the Gospel of God, and no man whatsoever;" to the praise of the inerrancy of the Church they opposed the example of the Council of Constance in which they felt the absence of the working of the Holy Spirit; some were already beginning to speak of returning to the homeland. Thus the Commission elected to negotiate with them itself from day to day in an awkward position. On 13th March Nikolas of Gusa had put the question, as from himself, and in his own name, whether, if the Council consented to the Article on Communion in both kinds, the Bohemians would appear content concerning the remaining articles? To which the envoys would give no answer since they feared that behind it a trap had been laid for them. When the same question was repeated later in the name of the Duke, and at the same time it was explained that they should, on receipt of the desired decree on Communion in both kinds, incorporate themselves in the Council, and by its further decisions take a share with respect to the remaining three articles: they wanted the offer formulated in writing, in order that they might discuss it, but soon returned it again, explaining that there could be no talk of incorporation before a perfect arrangement on all four Articles, as it was foolish to announce an agreement, and then to take a stand again on differences of doctrine; besides, they would thus overstep the Treaty of Eger, which they had no power to do.
To Duke William, the chief hindrance to a happy outcome appeared to lie in the number of the negotiators; if a smaller committee from both sides met, he thought, some arrangement could be made more easily. This attempt succeeded, so that on 19th March only four committee men from each side, eight people in all, began to assemble in Julian's house for familiar conferences which lasted the whole week. Neither the names nor the negotiations of these Committees are recorded; (23) but as a decisive result of their efforts the conviction emerged on both sides that a full and entire settlement was impossible at Basle. The Bohemians had till then flattered themselves with the hope that their doctrine explained to the Council would, at least for the most part, pass into the doctrine of the Common Church, and so would contribute to the improvement of the Christian system of dogma in general; the Council, however, actually showed its resolve to proceed on its way - without admitting any other influence whatsoever - and to point out to the Bohemians as though it were a privilege, a particular path on which they could move freely. When this state of affairs became clearer to the Bohemians, their zeal for further negotiations in Basle cooled, and they sought to rid themselves of the responsibility to their fellow countrymen as soon as possible. They wanted the Council itself to depute a delegation to Bohemia, and there, to negotiate immediately with the people assembled in the Landtag, since they had no power to grant such important things as were demanded of them. (24) From the earnestness with which they spoke of the matter, the Council was at last convinced of the inescapable necessity of such a step, although the delay and the outlay associated with it were not pleasant to them. They decided, therefore that envoys of the Council should go off with the Bohemian delegates on their return home, so that the negotiations begun in Basle


(24) These letters written to Bohemia by Wilhelm Hora and Prokop the Great are in Archiv Cesky III, 396, (quoted by Palacky.)
might be completed in Bohemia. While the preparations for this new
dlegation were being made, the theologians of both parties continued
their discussions.

Niklas Biskupec had already delivered his reply to Carlier;
after the aforementioned conference Ulrich from Zmian was allowed to
speak against Kalejseh, which he continued to do until 31st March and on
1st April Peter Payne relieved him. Their discourses took place under
rather troubled circumstances, since their opponents interrupted them
everywhere, but both parties were already laying less stress on such
speeches as at the beginning. On 2nd April the turn of the speakers for
the Council came again, John Stojkovic and Carlier (4th April), Kalejseh
and Palenar (7th and 8th April). Their discourses passed so to speak
into conversations, because already order was being observed by neither
side, and also a number of other speakers were putting their ear in, so
that the field of battle was in a state of flux. In this wordy warfare
Rokycana distinguished himself by his ready and pertinent wit, and gave
the man from Ragusa, above all, much to do through his irony; next to
him Peter Payne made himself notable through his sharpness, and Prokop
the Great through his tone of the preacher - yes, of the commander.
When Stojkovic once declared that he was not obliged as a doctor to answer
Rokycana, as a mere Master of Arts, the latter said: "You are not better
than Christ, and I am not worse than the devil, and Christ thought even
the devil due an answer." When, after the storm of 7th February,
Stojkovic, fearing to offend the Bohemians with any names, asked
permission to call Rokycana his "opponent", the latter said: "I will
honour you with the same title." When on another occasion he would
answer a certain sentence neither in the negative nor the affirmative,
Rokycana called to him: "Dont be afraid!" - and when he once became too
rambling, Rokycana said: "I understand! You belong to the preaching order
that is why you have to be so talkative." Once he invited him to Prague:
"Come with me, I would vouch for you with my life that no a hair of your
head will be hurt, only you must not take your cowl with you." When
Stojkowic announced at the end of his negotiations on 4th April, that he had finished the task allotted to him and exhibited his recently drawn up twenty books of writings, at the same time requesting forbearance, Rokycana said: "You see, my Lords, how he declares himself guilty for not carrying out what he wished, and as Caiaphas once prophesied, without knowing what, so it has also happened to my opponent." Whereupon Palmar replied: "Mr. Rokycana will only excite laughter." "Not at all," replied the latter, "I really mean that he is guilty, yet since I now have his writings, I will go through them as is proper." When earlier on the same day began a defence of the death penalty, Rokycana made the remark that it was a good thing that the Bohemians did not believe in it, otherwise far more blood would have flowed not only in conquest of towns and fortresses, but in particular in the taking by surprise of Prague by Hynek von Waldstein, where all the priests had attempted to save the lives of many unfortunates; yet in Bohemia no-one had been condemned to death nor punished with their lives for many years. When on 8th April Kaltolsen found fault with Ulrich from Zehin because he had expressed himself as if the origin of monasticism came from the devil, Ulrich answered: "I didn't say that. It must have been someone else, I know nothing about it." Thereupon Prokop the Great said: "I said that to the Legate, not in public but in private. But if the bishops as you say have taken the place of the Apostles, and the priests the places of the twelve disciples; if neither Christ nor the Apostles wanted these useless bread-eaters, who only give themselves up to idleness when they, as robust people, could perfectly well work, where can it come from, if not from the devil?" Thereupon great laughter rang through the whole hall, which was renewed when Rokycana, seizing the opening called to Kaltolsen: "Herr Doktor, choose Prokop as your provincial superior!" This is that much-discussed scene which became known through letters from Basle to all Christian lands as proof of Bohemian bluntness and rudeness. (25)

(25) In Aeneas Sylvius and Peter from Saaz' Diary. (quoted by Palacky.)
Already before the end of March it was decided that both the Bohemian delegates and those destined by the Council for Bohemia, were to set out on the Tuesday after Easter, e.g., 14th April. Wilhelm Kostka and Prokop the Great informed the Bohemians as a whole of this in a letter of 2nd April, in which they desired that the necessary safe-conducts should be sent to them at Figer; a great expenditure was not necessary for this "since we ourselves," they said, "will be able to conduct them, with God's help, if only you do not fail with the safe-conducts. As they have, however, on the way and in Basle, behaved decently and honourably to us in respect for you, it is our duty and obligation to see that their envoys meet with equal esteem. Also we request that you would inform all whom it concerns in Bohemia and Moravia, that they must appear with their priests at the Landtag on next Trinity festival (7th June) and discuss in common what concerns all, so that with God's help an end may be made once and for all of this misery and oppression. What the Bohemians once wanted with such longing to see a Council rule, they will now have it in their hands, through God's grace, since delegates of the Council are coming with powers to Bohemia. Therefore we wish that the Landtag be as well attended as possible since great things will now, God willing, be undertaken and perfected through common decisions."(26)

The Council appointed ten persons for the delegation to Bohemia, namely, two bishops, Philibert of Coëtances in Normandy and Peter of Augsburg; then the aforementioned John Palmar; Friedrich Parsperger, Provost of Regensburg; the also aforementioned Agidius Carlier; Alexander Sparur, Archdeacon from England; Thomas Ebendorfer from Haselbach, Canon of Vienna, and a well-known author; Joachim Tobe, Canon of Magdeburg; Martin Bernauer, deacon of Tours and John from Grillhausen, Monk from the monastery at Maulbronn, who was well-loved by the Bohemians. All these were put on oath by the Council after the

discussions which ended on 8th April, that they would perform their embassy with fidelity. During the following days, from Thursday (9th April) till Easter Monday (12th April) no negotiations took place between the parties, except that envoys from the Duke of Savoy came (on 10th April) as earlier (on 23rd April) envoys from the Duke of Burgundy had come, to greet the Bohemians and to renew the bonds of friendship between the two lands. The Burgundians behaved in a strange way. After they had laid stress on the fact that their lord, Duke Philip, was himself descended from the people of Bohemia on the distaff side, therefore he felt a particular inclination towards the Bohemians and wished to remain their friend; they warned the Bohemians, however, to be very careful about reconciliation with the Council, because, if the peace were disturbed again, their lord, though unwillingly, would have to stand by the Council with all his power. This addition irritated Kostka very much and he replied that he thanked them for their good will and hoped for a lasting friendship between the Bohemians and the Burgundians: "With reference to your threat, however," he said, "let your Duke only come to Bohemia, we will not run away from him but will make a stand against him as against all others." The delegates gave the assurance on parting that they had by no means had the intention of threatening the Bohemians. (27)

The envoys from Savoy behaved in a much friendlier way; they announced from their Lord that everything he had, even his life, was at the service of the glorious kingdom of Bohemia; whereupon Kostka, as leader of the delegation, thanked them with the same readiness, and rendered them the customary honours.

On Easter Monday the Bohemian envoys were taken for the last time to the Assembly of the Council in the Dominican Monastery. At the very outset of the sitting Duke William announced that he had just received a message from King Sigismund, about which he must inform the

(27) Thomas Haselbach's writing, quoted by Palacky. (I was not able to secure the document)
the Council, and when he was requested to wait till the Bohemians had been


be heard. Cardinal Branda, however, who feared a scandal if the

Bohemians, who had come to take ceremonial leave of them, received the

order to leave the hall, broke in, notwithstanding that it had been
decided earlier that the Bohemians should be heard. Six Cardinals and

many Archbishops, bishops and other dignitaries of the Church were present.

Rokycana spoke first in the name of all his fellow-countrymen; he began

with a prayer, took as his text the words of the Apostle to the

Corinthians: "We have come to the end of the times," and described the

fallen state of men, and the necessity of a reformation and a return to
the spirit of the primitive Church. Thereupon he praised the Council,
thanked it for its quiet and patient hearing, for the scrupulous keeping
and consideration of the safe conduct and for the friendly behaviour
towards them both in the Council and in the town, whereupon the other
delegates arose also to express their thanks. Further, he requested
that the Fathers would entertain no misgivings on behalf of those members
who were to travel with them to Bohemia; the Bohemians would take the
same care of them, of their safety and welfare, as they would for them-
selves. Concerning the twenty-eight Articles, he requested that the
matter might be postponed until the happy settlement, hoped for with God's
help, in respect of the four chief articles. He requested also that the
Fathers would kindly pardon it if one or other of the Bohemians had in
their discussions uttered any word which might have offended against the
reverence due to them, or against kindness. Finally, he turned to the
chief of the town of Basle, and thanked him too for his kind friendship
as host. Immediately after him Wilhelm Kostka from Postupice, arose and
intimated that it had come to his ears that delegates of the German order
in Prussia had acquainted the Council of hideous and improper things
against King Vladislaus of Poland, who was an ally of the Bohemians, and
had slandered him against all justice; he requested, therefore, that the

\* I suppose Rokycana is making a free quotation from I Cor. 10.11.
Council would pay no attention to such aspersions until delegates from both parties could represent their case before it. When at this point the deputy of the German order protested against the interference of the Bohemians in this affair, Prokop the Great replied that both Vladislav and his brother Prince Svidrigal, who were at war with one another, had appealed to the decision of the Bohemian Landtag in their quarrel, and both had promised to send their plenipotentiaries in the following days to Prague to mediate peace, so the Bohemians could not be silent but would take care that a delegation was despatched to the Council as soon as possible in this affair. Cardinal Julian promised that the Council would so conduct itself that the hope of peace and concord would not be disturbed, but requested the Bohemians to leave the Assembly for a while, as the Council had something important about which to consult. Prokop, however, did not want to stop speaking, he declared that he had several times already asked for at least a two-hours' hearing, without getting it; now he would restrict himself to two or three words. First, he said, he had noticed how people cherished the opinion of him that he had killed many men with his own hand; he would like to explain, however, that he with the best will in the world wished to say no untruth, but this was absolutely untrue; since he had never shed a drop of blood with his own hand, much less killed anyone. He had only had the command in many battles, in which many men had fallen. Only he was not guilty in this, since he had often enough called upon the Pope and the Cardinals to give up war and temporal dominion, and busy themselves rather with the exceedingly necessary improvement of the Church. Now is the Council assembled to undertake the work of this improvement, which all nations are awaiting with tears and signs. Therefore he warned the Fathers in a speech as little smooth as it was forbearing, that they should at least take steps to put away all recently introduced sinful customs, and lead the Church back to her ancient simplicity and purity; they should oppose neither the free proclamation of the Word of God nor Communion in both kinds which the Greek Church also values; they should cease to
condemn and persecute those who thought differently, like the Waldensians, for example, who although poor, were downright and honourable people; they should take care that God's laws were not forgotten, among the crowd of Church ordinances, and that the reproach of Christ to the Jews (28) should not apply to the Church of the day; since so many superfluous ceremonies and inventions of man had been introduced into religion that it had become veiled and troubled by them. He ended with praising that rule and direction recognised by the Treaties of Eger as the highest authority in Christendom, and alone in a position to help the Church to her desired haven of rest and bliss.

After this speech the Bohemians and all those who were not members of the Council left the Assembly, and the letter of 8th March from King Sigismund at Siena was read, in which he promised to come soon to Basle, and entreated the delegates through Duke William to await him. This pleased the Council very much, which would have been glad if at least some of the Bohemian envoys had remained in Basle. When they were recalled to the hall again, Legate Julian made the announcement of the embassy which had just arrived from the "Emperor" and enumerated the grounds on which they had already desired the Bohemians to postpone their departure; since the "Emperor" would shortly appear at the Council, and wished the delegates to await him, in the hope that all differences would be cleared up through his mediation; they might remain, therefore, and even if they did not wish to wait longer, they might delay still for at least eight days, in which undoubtedly official information would be forthcoming as to the Emperor's arrival. The Bohemians then drew together again for a general consultation, and on their return Rokycana stated that they would prove very grateful to the Council, if it asked even more difficult things of them, but this alone was impossible, since they had given notice of their departure to those at home, and had enclosed directions which could suffer no delay; also the promises and

(28) St. Mark, VII, 8.
intentions of the Emperor were not to be relied on in this matter, since he was wont, when he had made a decision to change his plans en route. In vain did even Duke William speak to them, that they might grant at the least only three more days in Basle; at last, when he saw their unrelenting attitude he ordered them to leave. After this Julian took leave of the Bohemians in a long speech, chose as text the Gospel of that day, of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, who recognised Christ there in the breaking of bread; he compared the Church to Christ and Basle to Emmaus, to which the Bohemians had come as disciples, and where they should have recognised their mother, the Christian Church, in the breaking of bread, that is to say, in the wish to eat bread with them in peace and concord. He repeated his old talk of the infallibility of the Church, since the Holy Spirit spoke through her mouth, and warned them to be obedient to her, he also answered the words both of Rokycana receiving with special gratitude the assurance that the delegates of the Council journeying to Bohemia had nothing to fear, and of Prokop, whom he thanked as his guest in his own name, for his ardour for reform, and explained that he, animated by the same love of reform, would gladly be his servant for the attainment of such a great aim, but that the way thither was not the way pointed out by the Bohemian envoys in the Council, but was that in which the Church was marching, led by the Holy Spirit. Here he recapitulated in brief all the dispositions which had taken place in the Council on the four articles of Prague, and expounded them according to his interpretation. Finally he turned again to all the delegates, blessed them, and said that they might go when they wished, in God's name, and gave them his hand in farewell. Then Rokycana blessed the whole Assembly again and commended himself to their prayers, but Priest Prokop prayed in a few words that they might above all keep their eyes fixed on the idea of Reform. Then each of the envoys gave the right hand of fellowship to the Cardinals and the Duke Protector, and all took leave of the assembly with a serene and cheerful air. When they were leaving the hall a very far Italian archbishop came pressing through the
crowd towards them and, holding out his hand also to them, began to weep bitterly.

The same day towards evening some of the delegates went to the most distinguished members of the Council to say their private farewells. At this opportunity Rolycana in particular promised, that he would use all his powers to bring an agreement into being happily, and Wilhelm Kostka assured Cardinal John Cervantes, that the Bohemians seriously desired reconciliation and peace; proof of which lay in their mission itself; since to what end would they have made such an outlay, and undertaken such hardships, being undefeated in war, if they had not truly wished for an end of the struggle and of the misunderstandings.(29)

Next day, on Easter Tuesday, the Bohemian envoys and the newly appointed Legates of the Council departed for Bohemia. When they reached Schaffhausen they had to stop for some time, because the Bohemian wagons which had been left there on the way to Basle had not yet been sent for further use. There the men from Basle, however, applied to them to have the Taborite badges taken down and removed from Landà's wagon; they asked Priest Prokop for his intercession in the matter, and he consented; only after long discussions and negotiations the Bohemians gave a unanimous reply that to hide and disown their badges would reound to their dishonour and therefore this must not be required of them, they ordered their flags to be folded up, however, and did not bring them out again.

They remained in Nürnberg from 23rd to 27th April; from here the envoys of the Duke of Savoy, of the Margrave of Brandenburg, of the Duke John of Bavaria, of the Bishop of Bamberg and of the town of Nürnberg accompanied them. They reached Eger on 30th April and all waited for the Bohemian escort; when this arrived on Sunday, 3rd May, they continued the journey the next day. In Luditz Jakoubek von Wręśowie

(29) John de Segoxia.
put them up splendidly and accompanied them to Prague. The men from Basle wondered and rejoiced when they saw that from every Bohemian town through which they passed the inhabitants streamed out far to meet them, received them with joy and escorted them ceremonially. In particular when they entered Prague on 8th May in the forenoon, a huge crowd poured out both in front of the town, and through the streets and over the bridges where their route lay; the heads of the army, the burgomasters and others came to meet them with a procession of singing children, and the honours done to them included the freeing of two men condemned to death. One of the envoys, Carlier, from whom we have this account, closes it with the words "De Gratias!" His account is in the Paris Library under the title "Carlcrius de Legationibus concilii Basiliensis."

This ten was the first Basle conference between the Bohemians and the Council, it was honourable to all who were concerned in it; it showed a spirit of straightforwardness, charity and mutual forbearance. It was not a slight matter in those days for a Council of theologians to listen to the arguments of heretics already condemned by the church. It was also no small matter for the Bohemians, who were already masters in the field, to curb their high spirit to a war of words. Yet, in spite of occasional outbursts, the general result of the conference at Basle was to promote a good feeling between the two parties. Friendly intercourse existed between the Bohemians and the leading members of the Council. But in spite of the friendliness with which they were received and in personal affection which in some cases they inspired, the Bohemians could not help being disappointed at the general results of their visit to Basle. They had been somewhat disillusioned. They came with the same moral earnestness and childlike simplicity which had marked their visit at Constance. They hoped that their words would prevail, that their arguments would convince the Council that they were not heretics, but rested on the Gospel of Christ. They were chilled by the attitude of superiority which showed itself in all the Council's proceedings, and which was the more irritating because they could not formulate it in any definitely
offensive words or acts. The assumption of an infallible Church, to which all faithful were bound to be united, was one which the Bohemians could neither deny nor accept. It gradually became clear that they were not likely to induce the Council to reform the Church in accordance with their principles. The utmost that would be granted was a concordat with the representatives failed to convince the Council; it remained to be seen if the good feeling which had grown up between the two contending parties would enable the Council to extend, and Bohemian people to accept, a sufficient measure of toleration to prevent the breach of the outward unity of the Church.

In Prague nothing important happened after the arrival of the delegates from Basle until the meeting of the General Landtag, except that both parties exchanged courtesies, paid visits and gave ceremonial banquets; only the Neustadt "Orphans" showed themselves less friendly, and their priest, Jakob VUK, irritated his hearers several times in his sermons, in which he said the whole Council of Basle was wrong, and only sought, like the Basilisk to scatter its poison among the Bohemians - so that the envoys saw themselves compelled to bear the same hardships with which they had come. Also a ferment arose among the people when the rumour spread through the town that Bishop Philibert had confirmed some Bohemian boys in his house, and some of the mob wanted to attack the delegates at night; but fortunately Prokop the Great hastened thither, frightened them away and drove them off before the delegates discovered anything of the danger in which they stood. (30) The estates assembled in greater numbers than ever before, but more slowly and later, as was certain. Therefore the deliberations of the Landtag began in the Karolin on 12th July when Rokycana first reported on the whole achievement of the Bohemian delegates at the Council. The next day the Basle Fathers were called to the Landtag and introduced to it, and they wondered not a little when they saw the Bohemians open every sitting with the hymn "Veni sancte spiritus" and prayer. Three priests were presiding that day, sitting
together on the chair of office: John Rokycana of the Calixtino (Utraquis) party, Peter Payne of the "Orphan" party, and Miklas Biskupec from Pilgrum, of the Taborites. Rokycana as spokesman greeted the delegates in the name of the whole Landtag with an address on the text of the exhortation of St. Paul to the Phillippines: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there by an virtue, and if there by an praise, think on these things," (31) and in his opinion all these virtues were united in the four articles of Prague. Then Bishop Philibort from France, after he had submitted their credentials from the Council, gave an address on the words of the Gospel "Jesus stood in the midst of his disciples and said: Peace be unto you!" (32) which Rokycana translated into Bohemian for the Landtag. Thereupon John from Palomar, amidst glorifications explained the beneficial results which would come under God's leadership from the negotiations already begun peacefully on both sides. On 15th June the same Palomar expressed the opinion of his companions that the nearest and shortest way to peace and concord was the occasion of the Bohemians to the Council, so that they could take part in its expressions and consultations, and their subjecting themselves to it, after the example of all Christendom. But when they returned to such extravagant and long-ago rejected demands, it was no wonder that the whole negotiations dragged on without result, until many members of the Landtag became highly impatient. On the 18th Prokop the Great replied to the reproaches of the Basle delegates that the Bohemians had defended their doctrine with sword and bloodshed, in the following words:—

"As regards war, we call on God the all-knowing as our witness that your party, whilst preparing a bloody crusade against us, although we did not merit it, first began the war offensively and cruelly laid

(31) Phillippines, IV, 8.
(32) St. John, XX, 26.
Bohemia waste with fire and sword; but we with God's help have defended ourselves from your unjust might till now. And however terrible these horrors of war, many spiritual benefits have already grown out of them, and by God's Grace more still will grow from them: not only, that many obstinate opponents of the saving truth of the four articles, who needed to confess them with their lips, soon after became their voluntary supporters and open defenders to the death. But also many true confessors of that truth were defended from the cruelty of the foe, who otherwise, frightened away by them, would have been untrue to the Holy Spirit, also, it is known from some of the writings released by the Council of Basle, that the Fathers of the Church were moved chiefly by the great tempest of war to assemble in council at Basle and to give us a hearing, which we consider as a great benefit of God that in this way the saving truths may reach the knowledge of all peoples; finally, the attention of many is turned through the working of God to these truths by the misfortunes and afflictions of war, from which there springs no small gain for the struggling church. Also, we are of the opinion that these tempests of war cannot cease until these saving truths are accepted by all members of the Church and are faithfully followed. We thereby assure you, reverend sirs, that we abhor all confusions and extravagances in the war, and, regretting them, ceaselessly bring to book those who are guilty of such; but we bear the burden of war, therefore, so that we can prepare a place in the Church for these godly truths, and strive after that cheering peace and condition out of which the unity of the Church, the brotherly love of all, the moral improvement and all other benefits which you too desire may arise." (33)

The same day, Palmar announced that it was impossible for the Legates to express a definite opinion on the four articles of Prague, since they saw how the Bohemians themselves did not think alike on them, and differed widely both as to their interpretation and execution;

(33) Martene, VIII, 602, 603.
it was therefore necessary, and they desired that they should be stated in more detail, and formulated in the sense in which the whole kingdom understood them. This was the first decisive step to uncover and profit by the deep-rooted disunion between the Bohemian parties; then, when the Prague masters planned such a formula, the priests and heads of the "Orphans" and "Taborites" were so powerfully incensed against it that they accused them of treachery. On 21st June Rokycana stated verbally a more comprehensive declaration of these articles in the name of the whole kingdom, with which the Basle envoys were not discontented; but when on the following day the same declaration was handed over in writing, they complained that the meaning was not now the same, but had been altered to a worse. According to their desire the Landtag nominated eight deputies from their midst who were to negotiate with the Legates on this subject along; they were: Rokycana, Peter Payne, Prokop the Great, Niklas Biskupec, Ulrich from Znain (Znojmo), Ambroš from Königgratz, Sigmund Manda of Prague and Mathias Lauda; later, a ninth was added to them Baron Wilhelm Kostka. This satisfied the delegates still less, since the extreme parties had the preponderance in this deputation. On this account they decided on a still more important and decisive step. On 25th June before the Landtag met, the most distinguished Calixtine nobles were called secretly to John Rokycana's house; the Legates came also, and represented to them how unseemly it was for them, to whom the government of the kingdom was in all honour due, as had always been the case with their forefathers, to be now not only not free, but to have to yield in every way to people who were hardly worthy to be their servants; and how their land, disunited and shut off from all Christendom, must sink ever further and deeper, particularly from want of scholars; for it there was no other remedy than in unity and peace with the Church; this was not impossible since the divergences with regard to three of the Articles appeared to be meaningless, and concerning the Article of Communion in both kinds, there was hope that the Council would be moved to grant their
request. They told the barons and knights present to use their influence in the Landtag, in spite of the opposition of the extremist parties, that the way to union might be entered upon. The joy of many of the nobles at this overture was great; in particular Reinhard from Neuhaus, who had already undertaken intimate discussions with the envoys, spoke in the same spirit, and placed himself at the head of the party which sought the peace of the fatherland in this way. (34)

When the meeting of the Landtag began on the same day the rumour soon spread of the Council's communication, and they applied to the Legates to express themselves with great clarity and certainty on the matter. The estates wished above all to know to whom the freedom to communicate in both kinds referred. A privilege in this respect granted only to the Bohemians would not suffice; it must at least also be extended to the Moravians and the supporters of the Bohemians in Silesia and Poland. Further, they asked with what words the release of the cup would take place, and desired from the delegates the necessary formula. Owing to apprehension that the former opponents of the cup in Bohemia and Moravia might suffer through their granting, these gave only uncertain and evasive answers; as to the aforementioned formula, they said, they had no powers; they alluded to an article of faith which the Council never left to even the greatest delegation to decide; their powers only extended to the admission of the Bohemians into the society of the Church and then their absolution from all Church punishments laid upon them and the ban hanging over them; the Bohemians themselves might therefore propose that formula in a shape in which it could be accepted by the Council; yet the envoys were convinced that as soon as the Bohemians returned to obedience to the Church, the Council would indeed prove compliant concerning all their desires, since how could the Church grant her holy blessings of grace to those who did not recognise her as their mother? The Landtag might therefore send new plenipotentiaries to the

(34) Ulrich Stockal: 'München Library Cod. Bavar. 1585 fol. 96. (quoted by Palacky.)
Council who could unite with the Church on the terms of the release of the cup in the name of the whole kingdom; there was no doubt that the Council would be ready and willing for this in the cause of peace and concord. Some further days were passed in such speeches, but the formula which the Bohemians handed over together to the delegates on 29th June, did not suit them. On 1st July some nobles again held a separate discussion with the Legates in Rokycana's house, as a result of which the Bohemian formula was made more limited and exact, to be taken to the Council by new envoys; but the public negotiations in which this matter was carried through did not elapse without passion. When Payne, on the opportunity presenting itself, again inveighed against the temporal lordship of the priests, whilst he wanted to limit his theme more sharply, and Priest Prokop agreed with him; a nobleman arose and challenged both to relinquish their possessions to other priests, who had less dread of managing worldly goods; he himself was ready at any moment to deliver up the church property in his possession. Another time, when the lords of the Landtag complained of the Council, that it had called the Bohemians "Hussites" in an insulting way, he thought it an honour both to be a Hussite and to be called a "Hussite"; and when the men of Basle told the Bohemian lords to give up innovations, and rather to return to the opinions and customs to which they had held thirty years before, he interrupted the speech: "Speak rather of 'a thousand years ago' if you take the measure of time as evidence of truth; we were still heathen then."

In the meeting of 3rd July the Basle envoys took leave of the estates with the customary ceremonies, without having attained what they most desired, namely, the conclusion of a general armistice; since Priest Prokop kept on insisting that he wished for true and unbreakable peace with all Christendom only when the Four Articles "According to God's law" were accepted; which shocked all the more when it appeared that it was only to depend upon his personal opinion when this quarrel was to be recognised as raised "according to God's law." The
envoys from Basle left Prague on 11th July, and with them went new delegates from Bohemia, Prokop of Pilsen, Martin Lupáč of Chrudim and the bearded Mathias Lauda. John Volmar of Prague and a Taborite captain escorted them to Luditz; from there Jakoubek from Všesovic took them under his protection, and escorted them to Egner, which they reached on 15th July; they arrived at Basle on 2nd August. (35)

The false rumour that the plenipotentiaries of the Council in Prague had granted all the demands of the Bohemians had spread in all the countries through which they travelled, and their assurance that it was not so was received with great pleasure in Germany; nevertheless they were pressingly requested to pay attention above all to the pacification of the Bohemians. One of the delegates, Martin Berruer who had arrived sooner than his colleagues, reported as early as 31st July in the Assembly of the Council on the results of the mission. Everywhere, he said, it was recognised with praise and thankfulness that the Council by its friendly conduct towards the Bohemians had accomplished far more than the most powerful armies by force; and since a noble mind is more easily guided by kindness than compelled by violence, they must behave all the more charmingly to the Bohemian emissaries the more honourable their conduct had been in their own country to those of Basle. He also requested that, until another hearing be given to the Bohemian delegates, the Fathers should strictly avoid all noises, chattering, laughing and interruptions, and should take the Bohemian Landtag as an example, where perfect quiet had reigned in the presence of the delegates, although the number not only of Priests and nobles, but also of the common people, was great. Thereafter, Bishop Philibert and John Palomar gave more detailed reports on their negotiations in a public session; after which, in the more limited session of 13th August, the same Palomar gave a secret account of the Bohemian question, from which we will quote some here. It was noteworthy, he said, how many had been sorry that the emissaries of the Council had received admission

into Bohemia, and how certain people endeavoured in every way to thwart the conclusion of peace, for fear that in a general peace they would lose their lordship over the people; since even then in Bohemia neither the people nor the nobility enjoyed freedom; both being subjected to the will of some army leaders who imposed all kinds of burdens on them as they wished. Further, the same Palomar told in detail of the reigning disunion between the three chief parties, the men of Prague, the "Orphans" and the Taborites, who called each other heretics. There were two kinds of Taborites, those who served in the field, who busied themselves continually with war, and those who remained at home, in city businesses; the common people had much to endure, since they had been told that the war was essential if the Germans were not to get the country into their power; an innate antipathy and hatred reigned everywhere against the Germans. Nevertheless, although the Hussites were disunited, they were all agreed on the Article on Communion in both kinds, though not all declared that there could be no salvation without the cup. The priests never ceased to nourish the mistrust of the people against the Church and the Council. For the rest, the Council's delegation had had two uses: firstly, that the opinion, spread abroad in Bohemia, that the Hussites had been the victors in the disputations, had been refuted; and secondly, the people of Pilsen had gained time, before a new siege of their town, to harvest their crops. The Silesians had a treaty with the Hussites on the strength of which they could trade with them without being compelled to assent to their faith; all the nations neighbouring on Bohemia, however, desired peace with them most passionately, since they were very much afraid of them. (36)

On 11th August, the new Bohemian envoys received a public hearing in a ceremonial and very numerous session of the Council, in which first Prokop of Pilsen, then Mathias Lauda, and lastly Martin Lupač spoke. At this point the formula accepted by the Bohemian Landtag was

(36) John de Segovia MS.
read, under whose provisions the union of the Bohemians with the Council was to take place. This important document ran as follows:

"We submit these articles to your Reverences in order that you may consent to the same in the following form, in consideration of the peace and unity desired by everyone, in order that they may be freely practised, taught and irrevocably followed in the Kingdom of Bohemia, in the Margraviate of Moravia and in all places where their confessors lived: (1) The most holy Sacrament of Communion in both kinds, namely, bread and wine, shall be freely given by all priests as salutary and beatific to all Christians in Bohemia and Moravia, and wherever their supporters might dwell. (2) All sins worthy of death, especially public ones, shall be done away with, punished and abolished by those whose duty it was. (3) The word of God shall be freely and truly preached by the Priests of the Lord, and by worthy deacons. (4) The priests shall not temporally rule over worldly goods in the time of the law of Grace. The formula of the unity desired for so long by us both, however, we submit in the following words: We are ready to unite and be one, just as all Christians are bound by God's law to live in concord, and to hold to all regular superiors, obey them in all things which they may command us according to God's law. Should, however, the Council, the Pope, or the Prelates order something to be done which God has forbidden, or forbid something which is required by the Holy Spirit, we are not bound to obey. On this an agreement will be concluded between us and you, as soon as our four articles have been decided according to the Treaty of Eger, to which we will have recourse in all future cases." The further contents of the document were that the Council was in future not to agree to the Bohemians' being called heretics, or insulted because of their faith, and that it should order that those Bohemian and Moravian priests who had till then not observed the four articles of Prague, could turn to them without a breach of honour.(37)

(37) Martens, 631.
the Council recognised the pressing necessity of winning
at least a party of the Bohemians for themselves through concessions.
In order to negotiate with proper reflection in such an important matter,
however, a special Commission of about fifty people was nominated which was
to give well-founded answers to the following two questions: (1) whether
the Bohemians should be allowed Communion in both kinds, while the rest
of Christendom only communicated in one kind? (2) in what sense the
Council could consent to the Hussite articles? From many sides opposing
voices were already being heard in this matter: not only single theologians
but also some Universities, especially in Germany protested greatly
against each privilege conferred on the Bohemians, (33) but on the contrary
others, many princes in particular, used their influence most ardently
for the granting of as much as possible for the sake of general peace.
The Commission held daily consultations for more than two weeks, until they
at last agreed to the proposal brought forward with regard to this matter.
On 26th August the prelates and almost 160 doctors were called to a
secret session, all swearing to betray no-one before the appointed time
what had been negotiated and decided. John Palomar, however, reported
on the whole examination and decision of that question by the Commission,
refuted the objections made, and supported with great eloquence the
proposal brought forward, that the wishes of the Bohemians should be ful-
filled; he described once more in detail the state of affairs laying
particular stress on how in Bohemia and the neighbouring lands spiritual
disease was spreading which demanded far swifter medical aid than a bodily
ailment; since the longer the latter lasted, the more unbearable it
became, and compelled the sick man himself to seek help, whereas the
former on the contrary, the longer it continued, the less it was felt,
and passed over into agreeable habit, finally in fact, into obduracy.
Even if the Bohemians desired no help, the Council was bound to care
for their souls' salvation; but through acceptance of the proposal a
sure beginning would be made to their absolute return to the Church.

(33) Kalteisen: Handschrift z. Kalenz, Nr. 124, fol. 118-123.
for this, however, the same caution and prudence were necessary which
Paul used with the Corinthians; the Bohemians were a shy and unruly
people, who refused to enter the sheepfold of the Church; one must treat
them like stallions or mules which one wants to break in, and treat them
kindly, till they may not feel the halter with which they are tied to the
manger; such a halter would be their consent to peace and concord.
Legate Julian also expressed himself in the same terms: yet the
negotiations dragged on for a further two days before a final decision
was reached. The Council tried to keep the matter secret not only from
the Bohemians, so that they would not learn their intentions before the
appointed time, but also from the Pope, from whom hindering interference
was to be feared; in spite of this, however, a general assembly was
called for 2nd September so that the decision would have all the greater
validity. Duke William, to whom the secret was also confided under oath,
not only praised the Fathers' plan, but also asked that in this way at
the same time King Sigismund, who had deserved so well of the Church and
Council, might be helped towards the recovery of the kingdom of Bohemia.
When the Bohemian delegates were brought into the Assembly, Cardinal
Julian revealed to them the decision of the Council, to meet all the
desires of the Bohemians in so far as it was possible in conformity with
the law of God, and to announce this through a delegation of their own,
which should again be immediately deputed to Bohemia; at the same time
he requested that the peace and unity of the Church, as well as the
safety and well-being of the emissaries of the Council might be recommended
to their people. Duke William also spoke in these terms, and added that
the Bohemians would never have, and would also never receive, a better
opportunity to obtain unity and peace with honour. An answer was not
given them on their articles however, so they had to go home without
knowing exactly how they had fared. Bishop Philibert, John Palomar,
Heinrich Tok and Martin Berrner were nominated as new emissaries to Bohemia
and they set out from Basle on 11th September.
Though many more discussions went on between the Council and the Bohemians for sometime to come, and we could spend more time and pages discussing them, the final result would have been the same as already mentioned in the previous chapter, when we spoke of the Hussite Influence at home. The Council merely made promises and advances to the Bohemians, which they had no intention of implementing, and the negotiations were undertaken in such a way, that the Prague Articles, in which the Bohemians believed, for which they came to Constance, and for which they fought and died, were so cleverly worked into the four Articles of the Basle Kompact Acts, only the minimum being granted to the Bohemians, namely, the Communion "Sub-utraque" and that too only in the Catholic sense.

Can we then ask ourselves, was there any influence of Hussitism at the Council of Basle after all? If we consider the whole purpose of the Council, what the Bohemians tried to get for their own country and for others, how they tried to persuade the Council with their views, then we could see quite clearly the seriousness of it all. The child-like simplicity and faith of the Bohemians is worth while underlining. They really believed that the Council would grant them their requests. The Bohemians conducted themselves very honourably towards the Council and they put their "trust" so to speak into their hands. Had the Council of Basle conducted themselves towards the Bohemians with an equal sense of honour we could say that the whole Christian world at that time would have been most richly blessed and we would see the influence of it even now.
THE HUSSITE INFLUENCE IN

EASTERN EUROPE.
Neither at the beginning nor at this later stage was Hussitism ever regarded as a merely local movement, limited by the boundaries of the Bohemian lands. Already the first preachers and reformers were trying to apply their programme to the whole church. This tendency later developed, and throughout the 15th century efforts were made to transfer the Hussite doctrine into neighbouring countries. In this way Hus's ideas and doctrine became known over nearly all Europe. The propagators were either Czechs visiting foreign countries and spreading their views through preaching or tracts, or personal contacts, or, again, students of Prague University, who broadcast the propaganda of Hussitism in their native countries. So it was for example in Poland. Poland was at that time intimately connected with Bohemia - the languages of both countries were then almost the same. The youth of Poland generally resorted for their education to the University of Prague, where a special college for them was founded by Queen Hedviga. (1)

Hus's character was held in great estimation in Poland, a fact sufficiently attested by the protestation presented by the Bohemians to the fathers of the Council in favour of that reformer, on which occasion they were joined by all the Poles present at Constance. Hus himself gives in one of his letters most decisive evidence of the part which the Poles, and particularly an eminent nobleman of that nation, took in his defence. (2) Jerome of Prague, had spent some time in Poland whither he was called (1410) in order to organise the University of Cracow. (3) The above circumstances united in communicating to Poland all the opinions which had sprung up in Bohemia, and insured them a rapid success.

(2) Z. Theobald: Bellum Hussiticum, Fransforti 1621, 30.
(3) "Eodem Anno (1410) M. Hieronymus qui dictor porhibebatur a Polonio Rege Academiae sua constitutuendae gratia Cracoviam et inde rebus suis confectis ad Sigismundum Hungariae Regem evocari - Idem. 18."
The fact that the Hussite doctrines were widely spread in Poland is sufficiently attested by the laws which the influence of the clergy enacted against heresy during the 15th century. The Holy Inquisition had been established in Poland already, in the 14th century, against the sect of the Praticelli; but we cannot trace any serious persecution of the sectarians. The archbishop of Cieza in 1416 convoked a Synod at Wielun, which passed some very severe regulations against the Hussites.

The Synod of Leczyca, held in 1423, likewise adopted very severe resolutions against the Bohemian "heresy". It enjoined the parish priests to imprison, and to bring before the bishops, all those who were suspected of favouring the new doctrines. It was forbidden to all the directors of schools to receive teachers who came from Bohemia, and intercourse with that country was to be prevented by all possible means. Fathers were prohibited from giving any assistance whatsoever to their children going to Bohemia or professing heretical opinions. It was also particularly recommended that the books which were used by the parish priests should be carefully examined. This last evidently proves that the doctrines of Hus were spreading amongst the lower clergy, and that books containing his opinions were circulating in the country. The circulation of Hussite books in Poland is moreover confirmed by the great number of Roman Catholic works published at that time in Poland against the Bohemian heresy, and if must have been very prevalent if it called for such a remedy. The Roman Catholic clergy were indeed too politic to expatiate, without necessity, upon heretical doctrines, the knowledge of which alone was already fraught with the danger of infecting the minds of the people, whose orthodoxy they wanted to preserve.

The regulations of the clergy were confirmed and proclaimed by the King in 1424, and heresy was declared high treason. Several diets enacted similar laws, which remained, however, a dead letter, and the influence of the clergy which had originated them was not sufficiently
great to ensure their execution. Martimüs of Brzesc, Inquisitor hereticæ pravitatis, strongly recommended in 1437 to the magistrates to arrest and bring before a tribunal all persons infected with Bohemian "errors". The regency which had governed the country during the minority of Vladislav III gave power in 1438 to Nicolas of Lencycya, also a Inquisitor hereticæ pravitatis, to act against the sectarians, who were to be punished according to the ordinances of Emperor Frederic II, and the civil authorities were enjoined to assist the Inquisitors.

The Dominican Monk, Martinus de Race, obtained in 1464 an authorisation from the monarch to act against the heretics, yet in spite of this formidable array of laws and regulations by which the Roman Catholic Church sought to repress the growing heresy, its efforts proved unavailing.

Poland had only one auto-da-fé, where some Hussites were burnt, but this act of atrocity was perpetrated in a time of general trouble, on the sole authority of a bishop and in a manner which resembled more an act of private vengeance than of public justice executed in consequence of established laws. There may have been some secret victims sacrificed in the darkness of some convent, and chosen from amongst the lower classes of society; but it was impossible to seize any individual belonging to the numerous class of nobles without a formal condemnation by a competent tribunal. Poland acquired, in the fifteenth century, its habeas corpus. The fundamental principle of the Polish constitution, the neminem captivare permittimus nisi jure victum, was established in 1450. Many of the first families in the country openly embraced the Bohemian doctrines without being subjected to any persecution; and even Sophia,

(4) Andreas Bninkai, bishop of Posnania, collected nine hundred horsemen besieged the town of Zboczyn and compelled the inhabitants to deliver to him five Hussite preachers whom he burned publicly in 1439. The same bishop who was also cruel to heretics, was very lenient to the vices and profligacy of his own clergy - J. Dlugosz Historiae Poloniae.
Queen of Vladislav Jagellon, was favourably disposed to the new doctrines.

The political relations which existed between Poland and Bohemia during the period when the Hussite doctrines were flourishing in the last named country naturally contributed to the spreading of them in Poland. We know of so many ties connecting both countries, and it was natural for Bohemia to look for assistance in its struggles against Germanism and Romanism to Poland, which had recently acquired a great increase of power, since the accession to its throne of Jagellon, grand duke of Lithuania, in 1386. The Bohemians influenced by the Utraquist party, sent an embassy in 1420 offering the throne of their country to

(5) We must not omit mentioning a remarkable fact, relating to the religious state of Poland, which happened in that country during the 15th century. Andreas Galka Doboszynski or Dobszyn, magister artium, of the University of Cracow, expounded with some others the works of Wyclif at Cracow about 1449 and wrote a poem in honour of the English Reformer:-

"Ye Poles, Germans and all nations! Wyclif speaks the truth! Heathendom and Christendom had never a greater man than he, and never will have one.
Whosoever wishes to know himself, let him approach Wyclif, whoever will enter the ways which he has pointed out will never leave them, and never will err.
He has unveiled divine wisdom, human knowledge and things that were hidden to philosophers.
He has written by inspiration about the ecclesiastical dignity, the sanctity of the church, the Italian antichrist, and the wickedness of the popes.
Ye priests of Christ, who were called in by Christ, follow Wyclif.
The imperial popes are antichrists; their power is derived from the antichrist - from Imperial German grants.
Sylvester, the first pope, took the power from the dragon Constantine, and diffused his venom over all the churches.
Led by Satan, Sylvester deceived the Emperor and got possession of Rome by fraud.

(Carmen vulgare in Laudem Wyclif.)

"We wish for peace - let us pray to God; let us sharpen the swords, and we shall conquer the antichrist. Let us strike the antichrist with the sword, but not with one made of iron. St. Paul says: 'Kill the antichrist with the sword of Christ!'

Truth is the heritage of Christ. The priests have hidden the truth; they are afraid of it and they deceive people with fables.
O Christ! for the sake of thy wounds, send us such priests as may guide us towards the truth and may bury the antichrist."

The author of this hymn was obliged to retire from Cracow, but he found a refuge at the court of Boleslav V, prince of Opole, in Silesia, who, as we know professed the doctrines of Huss. Another curious circumstance is that the celebrated Polish printer, Fiol who printed the first book with Slavonian or Cyrillic letter (1491) was obliged to leave Cracow for some time on account of his Hussite opinions.
Vladislav Jachecellon, King of Poland, but that monarch, of a naturally irresolute character, gave them no answer, although he received the delegates with great kindness. He desired to know the precise conditions upon which the crown was offered and to ascertain the opinion of his own senate. There were indeed, some weighty reasons against the hasty acceptance of the proffered crown. A war with the Emperor, who considered Bohemia as his hereditary kingdom, would have been an inevitable consequence. The German knights, excited by that monarch, would also in that case attack Poland. Jachecellon was more anxious to crush the above-mentioned knights - who in spite of their defeat at the battle of Grünwald (6) continued to be his most formidable enemies - than to acquire Bohemia, which was then divided by several factions.

Nicolas Hussonets, a powerful magnate, was aiming at the possession of the Crown of his country. The celebrated Jan Žižka was at the head of the Taborites, who, imbued with a feeling of nationalism, and inclining towards republican principles, were much averse to the rule of a king, and particularly to that of a foreigner. The Emperor Sigismund himself had still a strong party in the country, and the Bohemian diet at Caslav proposed conditions to him, but when these conditions were rejected, the Bohemians turned towards Poland. They sent a solemn embassy, the nobility being represented by Hinok of Walstein

(6) The battle of Grünwald, or Tannenberg fought on the 22nd July, 1410, is one of the most celebrated in the history of Poland. The Knights of Prussia were entirely defeated on that day by the united forces of Poland and Lithuania. They lost, according to contemporary historians, the immense number of fifty thousand men, the Grand Master of the Order Ulrich de Jungingen was killed and many officers of distinction taken prisoner. The advantages of that great victory were, however, entirely lost to Poland by the supineness of King Vladislav Jachecellon, and peace was concluded in the ensuing year, but the victorious party derived from it no real advantage. A very memorable circumstance of the above-mentioned battle is that John Žižka of Trocnov here afterwards the celebrated leader of the Hussites, distinguished himself on that occasion. Jesuit Balbimus says this in his "Epítome Rerum Bohemicarum," Prague 1677, page 424: "Itemo virum hunc (Zižkam) ruderem militae hoc tempore fuisse suscipietur. Narrat Idem Zelanski (A Bohemian writer) Polonis ante diu militasse et Lithuania, ac Prutenicis bellis omnibus interfuisse, ac praesertim in cruentissimo praedio in quo crucigeri coalit sunt 1410 maximum ad victoria attulisse momentum."
and Hálek of Vřešnov, the clergy by John Cardinalis and Peter Payne, and the towns by Mickoc and Stanicka, consuls or aldermen of Prague. (7)

The conditions on which the Bohemian delegates offered the throne of their country to the King of Poland were—communion in both kinds, the national liturgy, unlimited liberty to preach the gospel, the confiscation of the estates of the Roman Catholic Church and the confirmation of all national liberties. We must point out that these were very important conditions which the Czechs demanded and stressed. They also represented the motives which should make him accept the proposed Crown as follows:—a common language and origin; the reunion of Silesia with Poland, and even the union into the monarchy of Poland of Bohemia and Moravia, which would form a most powerful state, destroy Austria, and give to the new Slavonian Empire a decided supremacy over all its neighbours. Yet these extraordinary advantages could not overcome the irresolution of Jaffellon. The clergy, whose influence was great in the senate, opposed the Bohemians, and the idea of becoming the head of an heresy terrified the aged monarch, although he was by no means a bigot. Yet the advantages offered by the Bohemians were too good to be rejected altogether and the King, therefore, gave them evasive answers. The delegates offered the throne of Bohemia to Vitold, grand-duke of Lithuania, cousin of the King. (8) Vitold, although a bold and ambitious prince, did not accept openly the proposed sovereignty, but adopted a middle course, evidently with the consent of Jaffellon. He sent his relative, Prince Sigismund Coributt, with considerable forces and a large sum of money, to assist the Bohemians.

(7) J. Caro: Geschichte von Polen, III.


This important act was a recognition of the rights of the Hussites, and the Bohemian Diet of 1421, emboldened by the assistance of the Polish forces, rejected in a decisive manner the claims of the Emperor to the throne of their country. The Bohemians again offered the sovereignty either to Jagellon or to Vitold, and, in case they should refuse, to Sigismund Coributt. Jagellon, however, was not only irresolute, but even on the point of joining the Emperor, who deluded him with a promise of restoring Silesia to Poland. The negotiations with the Emperor were, however, soon broken off through want of mutual confidence. Jagellon assisted his relative with new forces thereby giving important support to the Hussites, whose doctrine was publicly adopted by Coributt. Coributt entered Prague and was proclaimed Regent of Bohemia. The pope sent a fulminating message to Vitold prohibiting him from assisting the Bohemian heresy and absolving him at the same time from every obligation he might have entered into with the heretics. Vitold in his answer to the Pope, acknowledged that he had assisted the Bohemians, but expressed his hopes that the "heresy" might be subdued by conciliatory measures, and requested that the excommunication pronounced against the Bohemians should be withdrawn.

Vitold's answer proves that he was by no means a bigoted Catholic, but we must not believe that he had any particular leaning to the Hussite doctrine. As we have already previously mentioned ambition was his creed, and he confessed himself that he did not understand much about religion. Had he been permitted, he would have undoubtedly given such assistance to the Hussites as to ensure their final success; but the irresolute character of Jagellon, without whose cooperation, or at least consent, he could do nothing to further the desired object, lost a favourable opportunity for establishing the greatness of the Slavonic race by the union of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia with the extensive dominions of Poland and Lithuania.
Coributt met with great difficulties in maintaining his new dignity, amidst the confusion of parties which unfortunately divided the Bohemians. He succeeded, however, in overcoming those difficulties, and Žižka, who had formerly been opposed to him, acknowledged him as Regent of the country. The Praguians (Utraquists) wished to elect Coributt King of Bohemia and to confirm the new order of things by his solemn coronation. The accomplishment of that project was prevented by the hostility of the higher nobility, because Coributt leaned for support chiefly to that party which was inclined to push the consequences of political and religious reform further than they wished or thought it expedient to do. Had Jagiellon been steady in his friendship to the Bohemians, Coributt would have easily overcome all obstacles to the throne; but the wavering mind of his royal relative marred the accomplishment of a scheme which every consideration of sound policy should have urged him to promote. The Bohemian Embassy, which arrived to request the confirmation of Coributt's regency, was ill received by Jagiellon, who reproached them with the troubles and anarchy which desolated Bohemia. It is very likely that the disorders unavoidable in a state of revolution and particularly in religious warfare, raised apprehensions in the mind of the Polish monarch lest they might extend to his own country, and inclined him to lend a willing ear to the suggestions of Rome. He listened to the delusive promises of the Emperor and sent orders to Coributt to abandon the Bohemians who were to be attacked by the united forces of Poland and those of the Emperor. Yet this holy war as it was called by the Pope, supported by rich donations of the clergy, was not even begun, but the fickle and unwise policy of Jagiellon was exceedingly prejudicial to Polish influence in Bohemia. The spirit of party was roused, and the Regent, unable to maintain himself, was obliged to retire. Coributt resumed again his dignity as regent of Bohemia and convoked the diet at Caslav in 1424, in order to bring about the reconciliation between the Taboritos and the Utraquists. Coributt's efforts obtained a temporary success, and he was elected King,
chiefly through the influence of the Utraquists. He made proposals to Rome for a reconciliation with the church. This raised suspicion amongst the Taborites, who, afraid of the restoration of the papal dominion, took up arms. A domestic war ensued, Zizka, the leader of the Taborites obtained a bloody victory over the Utraquists (Calixtines), and the negotiations with Rome were broken off. After the death of Zizka, Coributt regained his position and commanded the Utraquists and Polish auxiliary troops at the battle of Aussig (10) where the political and religious liberties of Bohemia were saved from imminent danger by a most brilliant victory over the invading Germans. Bohemia continued, however, to be torn by factions, and Coributt, unsupported by Jagellon, abdicated the royal dignity at the diet of 1427 and left the country. He revisited Bohemia in 1430, where he joined the party of the Orphans, but after some adventurous expeditions in Silesia and Lusatia he finally returned to Poland.

Notwithstanding the unwise line of policy which Jagellon had pursued towards the Bohemians, they still continued to turn their eyes to Poland, expecting the most effective assistance from a consanguine nation, whose sympathies were enlisted for their cause. A deputation of Taborites disputed publicly at Cracow about religion in 1427, but the most important transaction between Poland and Bohemia is the public disputation which was held at Cracow in 1431, between the

---

(10) The battle of Aussig, on the banks of the Elbe, close to the Saxon frontiers, took place in 1426. Aussig, a strong fortified place occupied by Roman Catholics was besieged by the Hussites of all parties. The Taborites and Orphans were commanded by Prokop and the Utraquists by Coributt. A numerous army of Germans under the command of the Margrave of Hesia, entered Bohemia to assist the Catholics; but they were entirely routed by the Hussites, although much inferior in numbers. This victory was very important to the cause of Hussites. Besides the troops sent under Coributt, many Poles, attracted by their sympathies for a consanguine nation and professing the Hussite doctrines, constantly flocked to the victorious standard of their ancient companion in arms Zizka. We may mention amongst them Gizowski, who had been commander of the guards to King Jagellon and who joined afterwards Zizka with a select band of warriors.

Palacky: Geschichte Böhmens, V., 412 ff.
Hussite deputies of Bohemia and the Professors of the University of Cracow. There were many professors at the University of Cracow, who had come from Prague. (11) The Bohemian delegates on that occasion were Prokop, Peter Payne, representing the Orphans, Staznička and William Koska from the Utraquists (Calixtines). Unfortunately, the chronicles have left no details about that polemical meeting. The fact that the heretical tenets were suffered to be publicly discussed, however, is alone sufficient to prove the state of public opinion which prevailed at the time in Poland on religious matters. A Bohemian embassy which arrived in Poland in 1432, in order to propose an alliance against the German Knights, was received with great honour by King Jagello, who was then at Visitz. The Polish clergy also admitted the Bohemians into their churches, notwithstanding the fact that they remained under the papal excommunication. This conciliatory measure was adopted by the Archbishop of Gniezno, by the bishops of Vladislav, Poznania and Chelm. It was violently opposed by Cardinal Zbigniew, Bishop of Cracow, zealously devoted to the interests of Rome, and the exertions of that bigoted prelate, who, having succeeded in exciting a riot amongst the populace at Cracow, shut the town against the heretics, destroyed by menaces and intrigues, the hopes of those who wished to establish a connection between Poland and Bohemia. The King was so irritated against the bishop of Cracow that he intended to put him to death but was dissuaded from committing that action by John Tarnowski, palatine of Cracow.

The manifold relations between Poland and Bohemia, which we have described, naturally contributed to the spread of Hussite doctrines in Poland. The effects of those doctrines began to manifest themselves during the minority of Vladislav of Varna, surnamed thus on account of his heroic death in 1444 at the battle which bears the name of that place. We have already said that many great families in Poland had publicly

embraced the doctrines of Hussite. Some of those grandees, Abraham Zbonski, Spytek Melsztynski, John Straz and others, made a confederation in 1435(12) for religious and political liberties or purposes. They refused the payment of tithes and demanded a limitation of the royal power and the correction of several abuses. In 1439 the Confederates manifested bolder designs. They proclaimed the abolition of tithes as well as of church censures and excommunications. They demanded a change in the Roman hierarchy, and that the enormous estates of the clergy should be appropriated to objects of general utility. Besides these religious objects, they entertained political schemes of a most daring character. They wished to prevent Vladislav from succeeding to the throne of his father, and some of them went so far as to wish for an abolition of the royal dignity.

Spytek Melsztynski, a Hussite, who was also the principal leader of that party, had established in all his estates the Hussite mode of worship. He was excommunicated by Zbigniew, and excluded from the Senate. Melsztynski assembled an army, devastated the domains of the Bishop of Cracow and seized the town of Zator, whence the capital derived its principal supplies. The Council of Regency which governed the country during the minority of the King, dared not to oppose Melsztynski, who had a large party in the country, but entered into negotiations with him. The "heretical" grandee consented to disband his troops, and received a ransom of one thousand marks for the town of Zator. The movement of Hussitism, which had triumphed on that occasion, was excited by the Dowager Queen Sophia who was secretly attached to the Bohemian Hussite doctrine and hostile to the Council of Regency, which was checking her influence. Melsztynski again assembled forces,

(12) The nobles of Poland had the right to form an association for the defence, even by force of arms, of the national liberties, if they were threatened by some danger. Some associations were called Confederations, and they gave birth to a power which could save as well as destroy the country.
more considerable than before, defeated the troops of the Regency and established his camp near the capital. Had he been able to occupy Cracow and take hold of the reins of government there would have been an end of Romanism in Poland. He, however, lost his life in an engagement, his party was routed and the body of their leader, as that of an avowed Hussite, was left unburied on the field of battle.

It was shortly after the defeat and death of Melstynski that Bninski, Bishop of Poznan, in 1439 captured at the Castle of Zbaszyn prominent apostles of Hussitism and burned the Hussite preachers on the Square of Poznan, but even thus he could not stop the influence of Hussitism. Throughout almost the whole 15th century people were called before the courts in the diocese of Poznan and Gniezno on the charge of relations with Bohemia and of observing Hussite practices, especially the Communion in both kinds. (13)

The relations between Bohemia and Poland which had been interrupted for some time were resumed again when Barbara, widow of the Emperor Sigismund III, persecuted on account of her religious views, retired to Poland. The youthful King Vladislav received the imperial refugee with all the regard due to her. Barbara, who had retained great influence in Bohemia, induced the Bohemians to elect for their monarch Casimir Jagiellon, brother to the King of Poland, and the Polish diet, held at Korczyn, acknowledged that election, in spite of Roman Catholic opposition. Casimir marched at the head of a Polish army to take possession of his Sovereignty. The Roman Catholic party of Bohemia elected Albert, Archduke of Austria in opposition to Casimir. Casimir occupied Moravia, and the Polish Forces, united with the Hussites, took Kuttenberg and Sobeslav, two important towns of Bohemia. Casimir's progress was stopped through the interminable dissension between the

(13) O.Odlžilík: Wyclif and Bohemia, 27.
Taborites and Utraquists (Caléxtines) and hostilities were suspended by the efforts of the Council of Basle. A congress was held at Breslau in order to arrange peace between the contending parties. The Polish delegates proposed that Casimir Jagellon and Albert of Austria should equally resign their respective claims to the crown of Bohemia and submit them to a diet of that country which should freely decide upon the respective merits of the two candidates. This truly liberal proposal was rejected by Albert of Austria, who was afraid that the Polish party supported and influenced by the Hussites, would prevail over his own, which leaned entirely on the Roman Catholics and was at that time greatly in the minority. The negotiations were broken off, and the congresses which were later held at Namyslaw and Lubusz had no better result. The Council of Basle, however, obtained a suspension of hostilities. The change of circumstance prevented the Polish prince from prosecuting his claim to the Bohemian throne. His brother, Vladislav, was elected King of Hungary and his attention became entirely absorbed with the affairs of Turkey. Casimir's adherents diminished in Bohemia through the increase of a party which, being adverse to every foreign influence, was equally so to Poland, notwithstanding a common origin and a similar language.

Casimir became King of Poland after the death of his brother, at the battle of Varna in 1444 and again relations were renewed under his reign, by George Poděbrad, the Hussite king of Bohemia (1458). Poděbrad, feeling that he was unable by himself to oppose Rome and Germany, sought support from Poland. He proposed to restore Silesia to Poland, to conclude an alliance against the German Knights and ensure the succession of his throne to a prince of the Polish dynasty. The Congress of Bytom, which met in 1460 for the consideration of the above-mentioned proposals was unable finally to settle that important negotiation on account of some misunderstanding which arose between the Bohemian and Polish delegates respecting the succession of the Polish
prince to the crown of Bohemia. An alliance was, however, concluded between the two countries against their respective foreign enemies, by which were understood Austria and the German Knights. A personal meeting which took place between the Kings of Poland and Bohemia in 1426 at Glogow, confirmed and developed the treaty of Bytom. By a solemn recognition of Podebrad's sovereignty and by entering into a formal alliance with him, Casimir became the ally of the Hussite party which Podebrad represented, and by whose influence the reversion of the throne of Bohemia after his death was guaranteed to a prince of Poland. The Roman Catholic party felt the danger arising from an alliance between the Hussites and the King of Poland. They convened a diet at Iglau and resolved to give up to Poland some provinces, provided Casimir would dissolve the treaty of Glogow and employ all his forces to crush the Hussites, instead of supporting them. Casimir remained, however, firm in his friendship to the Hussites and rejected those offers. The Catholic party offered, after Casimir's refusal, the throne to Mathias Corvin, King of Hungary, but Casimir intimated that he would never allow the right he had acquired by treaties to be infringed and remained faithful to the Hussite King George, notwithstanding the complaints of the Pope who reproached him as acting against the interests of Christianity.

The Pope required that a crusade against the Hussite doctrine should be preached in Poland, but Casimir severely prohibited such proceedings and permitted nothing to be done against his ally.(14)

We have perhaps expatiated too much on the relations which existed between Bohemia and Poland during the 15th century in order to prove that Poland was not without its share of the influence of Hussitism and support of Hussite doctrines and reform ideas.(15)

It is indeed extraordinary that the Hussite doctrines, which were widely circulated in Poland among all classes of people, had not obtained a complete triumph and become the established religion of that country. It may be partly ascribed to the circumstance that the conditions which had materially promoted the success of Hus’s reform ideas in Bohemia, did not exist in Poland. We mean the struggle between the Slavonian and German elements, which rendered the doctrines of Hus the rallying point of the national party against foreign influence, and gave to a religious question the mighty support of political feeling. This element was entirely absent in Poland, which, being independent, had no occasion to struggle for the maintenance of nationality, threatened with destruction from a growing influence as was the case in Bohemia. Then the discussions amongst the Hussites themselves which had acted so prejudicially to the cause of reformation in Bohemia, had also no doubt exercised a pernicious influence on its progress in Poland. Whatever might have been the cause of that failure, it cannot be sufficiently lamented, as the triumph of the Hussite doctrines and influence in Poland would have undoubtedly led to the establishment of Hussitism amongst the greater part of, if not the whole, of the Slavonian race and might perhaps have produced an entire overthrow of Romanism in Europe. Though the Roman Catholic church of Poland remained dominant and preserved unaltered its outward form, its spirit was much changed through all this. Romanism, during the 15th century was fast losing its hold upon the mind of the people in Poland who were much prepared for the reception of the reform doctrines, and this accounts for the rapid spread in the following century, where we find many adherents of Hussitism.

One of the most prominent noblemen of Poland who was influenced by Hussitism was John Ostrorog. He was a man of great learning and held a high rank in his country. His father was Regent of Poland during

(16) O. Odložilík: Wyclif and Bohemia, 26.
the absence of King Vladislav on the unfortunate expedition of Varna. He was himself palatine of Poznań and had obtained the dignity of doctor of laws from the university of Padua, where the Polish nobles generally went in order to complete their studies. His opinions may be considered therefore, not as those of an enthusiast, strongly impressed by ideas new to the community in which he lived, and which he sought to convert to his own conviction, but they must rather be viewed as the expression of the opinions which were at that time entertained by the thinking part of the nation. The calm and dignified tone in which Ostroróg's work is written, reminds us of the views of John Hug or Peter Chelčický. It contained the opinions of a moderate party wishing for reforms required by the necessities of the age. From his "Memoryal o naprawie Rzeczy pòspolitej" (Memorial on the Reform of the Commonwealth) we give a few extracts:–

"There is no objection in recommending to the Pope this Kingdom as a Catholic country, but it becomes not to proffer to him in unlimited obedience. The King of Poland is subject to none and has no superior but God.(17)"

It is unbecoming to address to the Pope humble and submissive letters. The King is not the subject of Rome; humility is not bad in itself, but when exaggerated, and shown to one who has authority in affairs of a purely spiritual nature, it becomes guilty. Christ has not submitted temporal affairs to the apostolical see, he has even said, that his Kingdom was not of this world. The clergy should also bear the public burdens, equally with other citizens.(18)

If the bishops and all the clergy were, as they suppose to be, really spiritual, I would object, that the civil authority should direct their elections of the church dignities. The King would then distribute only the political dignities, and the clergy watch over the salvation of souls. The ecclesiastical duties, and their worldly business, would be then entirely separated. But there is none who would investigate, and clearly explain, the duties imposed on the clergy. Custom has prevailed, in order to avoid greater evils, it is necessary to leave the elections to the King, who will choose persons of learning and of a weak character, and thus prevent mutual hatreds between laity and clergy.

It is lamented that Italian perversity impoverishes the Kingdom of Poland by manifold exactions. Rome draws annually large sums, under the pretence of piety and religion, but in fact, by means of

(18) Jan. Ostroróg: Tractat 33(18) ( " )
superstition. A Bishop never gets his consecration without paying some thousands of ducats to the Roman pontiff, although the canon law leaves the consecration of bishops to Archbishops. Our lowness and supineness have given the force of law to the Italian perversity and abuses. The annates were originally obtained for the expense of a war against the Turks; war has ceased, and the annates have remained. It is not right, therefore to continue longer this tax of mistaken piety. The pope must not exercise tyranny under the pretence of religion.

The clergy seek always to screen themselves, whenever they are called to assist the needs of the state. They feign to have fears when there should be none. They have probably forgotten that all their superfluities should be the property of the poor. If, therefore, the clergy make an ill use of their goods, they commit robbery. There could be no purer aims, if the church would devote the goods that are given to the poor to their exclusive use.

It is not a deceit that the Pope imposes upon us, in spite of the king and the senate, I do not know what bulls, called indulgences. He gets money by assuring people that he absolves their sins, but God has said by his prophet: My son give me thy heart, and not money. The pope feigns that he employs his treasure for the erection of churches, but in fact, he employs them to enrich his relations. I will pass over in silence things that are still worse. There are monks who praise such fables. There are a great number of preachers and confessors who only think how to get the rich harvest, and who indulge themselves in luxuries after having plundered the poor people.

Ostrorog says, after Rome, our own country is the greatest sink of simony and deceit. The clergy sell burials, extreme unctions, penitences, baptism, and marriages, which should all be administered gratis. The bishoprics were erected and endowed that they might pay the ministers of the Church. The tithes were formerly given by the rich and not by the poor; but now the poor give tithes to the rich. Is this the application of the precept: I require mercy and not sacrifice.

It is very bad that convents are filled with idle and incapable people. St. Paul recommends to be cautious in bestowing ordination. What scandal and what abuses have not arisen from such people! After having shaven his head, and donned a cowl, one thinks himself fit to correct all the world. He cries and almost bellows in the pulpit, because he sees no opponent. Learned men, and even those who possess an inferior degree of knowledge, cannot listen without horror to the nonsense and almost blasphemy uttered by such preachers. People such as are least qualified for it, enter generally the ecclesiastical order, because idleness is an agreeable thing, a blessed repose. They have perhaps been induced by St. Paul, who says: 'If a man desireth the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work!' But they have not thought that to desire episcopacy for its advantages is a bad thing."

This view of the Roman Catholic Church exposed by Ostrorog contains a censure of that church as bitter as any Hussite might have uttered on the same subject. It is no wonder, therefore, that the reformation
proposed by him were called by Roman Catholic authors, seeds of dis-
obedience and rapacity; because their adoption would be a complete
separation from Rome. Although Ostroroga did not attack the tenets of
the Roman Church his derision of indulgences was sapping their in
foundation. The communion of two kinds, was left untouched by Ostroroga,
but his bold accusation of Roman corruption and abuses and his decided
demand for their effective redress, exhibit a spirit of opposition no
less daring than that of the Hussites of Bohemia.

Even as late as 1499, not long before the coming of Martin
Luther, the priest Adam of Radziejow went to the stake for his refusal
to disregard the command of Our Lord "Drink ye all of it" and for
offering to the people both consecrated bread and wine.

The Hussite movement in Poland we could say did not capture
the whole nation but it had through the 15th and first half of the
16th centuries many adherents.
THE INFLUENCE OF HUSSITISM IN MOLDAVIA. (1431-1436).

The spreading of Hussite ideas and doctrine, outside the Czech countries, began soon after the death of John Hus. Though it met with great resistance in the neighbouring countries, yet the movement won through, especially after the battle of Taus (Domažlice). Hussitism spread all over Germany, as we have already seen, and so it did in other places in Europe. (1)

In the beginning of the 15th century Hussite doctrines and manifestations were emerging also in eastern countries like Poland, Hungary, Transylvania and the newly created Dukedom of Moldavia, including also the territories between the Carpathian Mountains and the Danube called Muntenia, where the Rumanian nation was developing. (2)

In the middle of the 13th century there were two Dukedoms of the Muntenia territory. Soon after the invasion of the Tartars these two Dukedoms united, but they only got their independence in the second half of the 14th century. About the same time Moldavia, a kind of province of Hungary, was also fighting for its freedom and independence. About the year 1360, the Duke Bogdan drove the Hungarian vassals Drusose and Saga out of the country, refused obedience to the Hungarians and created an independent state, and for the rest of his life lived on hostile terms with them. Later, in 1337, Duke Peter recognised the supremacy of the remote and not so dangerous, Poland. (3) King Sigismund, after failing to get back the Moldavian lands, resigned his claim in favour of the Polish Kingdom at the Congress at Lubovln (in Slovakia).


with the understanding that King Vladislav should influence Duke Alexander of Moldavia to give help to the Hungarians if they were attacked at any time by the Turks. If he did not obey, however, he would be removed from his dukedom and his land be equally divided between the two countries of Hungary and Poland. Moldavia remained in a feudal federation with Poland until the middle of the 16th century. This position was similar to that of the Czechs to the German Empire under the first Premyslids.

Not long after the rise of the Dukedoms of Muntenia and Moldavia there were created also metropolitan sees of bishoprics on their territories. In 1359 a Slav Bishop from Vicin came into the capital city of Argesa in Muntenia (4) and another Slav bishop went to the coastal city of Belgrad in Moldavia. With the entrance of these two Slav Bishops into the Rumanian Dukedoms there came also the influence of Slav culture, already known there before the 15th century. The beginnings of Slav culture, no doubt, comes from the time when the Rumanian and Slav peoples lived together in the territory north of the Lower Danube.

An important development arose in the second half of the 14th century, when the Turks penetrated in the Balkans and occupied Bulgaria and Serbia. Only the ruler of Muntenia safeguarded his independence. Many people from the conquered lands entered his country, and with them went Slav Monks and Scholars from the then prominent school of the patriarch Euthimia.

We would like to mention one of the learned men who settled in Muntenia, Nicodemos, born in Macedonia, who studied at the Monastery at Mount Athos. In his previous visits to Muntenia he had

---

(5) N. Jorga: Vol. I, 32 ff. This city was later known as Ackerman and the Rumanian Slavs call it Cetatea Alba.
A.D. Xenopol: III, 256 ff.
formed two Monasteries, "Vodice", not far from Mehadia by Iron Gate and "Tisam". (7) Into both of these Monasteries he called Monks from the south Slavonic Danubian countries. Not long afterwards, he was also active in Transylvania, where he worked at the Monastery called "Silvas" not far from Macea. (8) When he died in 1466, not only were the old monasteries in Muntenia flourishing, but new were also founded, namely, Zoia, Kotmana, S molgov, Strugulea and many others. (9) Very fruitful also was the activity of his school in Northern Moldavia. Even during his lifetime his pupils went there, and, with the support of Duke Peter, founded the monastery of Neam', (10) called after a little stream at the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains, and some years later another Monastery was built near the river, Dystric, then Miana and Pohrata. (11) In 1402 Duke Alexander founded the Monastery "Moldavia" (12) and Duke Stephen (1451-1504) built the monasteries, Honom, Putnu and Voronec. (13)

Slav culture obtained new life and strength during the Turkish attacks on the Balkans, especially under the reigns of Stephen the Great in Moldavia and also under Neagda Basaraba in Muntenia. (14) In all these Rumanian Monasteries, literary activity continued, old and new Slavonic books were translated and great care was taken to preserve the old hand-written manuscripts. Copies of some religious scripts,

(7) K. Jirocek: Dejiny národa Bulharského (History of Bulgarian Nation) 207, 599.
N. Jorga: Istoria. (History) I, 40.


(9) N. Jorga: Istoria Literaturei, 10. (History of Literature).

(10) N. Jorga: Monasteria (Monasteries).

(11) N. Jorga: Istoria Literaturei, 10. (History of Literature).

N. Jorga: Istoria Bisericii, 67 (History).

(13) K. Kozak: Die Inschriften aus der Bukovina.
N. Jorga: I, 95.

especially Gospels, were made, one of which was given to the Monastery of Homor by Stephen the Great. (15) Copies were also made of world chronicles especially the chronicle from Constantine Manasses, which was also translated into the Bulgarian language in the 14th century. (16)

The Slavonic language was not only the ecclesiastical language on Rumanian territory, but also the official language of the Courts of the Dukes. All official documents and correspondence, were written in the Slavonic language which was replaced by the Rumanian language only in the latter half of the 17th century. (17) In Transylvania the Rumanian language came to be used sooner, with the coming of foreign colonists and also under the influence of the Reformation. The whole of Transylvania was thickly colonised by people of Hungarian and German origin. Already in the 11th century great numbers of the so called "Sekels" were settling in Transylvania (a country rich in natural resources, with good arable land, etc.,) east of the Hungarian borders, and created what was at that time the equivalent of military academies for the defence against the Turks and Tartar invasions.

The Germans came to Transylvania about the beginning of the 13th century. As members of a great colonisation movement from the Rhineland and Flanders, they overflowed into the whole of central and eastern Europe and some of them came to the Rumanian lands and concentrated near the following towns: Sibiu, Brasov, Bystric, Rodny, etc. At the same time Germans from Galicia, Cracow and Lwow came to the Dukedom of Moldavia, where they created new commercial centres. The most important of these was Susa via which was later the capital of Moldavia. (18)

(15) I. Bogdan: Evangeliile.
(16) I. Bogdan: Cronice (in Analele Acad., 1909, xxxi).
(17) The first Document or letter which came to the Rumanian court in the Rumanian language was in 1600, and the earliest one preserved in the Rumanian Literature was from the year 1521 by Reasen.
(18) N. Jorga: Geschichte des Rumanischen, Volkos I, 159 ff. 170.
With the German colonists, the Hungarians also pressed forward into the Carpathians, and settled in the towns of Siret, Trotus, Kotnart, Bakov, Aiud, Romanu, Harlau which they created and also some other smaller villages.\(^{(19)}\)

The German and Hungarian colonists lived there before the rise of the Rumanian Dukedoms. These Dukedoms were strengthened also by new colonists who came during the 14th and 15th centuries. Some came on the invitation of the Rumanian Dukes and others because they had been expelled from their own country for reasons of faith or politics. All these colonists got special privileges from the Rumanian Dukes, as did the German colonists who settled in lower Transylvania from the Hungarian Monarchs.\(^{(20)}\)

Apart from the German and Hungarian colonists we also find many Armenian settlers in Moldavia. When in the first part of the 14th century the Turks invaded Little Armenia the inhabitants of that country fled to different islands in the Mediterranean, some going to the Crimea, others as far as Iwov, and others to the above-mentioned Rumanian lands,\(^{(21)}\) where they mostly settled in the cities and towns of Susav, Siret, Romanu, Bakov etc.

For us the most interesting colonists are the Hungarians and the Saxons. With the ever growing developments in the Moldavian territory Catholicism penetrated from Poland and Hungary deep into the Orthodox world, where it began zealous propaganda.\(^{(22)}\) Already, in the

\(\text{(19)}\) H. Jörga: Geschichte des Rumanischen Volkes I, 162 ff.

\(\text{(20)}\) It is very interesting to note that with these colonists came also some Hussites, who were persecuted in the different countries in Europe.

\(\text{(21)}\) F. Bischoff: Urkunden zur Geschichte der Armeiner in Lemberg. Archiv für osteuropäische Geschichte XXII, 1 ff.

\(\text{(22)}\) Smailt: Moldavian episcopatus et rei romanocatolicae rei gestae (Budapest 1887).

J. Kemény: Uber das Bistum um Franciscau Kloster zu Bakow in der Moldau II, 1-82.


N. Camică: Der Katholizismus in der Donau-Drastenthümern.
beginning of the 13th century, through the efforts of Dominican and Franciscan missionaries, a Catholic Episcopal seat was founded in Moldavia, but it disappeared at the time of the invasion of the Tartars. It was later twice renewed but at the end of the 14th century Moldavia was once again without a Roman Catholic Episcopate. (23) But not only in Muntenia, but also in Moldavia, under the energetic Catholic action undertaken by the Dominican and Franciscan society called Societas Patrum peregrinatio

inter gentes propter Christum, the hope of success was greater, because these missionaries had stauncher support from the Hungarian and the Saxon colonists, and, through the influence of Poland, the court of Moldavia was open to them.

The success was even greater when the Moldavian Duke Lacka (1364-1374) accepted the Roman Catholic faith and promised to support the work of the missionaries and bring his subjects to the Roman faith as well. Under these circumstances the Pope asked the Archbishops of Prague, Cracow and Vratislav, to investigate conditions in Moldavia. From the good reports of their investigations the Pope created a new bishopric in the town of Siret. The first bishop in Siret was the Polish nobleman Andrew Jasterzbiec, who went to his diocese in 1371 and took with him many new missionaries; and on his request the Moldavian minority got from the Catholic Duchess Margaret, new monastic buildings in Siret and Baia, with great estates and also special privileges. But the new bishop was not long in his "poor" diocese, and his successors, the Dominican John (1383-1394) and Stephen (1394-1412) spent most of their time in Poland at the Polish court, though they were urged at their nomination to live in Siret. (24) The bishopric at Siret soon after its foundation became more or less a brevet rank, or merely subsidiary, but when in 1412 two persons were nominated for the office, neither of them accepted it. On the other hand after the death of Duke Lacka (1372)


(24) John was found in Moldavia only once and Stephen stayed in Cracow. (1396 and 1401, 1406, 1411).
the Moldavian minority did not receive any grant from his successors. Most of them were of Slav Orthodox faith so that the Catholic missionaries had to depend on their own strength. Only through Polish political intervention and pressure upon the new Moldavian ruler in the beginning of the 15th century, did the Catholic missionaries get help for their work.

When in 1412 King Sigismund resigned his claim on Moldavia in favour of Poland, Duke Alexander at that time gave the oath of fealty to King Vladislav, and on the request of the Polish prelates the Lithuanian grand-duke Vitold sent Gregor Cambiaka with some representatives from the Saxon and Hungarian colonists in Moldavia to the Council of Constance. (25) Alexander strengthened his bonds with Poland and Lithuania by marrying a sister of Vitold, a known Catholic. (26) By her efforts and with the help of Polish-Lithuanian relations and friends, a new Catholic Episcopate was created in the little town of Baia and a new church was built for them.

The first bishop of Baia, on the recommendation of Vladislav, was the dominican vicar, Societatis patrum peregrinantium, Jan der Ryzaw. The new bishop went to Moldavia immediately. In 1420 he wrote an enthusiastic letter to Rome about the most favourable conditions and boasted that many of the Moldavian orthodox people had turned, thanks to his efforts, to the Catholic faith.

In the first half of the 15th century five letters from Moldavian bishops and vicars are preserved. They show very clearly the tendency of the Moldavian Catholic Church. In a letter dated 1st July, 1420, the bishop of Baia (27) requested Pope Martin V for a "Privilegium" of Urban V so that the misunderstandings and disputes between the bishop


(26) The Duke Alexander was faithful to the Orthodox Church and when she failed to bring him to the Catholic faith she asked the Pope for divorce, which was later granted to her.

(27) K. Rube: Listy. 122 (Letters).
and the monks, which existed at that time, should come to an end (and also that he should send some impartial person or judge to his diocese.)

What kind of disputes these were we can see from another letter written by a Franciscan vicar on the 3rd July, 1421. The vicar complained of a breach of promise by the bishop, that he violated the rights of the clergy and has even excommunicated some of them, with which he causes great indignation not only among the "faithful" Catholic converts, but also with the ruler himself, who was kind enough to help and support them in their mission work. Through these disputes many of the "converts" were leaving the Catholic faith and joining the Orthodox Church and were trying to influence others to this heretical teaching. So the vicar in his letter asked the Pope to intervene on their behalf and to take necessary steps against the bishop, and also that he should confirm all the special privileges to the Moldavian minority already granted to them.

In another letter the same vicar wrote to the Pope that the bishop of Baia was now more than ever standing against the monks, that he was forbidding them to take confession and that they were not allowed to take any new member to their Order, without his permission and that everywhere he was persecuting them with severe interdicts. It is interesting that the Pope gave orders to the Archbishop in Hnezden in Poland, to find out all about these disputes and confusions in Moldavia between the bishop and the clergy, and also to grant the vicar's request. It is clear from contemporary testimonies that the favour of the Papal Curia to the Order, and to the well wishes of the Catholic church in Moldavia, was unexpected and that the bishop of Baia was right to persecute in his diocese some of the "uninvited" preachers.

In 1412 their own "weak" vicar Mark of Kandic was accused by the Polish King of stealing valuable things from his safe. In the same year King Vladislaw sent his officials in the East a circular with an inquiry about the monks in the vicariate of Russo-Moldavia, who had

(28) K. Eubel: Listy, 122 (Letters)
left their posts and were wandering and loitering about the land, wearing civilian clothes and leading disorderly lives. When punished they threatened vengeance. (30)

This picture was finally complete when in 1446 and 1451 reports came through, not only regarding the licentious life of the Moldavian minority but also regarding the obvious badness of the lives of the monks and friars, which had become so habitual with them that reform was impossible even through the good intentioned or right thinking preachers. It is impossible to say how long the bishop stayed in the diocese under these circumstances, but it is quite possible that he resigned from his bishopric. His successor Peter Czipser got his commission from the Pope Curia, with some privileges, in 1438, under the condition that he would stay permanently in his bishopric. (31) But even with the coming of a new bishop the disputes between him and the monks, friars and other clergy and the still deeper immoral life of the monks spread even more widely over the Roman church. On one side were the many "faithful" of the Orthodox Church, and on the other hand a great many were won to the reform efforts of the Hussite movement and doctrines, which were spreading by this time into Moldavia. The ground could not have been better prepared, and that it found, under such conditions and circumstances, a good response from the local population, can be well understood. Though we have only scanty information about these occurrences, still they are interesting and valuable.

Some time before the year 1431, there appeared in Baia a Hussite preacher called in the documents Janos. (32) It is quite possible that he was a bachelor of the Prague University, and himself a native of


(31) K. Eubel; Listy. 122.

Moldavia. (33) He was, it appears, a member, or even leader, of the Hussite emigrants, who had escaped from Northern Hungary to the Dukedom of Moldavia in 1420 because of their views. (34) In a short time a Franciscan Monk joined him and with him and with the help of other clergy, he began to proclaim the Word of God and the reform ideas of the Czech lands. He condemned the abuses and sins of the Moldavian church, pointing out to them, that they should refuse obedience to the Catholic clergy, and stressing the importance of their changing their way of living. As he went round the towns and villages a great many adherents followed him. James not only taught them and brought before them the Word of God but he instructed them about life in Tabor, and how they should defend themselves if the need arose as the Hussites in Bohemia had already done. (35)

Under such circumstances the defenceless Moldavian bishop turned to his superior Archbishop of Lwow for help. In his letter he tells him, how his diocese is suffering from this "infection" of Hussitism which is spreading all over the country and that he has lost the hold of the people, because of this "heretical" teaching. The Archbishop immediately brought this to the knowledge of the King Vladislav with the hope that the King might intervene and force the ruler of his vassal state, Duke Alexander, to hand over the Hussite heretics to the Polish Inquisitor and to suppress the dangerous movement. King Vladislav in January, 1431, sent a long letter to Duke Alexander, informing him of the danger in his domain. So that he should have a vivid picture of what might happen to his land, Vladislav points out

(33) J. Barbulescu: Archiva Istorica - 212 (Historical Archives).
to him the religious reverses which were going on even under his rule in the Dukedom, and also points out to him the state of affairs in the Bohemian Kingdom, a country which was once renowned, and now was disorganised through the religious storms of the Hussite movement. The Hussite preachers, says Vladislav, are not acting for religious motives, but for selfish interests. They take the fortunes from the rich, they plunder your country, and they will even try to take the land from you. Are you going to live under their terrible oppression and under the brutal rule of the peasants and their Hussite priest? You will live in poverty and hunger and nobody will be able to help you, and the disorganised Czech lands should be a frightening example to you. Through this fatherly advice King Vladislav urges the Duke again, that as soon as possible he should take the necessary steps and put out the flames which had started in his domain, before it is too late, and to hand the Hussite preacher James, and his zealous followers, to the Polish prelates to suffer the punishment which they so richly deserved. Another letter, more or less of the same kind, as it appears, was sent to the Duke by the Polish prelates and nobility. (36)

But both of these letters failed in their mission. Duke Alexander gave orders in his land, on the contrary, that nobody should interfere with the Hussite preachers in spreading their teaching, and he threatened with cruel punishment those who interfered and would not obey his command. On the other hand he encouraged the Hussite preacher James and his followers for still more active Hussite propaganda with the promise of his help and protection. (37)

Though the Moldavian Bishop John sent an urgent call to the request Archbishop, doubtless with a view that King Vladislav should

(36) Codex epist. saec XV., Monumenta medii aevi res gestas Poloniae illustrantia XII, 290.

(37) Codex Epist. saec XV., Monumenta - 291.
energetically intervene against the Hussite heretics and their protector, Duke Alexander, the help was not forthcoming. King Vladislav, the Archbishop, the Court and prelates of Poland were engaged at that time with the war situation in their country, so that they did not have the time or strength to punish the disobedient vassal Duke and to bring him back to obedience, and so with great distress they had to watch the spread of Hussite doctrine in Moldavia.

With great pain and sorrow Archbishop Olesnicky wrote in January 1432 to Cardinal Julian Casarini about the hopeless turmoil into which his Archbishopric was being thrown, and also about the regret he felt not to be able to attend the Council of Basle, because in the nearest Dukedom of Moldavia, the Hussite teaching is spreading rapidly and in his own country there is the threatened peace with the Archduke Svidrigajld, who is in league with the German princes, the Czech Hussites and Duke Alexander.(38)

The zealous Hussite preachers never thought that all these conditions would be to their advantage. All these happenings at this opportune time pressed them ever further forward in their spreading of the Word of God and the Hussite teaching. Some of them, and perhaps even their spiritual leader, James, in the years 1431-6, went to the neighbouring countries of Transylvania and Eastern Hungary to the inhabitants of the Transylvanian and the East Hungarian diocese, and here also they met to their surprise with great results. The Translyvanian bishop George calls the Hussites "black-sheep", loitering through his diocese, and converting many of his "faithful" to their doctrine. But when in 1435-7 the hand of the inquisition in the person of the passionate James of Marchi tried to reach them they withdrew with their converts back to their followers in Moldavia.

(38) About the Czech Hussite association v. Caro: Gesichtete Polens IV p.10 ff.
A.Jeckick: Powstanie Svidrygajldy, 210 ff. (Rebellion of Svidrigayld.)
F. Palacký: Jazyk Češky na dvorce litovském in 15 cent. in C.C.M. p.280-283. (Czech Language in the Luthonian Court.)
J. Czoll: Čechy a Prusi p.197 ff. (Bohemia and Prussia.)
In Transylvania, where the wave of Moldavian Hussitism began in the first half of the 15th century, its doctrines were not unknown. The Moldavian Hussite preachers encountered there other reform currents which had their focus in North-eastern Hungary and in Syrmia, and, unobserved, they were spreading more and more to the east, right to the borders of Moldavia. King Sigismund and the Hungarian hierarchy, while engaged with the Czech rebels, were unaware of this movement in their land and this gave the reform movement an even greater opportunity to expand. The conditions under which Czech religious thought spread there were similar to those in the neighbouring Moldavian dukedom, nationally and religiously these districts were much the same. The Catholic colonists of Saxon or Hungarian origin lived beside the Romanian orthodox population in Syrmia, and here and there met new emigrants from Serbia, who were becoming more numerous in lower Hungary, especially in the middle of the 15th century, (1) because of the many raids by the Turks on the riverside of Moravia. The Transylvanian orthodox were under the control of the orthodox bishop from Muntenia and Moldavia. (2) These orthodox were often threatened with Catholicism because the Hungarian government had so often hindered them in the execution of their ecclesiastical duties in the Empire, pointing out the regulation, based on the Council of Lateran in 1215, under which all the inhabitants of Hungary are under the jurisdiction of the Latin bishops. Sometimes, however, in the second half of the 15th century, they were visited secretly by wandering orthodox bishops, who explained to them about the waiting priesthood. The names known to us are John from Kaffy in the Crimea, Takaria from Galana and Joanichia from Belgrade (Serbia). Only in the 16th century were they allowed to have their regular clergy. (3)

(2) St. Metcs: Istoria Bisericii I, 40 ff. (History).
(3) P. Teutsch: Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche in Siebenbürgen.
The Hungarians and the Saxons, living north of the river Morus, had a catholic bishop in Alba Julia. The Saxon colony south of it, especially in Sibinia and Brasovia, was under the direct supremacy of the Archbishop of Ostrihonia. Besides that the Hungarian population had in Eastern Hungary their own bishop in Great Varadin, and also south-east of the river Tisa in Czanadia.

The territory between the rivers Tisa and Danube was administered by Archbishop Baczsko-Kolozsky, under whose jurisdiction all the above-mentioned bishoprics lay, and also even the bishopric of Syrmia, situated between the rivers Danube and Save.

The Franciscan Order, which had already settled in Ostrihonia in 1229, helped the catholic clergy in the exxlesiastical administration and in shepherding their flock. In 1327, one of the branches of the Order settled in Bosnia, and later some of them were called to southern Hungary, especially to Syrmia, and also to Transylvania. By the year 1447 they were so strong numerically that they broke away from the Franciscans in Bosnia altogether and founded here an independent society called "Provincia Sancti Salvatoris".

The Hungarian nobility, the "Szekels" residing in the eastern part of Transylvania, and the Saxons in Sibinia and Dystricia, formed together a "privileged nation", and on the other hand the peasants of the Hungarian and Rumanian population groaned in great need and privation. The position of a Transylvanian peasant, Hungarian or Rumanian, was far worse than that of the Czech peasant before the Hussite wars. Already Ludwig the Great (1342-1382) had limited the freedom and movement of his subjects (serfs) and King Sigismund, in 1405, took their rights from them altogether and besides that, he increased serfdom. On them lay the burdens of the country, the tithes were collected from them, not only in money, but in goods (their products of the land). Sometimes the collectors had to come to collect the tithes with guns in their hands.
Bishop George Leresch in 1432 did not collect his tithes because the coin was bad, but when four years later better and heavier coin came into circulation, he demanded that the whole amount be paid to him, and when the serfs could not pay it, he persecuted them and punished them and even some were excommunicated. That is probably why, at that time, many of the "faithful" went through the marriage ceremony without the church's blessing, the dead were buried at the walls of the cemeteries, and newborn children were not baptised. (4) When King Sigismund heard about the quarrels between the bishop and the serfs, he commanded that the tithes should be paid to the bishop, not only in the "better" coins but immediately, (5) and those who failed to obey his order were dealt with accordingly. (6)

The untenable social conditions worsened also in other directions. As in the Baia diocese, so also in Transylvania and Eastern Hungary, people became alienated from the church, dissatisfied with the empty ceremonials and flat formalism of the service and by the disorderly and scandalous lives of the clergy. There were also complaints against the friars and monks, who not only neglected their office (7) but who openly lived in concubinage. (8) In other times the "believers" cried for religious reform among the civil clergy, and especially in the monasteries when their superiors failed to induce the monks and friars to live a clean and better life. (9) The moral and religious life of all the clergy, in many parts, was in such a deplorable state that, for example, the bishop of Transylvania and the hierarchy thought it best to take

(4) J. Teleki: Hunsdaiak Hora Magyaroszagon X, 3-10 (Collection of grievances of Hungarian and Rumanian peasants.)
(5) P. Hunfalvy: Archiv: 77-78.
(6) G. Fejer: Codex Dipl. C, 7.
(8) Katona: Historia crit. XII, 774.
action against them, and publicly excommunicated and banished some of them, not only from the church but also from the country. (10) The dissatisfaction with the deterioration of social and religious conditions among the people awakened and grew in strength becoming the popular mood of religion, which in Syrmia perhaps at that time kindled a Bogomile movement spreading from Bosnia to Lower Hungary. (11)

We find the Bogomile movement only in Lower Hungary and Syrmia, and the first information about it is given in the documents telling of the southern Hungarian Hussite movement in the fortieth year of the 15th century. As bishop James of Syrmia wrote on 13th July, 1437, to the Papol Curia that in Syrmia, where the Bosnians and Serbians settled, there sojourn also many heretics, infected with different heresies, especially with the teaching of the Hussites. (12) So also at the same time a Bosnian bishop Joseph, wrote to the Pope saying, that the simple people in Syrmia were infected by Serbian and Bosnian heretics and especially by the Hussites. (13) The same testimony was also given by the Syrmia magnates; Ladislau of Pozary, who tells on 25th February, 1437, that between the rivers Danube and Save live the Serbians and Bosnians with Christians and the Hussites. (14) And according to the writing of Ladislau of Haroth of 18th July of the same year, the villages and cities of Syrmia were inhabited by Serbs and Christians,

W. Hukki: Geschichte der Alteste Sudslavische Literatur p. 83 ff.

(12) E. Fornondzin: Acta Bosnae, 162. in partibus sirmiensibus, ubi Bosnenses et Rasciani, catholicae fidei semuli mixtim habentae ac inter fluvios Zavan et Danubium simul commorantur (inquisitor Jacobus invenit) plurimosque haereticos diversa haeresibus singulariter haeretica pravitate malodictorum Hussitarum.


(14) E. Fornondzin: Acta Bosnae, 159.
but the Hussite teaching spread only among the "faithful Christians". (15) From the documents we can clearly see that in Syria there were not only different nationalities but also different sects, (Catholics, Orthodox and Bogomils), Catholics being called "Christian", Orthodox "Rascianos" and Bogomils "Bosnianos", all of these, however, being different from the Hussites, who appear as a distinct body.

It was in Syria first of all that the Catholic inhabitants accepted the Hussite slogans, but the abuses in the Catholic Church brought the Hussite movement to life in Lower Hungary and it remained there for a long time. The distinction between the Syrian Hussites and Bogomils, revealed in manuscripts is differently described. The Bogomils are, as the manuscripts show, of Slav origin, but the Catholic inhabitants, and later also the Hussites, were nearly all of Hungarian origin, as we can judge from the circumstances that the Lower Hungarian Hussite preachers, Thomas and Valentine, translated the Word of God for their followers into the Hungarian language. (16) From this, of course, we cannot say that there is no possibility of influence by the Bogomil movement on the Hungarian Hussites. It is very probable that the Bogomil movement made more favourable the environment in Syria for religious reform.

There was mutual understanding between the Bogomils and the Hussites. They drew help and strength from each other for the fight against the Church, and also exchanged some dogmatic teaching. (17)

(15) K. Fernandez: Acta Donae, 162.
St. Katsor, Historia critica XII, 776... "magnum partem Sirmiae Rascianos inhabitare, lect quaeamcivitates ac villae christianoe nomine fungantur tamen in compluribus Rasciante cum christianis mixtis commorantur; inter veroe christianos quaedam villae et civitates sectis Hussitarum hereticorum infectae per plurimos annos extiterant."

Tune Thomas et Valentine... ad Regnum Moldae intraverunt, ubi iiden duo clerici heresim seminantes utriusque Testamenti scripta in Hungaricam idioma transtulcrunt; etc.

(17) Sextus decimus art: Dicunt, Christum non esse veraciter passum neque vere mortuum (articulus iste fuit primo manichorum et multorum aliorum hereticorum).
Quintus decimus art: Prohibent sibi crucis fieri - This article and the above is from the Bogomil teaching. Quoted by K. Jírovec: Dějiny star. Bulh. 145 (History of Bulgaria.)
is also possible that many Bogomils accepted and joined the stronger, Syrmian Hussite party, when later the cruel inquisitor James of Marchia came into Lower Hungary, and the same may have happened to other religious sects not belonging to the obedience of the Roman Catholic Church.

In the northern parts of Eastern Hungary, the popular feeling against the church was perhaps strengthened by the occasional raids of the Hussite army into Slovakia during the thirties of the 15th century. (18) If we remember that the Hussites who made at that time expeditions as far as Eastern Slovakia were full of the spirit of Hus, Zizka and Prokop and, apart from that, tried to win the inhabitants of the territory they occupied to church reform in the spirit of Hus, in many places succeeding in their object, as for example in the provinces of Spiš, (19) Nitra, (20) and Bratislava, (21) it is not bold presumption to state that from these places Czech religious thought and endeavour spread as far as the neighbouring Varadin diocese, where the mark of Czech reform in the beginning of the 15th century manifested itself. The Hussite demands, expressed in the Four Articles of Prague for moral reform and for the free preaching of the Word as the rule of life, spread right through Slovakia, actively affecting the inhabitants of Eastern Hungary, displeased as they were with the situation of the Church, which the Varadin bishop feared might lead to open revolt (1436). The bad feeling against the Church in his diocese was also strengthened by Czech and Slovak elements, and therefore, the anxiety of the higher clergy was great as expressed in the bishop's statement: "It would not be too much to say that the 'Christians' or 'believers' took arms against us and

(18) F. Palacky: Dějiny národa českého (History of Czech nation.) Tomek: Děj. m. Pr.IV. (History of Prague.)
(19) G. Fejér: Codex Dipl. X, 7.
killed us all" (22). One who was the foremost leader of the Hussite movement in Syrmia, was Blasius of Kamancz or Master of Kamancz, of whom a contemporary chronicler asserts, that he came in contact with the Hussite movement and doctrine, while he was a student in Prague where he was sent and kept by some friends, citizens of his birth-place, Kamancz. (23) Though his name, Blasius of Kamancz, does not appear on the Roll of graduated Students of Prague University, it is not impossible that some of the registers were not complete. (24) It may well be, since Prague University was visited by so many Hungarian students. Their number did not decrease even when Hungary had in 1387 its own University, (25) or when the Hussite revolution took place, but on the contrary at the beginning of the 15th century it was still higher and, when the Germans left the University of Prague in a body and founded their own University in Leipzig, the number of Hungarian students did not even then decrease. The great number of these Hungarian students at Prague University was understandable because of the privilege of the Kutna Hora (Kuttenberg) Decret, which was not only for Czech Students, but also for Hungarian, as they were counted as one nation with the Czechs at the University, and also at that time, got preferential treatment to other "nations". Under such circumstances, we can understand why Hussite influence,

(22) G. Fejor; Cod. Dipl. X, 7; Varadin Bishop John's letter of 1 Dec. 1436.


Quote: "Ita enim haec haeresis hussitarum venerat in Pannoniam, Quandum magister Blasius predictus puér docilis crat, tunc cives de Kamancz eis venientes miserrant cum ad studium, promisientes eis, ut plebaniam de Kamancz sibi merobitur, eisdem condonarent, Tunc ipse puér ex desiderio studii transactus Bohemiae, intravit civitatem hussitarum videlicet haeresis pravitate infectus, tandem cum quibusdam suis ad pannoniam tempore competenti regressus in suam patriam, scilicet Kamancz, ibique illa hussitarum haeresis, scilicet eisdem magister Blasius incusando se inquisitor predicto (sc. Jacobo de Marchia) dixerat, non ab ipso, sed a suis in illa patria disseminata fuerat..."

(24) There are only two rolls in the faculty of that time:
Faculty of Arts 1357-1385 (Liber decandrum I, Prague 1830 II, Prague 1832.
Faculty of Law 1372-1418 (Album seu matricula universitatis Pragensis I Prague 1834.

(25) F. Tadra: Kulturní styky s cizínou až do válek husitských 121-122. (The cultural contacts with foreign lands to the time of the Hussite wars.)
propaganda and doctrine found so many followers among the Hungarian and Saxon students.

Apart from Blasius we do not know about any of the Hungarian students of Prague - where they returned home and in what they were engaged - but undoubtedly there were some clergy, who, besides Blasius, helped to spread the Hussite gospel and doctrine in Eastern Hungary and in Transylvania. (26) It is not known how and when Hussite propaganda began in the above-mentioned territories. The Chronicler mentions that the Hussite preacher Blasius returned from Prague at an opportune time, and according to other contemporary documents, the Hussites were in Eastern Hungary before 1437. The same year the voice of Czech Hussite teaching was not only heard in Transylvania, where the Hussite preachers went from Moldavia, (27) but also in North-western Hungary, in the diocese of Varadin. (28) Also in Lower Hungary there were some Hussite preachers who preached Hussitism, but the busiest of them was very probably Blasius who became a Hussite minister after his return from Prague to Kamian, and also guardian of a "congregation" in a little town called Bacia. Other prominent men were Thomas, Valentinus and Andrew. In St. Martin, a little village, not far from Petrowaradin, James, a Hussite minister and fellow-countryman of Hus was spreading the news of the Czech reform, and also in a village called Buldenau not far from it, a priest named Valentinus was doing the same. The preaching of the reform by these clergymen was magnetic, as in the Czech lands. First of all Hussitism spread among the lower classes, who with sorrow watched the sinful lives of all the Roman Catholic clergy to whom they had to pay so many different tithes and other

(26) Loserth: Ueber die versuche etc. 103, 104, 105.
V. Novotny: Hus Korrespondence, 349-350 ff.

(27) Already mentioned in my previous chapter, when we spoke about the Hussite influence in Moldavia.

(28) G. Fejer: Codex dipl. X, art. 7, 810.
Patona: Hist. crit. XII, 745.
demands under heavy pressure.

The fearless leader and speaker of the lower class was a man of Kamanz, a tailor by trade, called Valentinus. That others also came to join the Hussite preachers, whose courage did not fail, could be seen in the stormy aftermath. The Hussite priests with their followers at first met in secret, for example in cellars, cow sheds and uninhabitated mills, where they served Mass in civilian clothes and in places not consecrated, and with it served communion in both kinds to believers men, women and children alike. The courage of these followers of Hus increased with their increasing numbers, so that they openly prepared revolt against their persecutors. According to the words of the bishops of Syrmia (29) and Varadin (30) who say that already at the end of 1436 in many places in the south and northwest of Hungary, the people were coming to arms with the intention of killing all the clergy, from the lowest rank to the highest prelates, without mercy, as the Hussites had done in Bohemia. That the Hungarian bishops were feeling anxiety at the roused and irritable frame of mind of their serfs was soon to be seen in Transylvania, where, in 1437, the storm of protest by the subjugated inhabitants against "money-grabber" Bishop John Lepes broke out. (31) In Transylvania there arose more or less the same tumults as were in Bohemia and Moravia soon after the death of John Hus. The rising broke out in the southwest of Transylvania, and from there it spread all over the diocese. Hungarians, with some Rumanian serfs, murdered many of the nobles and clergy, looted their possessions, and then burned their houses. Later, behind quickly built fortifications in Babolnaus they waited for the army of Bishop John Lepes and the magnates.


(31) F.Klein: Geschichte von Ungarn II, 309.
After the first battle, in which the serfs were the victors, an agreement was arrived at, but the rising was not at an end. Marauding parties of peasants attacked the estates of bishops and nobles, and it was not until 1437 that they were defeated at Kolozsvar (Cluj) with the help of Hungarian troops. In order that the same confusion would not arise in other Hungarian territories efforts were made to avoid it with the help of civil and church authorities, by the zealous and passionate inquisitor James of Marchia, also known as Jacobus de Piceno or Jacobus de Monte Brandone, Italian by birth and a member of the Franciscan Order. He began his work as guardian of a Monastery Konavlii near Dubrovnik, where very soon he was noticed for his zealous fight for virtuous life in Christ's spirit. The Pope Eugen IV entrusted him, in 1432, with the task of correcting the fallen morals of the Bosnian Franciscans. His task was hard because he came into conflict not only with the Franciscan Order but with the civil clergy also. With indignation, he was not slow to call even the Bosnian King Stephen, as sometime ago John Milec had called the Bohemian King Charles IV, the greatest heretic, or a heathen and antichrist. After this he left the land and went to Southern Hungary to assist in the Franciscan Monasteries there. Even although he had given unhappy information to the Pope Eugen IV he was called back to Bosnia where in 1435 he began his mission in the territory of the diocese of Fünf Kirchen (Five Churches). There he got an urgent call from King Sigismund to come to Belgrade where in December 1435, came the Embassy of the Czech Utraquist party for negotiations with Sigismund and the delegates of the Council of Basle about the Compacts. By the efforts of James, Sigismund planned that the Czechs must be won to his side. Although he stayed in the Court

---

(33) Bermendžin: Acta Bosnae, 162.
(34) Farlati, III, sacr. IV., 66.
G. Pfejer: Cod. Dipl. X., 7, 675.
of the King for two months and there held disputation with the Czechs, his work was fruitless.

King Sigismund wanted to send him to Bohemia for further discussions with the Czechs, but his superior in the Franciscan Order, William de Casalis, asked him to finish his work which he had begun in Bosnia and to bring order into the Bosnian monasteries, then he would give him permission to leave for the Bohemian lands. (36) In another letter his superior appeals to him to take with him for help a few friars, so that he could energetically proceed against the disorders and abuses among the Bosnian and Hungarian minority. (37)

The Varadin Bishop John was the first who at the desire of his clergy invited Inquisitor James into his diocese. (38) In his territory with clerical and civil help James worked with great success, and according to John Kurczolai, in a very short time he brought the people in north-west Hungary, who were infected by the Czech heresy, back to the fold of the Church, through threats and punishments and his preaching. (39) The success of his inquisition made his name known far and wide.

On 8th May, 1436, the Bishop of Transylvania, George Lepes, asked him to come as soon as possible to his diocese and a little later he was called to the south of Hungary to stop the spread of heretical teaching which was undermining the whole territory. (40) All this was to James a still greater urge to zealous inquisition, especially when the Pope gave him a letter of praise and assured him that all inquisition

(36) Ferndőzsin: Acta Bosnae, 149..."Cum vero vicariam visitis veris et pro tempore ordinem bonum posueris, tibi dabo licentiam eundi In Bohemian"

(37) Ferndőzsin: Acta Bosnae, 146.


G. Fejér: Cod. Dipl. X., 7., p.313.

law in Hungary and Austria was under his control. (41)

In Transylvania James did not stay long. When he began his inquisition sermons the aforementioned disturbances began, so he left and came to the territory between the rivers of Danube and Tisa, in Syrmia and Temesvaria, where he had already been active. There the bishops lightened his work by saying in their pastoral letters to their clergy that they should not interfere in his work, under the threat of excommunication. This help given to him there by the ecclesiastical authorities and the lower Hungarian nobility, enabled him for a time to make a stand against the Hussites round the cities of Kamánz and Bacía. (42) When he observed anyone holding to the heretical teaching he reproached him with words, then threatened with punishments and imprisonment. He confiscated his goods, and excommunicated the clergy who held to the reformed faith. Many were converted through fear and not through conviction. He was merciless to those who held to Hussite views and handed them over to the civil authorities to be burned at the stake. The bodies of known heretics were taken from their graves and burned (as, for example, the body of James, Minister in St. Martin).

The end of the clergyman Valentinus, a minister in Bulchenau, was interesting. Inquisitor James knew that he was a "Hussite heretic" and imprisoned him, but not without the opposition of his followers. The master-tailor Valentinus, mentioned above, was not afraid to draw the sword against the Inquisitor's assistant in the Kamánz, Judge John. He evidently was the executor of "holy righteousness" and the receiver of James of Munchia. Convicted heretics he kept in prison, and if they still held to the Hussite heresy, he sent them to the stake. The tailor

G. Fojtor: Cod. Dipl. X., 7, 794.

(42) About the inquisition in these cities the story is told in Chronica Minorum in Bathyancu in Alba Julia.
Valentinus alone helped three condemned men to escape, and then came with a number of armed men to the prison where the clergyman Valentinus was also held. They forced the prison door, liberated Valentinus and the prisoners and assisted them to flee from the town. He was persecuted all the time, however, and, when he died during his flight, Inquisitor James ordered his body to be burned, along with those of some other Hussite heretics. He acted in a similar way towards all who held in the slightest degree to the heretical teaching, and those who wanted to save their lives had to flee. The Kamancz Minister Blasius fled to Bacia where he was arrested and brought back to Kamancz to the inquisition, where under threat and pressure he recanted his Hussite doctrine and spent the rest of his life as the Chronicler says, "in a manner which is praiseworthy.

Andrew (Ondreus) a Hungarian secular priest in the diocese of Bacia, behaved in the same way. Inquisitor James removed him from his office and handed him over to the civil court for punishment because he would not renounce his heretical doctrines. Nevertheless, when he was taken to the stake to die he was willing to recant all his "errors", and gave a promise that he would bring others who were infected with Hussitism back to the "faith". James sent a report about Andrew to Rome and asked for advice. He received full power to restore Andrew to the priesthood on condition that he would openly and in humility repent of his sins and errors, and under oath swear never to teach or hold such doctrines again.

Inquisitor James thus succeeded in part, through fire, torture or threats, in stopping Hussite influence in lower Hungary, Syrmia Bacia and Temesvaria when he removed its leaders. Moreover, in order that the Hussite infection would not spread again he left in different districts zealous and devoted clergy who were to look after the "believers and prevent them from listening to the Czech heresy. At the beginning

(43) Vaddingus: Ad.Min, XI. p.6, 7, 8.
of 1437 he was praised with gratitude by the bishops and clergy for what
he had done in their territory and was called a true liberator and the
greatest fighter for the "honour and glory" of God. (44)

About the same time Inquisitor James tried, on the invitation
of Sigismund, to work among the Taborite mercenary soldiers who, in
May, 1437, came to Syrmia to help the Hungarian army in the war against
the Turks, (45) but new circumstances turned his attention elsewhere.
This merciless inquisitor worked not only against the Hussite heretics
but also against the morals of the fallen clergy, thus greatly incensing
the clergy, who told him that he had no right to be in their territory
or in that of Lower Hungary. The Ölkac Dean Simon actually put him
under excommunication, but through the intervention of King Sigismund
and the Archbishop of Esztergom, the Dean withdrew his excommunication,
and issued besides a proclamation to the believers binding them to
absolute obedience. (46)

The successor of Sigismund, Albrecht, came to the aid (47)
of James, who, after a break of one year, once again began his inquisition
work in lower Potisla. We have no detailed information about this
second period of activity but we do know this, that wherever he went,
he received the help of King's servants, who admired his work. We also
know that he confirmed the court's decision on the Kamanč tailor
Valentinus. (48) It is certain, however, that when in 1439 he left
Hungarian soil altogether (49) with the highest acknowledgment and praise,

(44) G. Fejér: Cod. Dipl. X., 7, p. 301.
Ferdenčin: Acta Bosnae, 164.
Fejér: Cod. Dipl. X., 7, p. 312.
he had not really exterminated all the Hussites. In different districts both during his inquisition work and after he left, there were still many followers of the Czech religious movement. Although they were persecuted all the time by the Hungarian nobility or hierarchy, they still survived, especially when John Jiskra, with his escort, came in 1462, to Czandá where King Matthias had given him, at the conclusion of peace, a castle named Solymos, the little town of Lipovou and about 70 villages. In 1467, after the battle of Kostolán King Matthias sent three hundred Hussites to lower Hungary, the majority of them women, to settle among the Serbian population. It was actually in this Czandá region that the Hussites had, in 1470, three churches in the villages Nagylak, Bodrog and Fellak. The Hussite colonists at this time in Transylvania were even more numerous, however. In the reformed church in Arduzal (Hungarian Szamosardo) in the district of Salagiú in north-west Transylvania there has been preserved to this day the sign of the Chalice in the form of a great tulip.

Although to the end of the 15th century the inquisition in Transylvania was active, Hussitism remained in these territories up to the time of the reformation of Luther and Calvin. Many of the Hungarian and Transylvanian Hussites, after the long persecution, which lasted through the 15th century, left their possessions and sought refuge in the neighbouring countries. In 1437, through the inquisition of Janes (Jacobus) of Marchia, a great number of the brethren left, under the leadership of the priests Thomas and Valentinus, for the dukedom of Moldavia, where, under the protection of Duke Alexander,

---

(51) A. Petrov: Časopis Česko Historický, 1923, 415, note 6 and 424. (Czech Historical Magazine.)
(52) Cronica Minorum. (S. Simon: Additamentum ad imagines antiquae et novae Hungaricae v imago novae Hungaricae 1754, p. 4 de Saxonibus Hussitis regnante in Ungaria Sigismundo exactis ac in Moldavian profectis huii notum fuit, sed progenium illorum iam catholicam esse....)
there was religious freedom. The Hungarian Hussites were well informed about conditions because they were in contact with the Moldavian Hussites before 1436, and their preachers were also among them, so they were hopeful that in the Moldavian dukedoms they would be kindly received as new colonists. When they crossed the border into their new home they settled down in the town of Trotusi, where the Hungarian Hussite translation of the Scriptures was copied. The Moldavian Hussites, too, were strengthened by their coming and with the year 1437 there began a new epoch in the development and progress of the Hussite movement in the Moldavian dukedom.

(53) Codex Bardinus p. 240 (The spreading of the Hussite German Scriptures in Moldavia, which have never been mentioned, have great significance for the solution of origin and source of the first Romanian religious texts.)
The Hungarian colonists found relations in Moldavia very uneasy (1) because from the time of Alexander the Good (1431) until the year 1457 when Duke Stephen firmly gripped the reins of power, this land was tossed unceasingly on the waves of discord and disputes between the pretenders to the throne, some seeking help in Poland and others in Hungary. But this internal crisis was to the advantage of the Hussite emigrants from Hungary because no one was interested in their banishment or in the suppression of their religious endeavours. There was no danger for them even from the Church, because the Orthodox Church did not bother about the members of the Western Church and the Catholic Church in Moldavia was almost totally disorganised.

The Catholic bishopric in Siret had already disappeared at the beginning of the 15th century, and the bishopric in Baia was, from the thirtieth year, a "titular" one only. It was mainly owing to the civil disorders and other troubles that the bishops did not receive any income (2). That is why the diocese of Moldavia was entrusted to the neighbouring bishop (3). The disorders between the civil and the Regular clergy were unceasing, a fact of which later complaints are sufficient testimony. For example, in 1446, the Inquisitor Fabianus from Baia wrote to Rome saying (4) that the Moldavian clergy, who are the administrators of the Catholic church there, lead very licentious lives, act against the sixth commandment to the offence of God, and to the destruction of the souls, which were entrusted to them, and, through

their example, to the deterioration of the believers. (5)

In 1451 also Peter, not long before nominated Bishop of Moldavia, sent a note to the curia of the Pope and described with great distress the morals and corruption of the Moldavian Catholic clergy. (6) The Bishop complained especially of the Franciscan and Dominican Orders that, without his consent, they set themselves up as administrators of the Catholic Church, served the sacrament of baptism and granted confirmation, freely dissolved marriage and again gave the church's blessing to the divorced. They even taught the people that there was no need to have bishops etc. He said that if something were not done very soon against these excesses, even the bishopric in Baia would be ruined as were all the others on Moldavian territory and that a bishop with one priest could hardly survive on the Moldavian income.

Under these circumstances the Moldavian Hussites, profiting by liberal and rich gifts, and by protection in the Duke's court (7) were spreading their reformed religious teaching both by preaching and writing, entirely free of the fear from persecution, and especially they were giving the Word of God to the inhabitants in their mother tongue. At that time the Bible was translated into Hungarian, (8) and no doubt even into the German and Rumanian, languages. Of the Hungarian Hussite translation are preserved three fragments known as the Vienna or Revalius Codex, (9) Munich or Jaszayus Codex (10) and Aporus Codex. (11)

(8) Cronica Minorum in Bathyaneu in Alba Julia, 40.
(9) This Codex according to Volf Gyorgy is kept in Vienna National Library.
(10) In the Munich Library (Volf Gyorgy).
(11) This Codex is kept in the Szokels Museum in Transylvania.
These Hussite texts are the oldest Hungarian translations of the Scriptures. Hungarian literature has no ancient monuments in the national tongue except one sermon of the first half of the 13th century (called Halottas beszéd) and also a hymn in honour of St. Mary of the 14th century.

This translation of the Scriptures into Hungarian dates from the first half of the 15th century. That the Scriptures were also translated into the German language is not certain, but it is possible, since Archbishop Bandinus found in 1648 in the Saxon town of Neamt, a German Breviary and Postille which were preserved from the local Hussites.

As far as the oldest preserved Rumanian religious texts are concerned, known as the "Codex Voroneceanius", it is supposed that they are the work of the Transylvanian Lutheran or Calvinist clergy of the 16th century. But through the study of their language and other points it was recognised that the translations were already in existence about the middle of the 15th century somewhere in the north-western corner of Moldavia, where the Hussite movement was spreading among the Catholic inhabitants. The peculiarity of their language - "Hungarians" and "Saxonism" suggests that they have been written

(12) F. Keinz: Zwei alte ungarische Texte aus einer Handschrift, 4-7.


(14) D. Pensianescu: Histoire de la langue roumaine. II, 8 ff.

(15) N. Iorga: Istoria Literat. (Hist. of Literature).

(16) A. Candreä: Psaltiera XCI (Psalter).

(17) A. Candreä: Psaltiera XCIII.
by a Hungarian or Saxon who knew the Rumanian language, for the purpose of Hussite propaganda. (10)

The Moldavian Hussite preachers, in the fortifteenth year did not limit their influence only to the small Moldavian Dukedom, but spread in different directions and also returned to Transylvania, (19) where undoubtedly they met the Czech Hussite warriors (20) who were active there and everywhere. As the "apostles of Christ" they were spreading the "truth of God". According to a contemporary Chronicler (21) one of them, called Valentinus, went as far as Turkey, and, when he had learned the language of that country, he began to spread the teaching of Hussitism among the population. Because he had great success there, and hoped for still better, he asked for help from his companion Thomas. Although the latter did not consent to his desire, Valentinus continued in his work so successfully that even the Turkish Sultan heard about it, and fearing that Islam might suffer, gave orders for the capture of Valentinus and for him to be skinned alive.

The chronicler Blasius does not mention the places where Valentinus was active, but it is possible that it was somewhere in the Northern part of Bulgaria, or in some region on the left side of the Danube, for example in the neighbourhood of Giurgiu, which the Turks had under their control from 1413 (22) and from thence they made sudden raids into Muntania or other territory.

(10) S. Pusarciu: Zur Rekonstruktion des Urmaleischen (Beihcft Zur Zeitschr. THF Rom. Philol.) Halle 1910 XXVI.

(19) ?adain;ua; An.Min. XI, 205, 253.
Ti'nri-aVzacuT; Docurricntc I, ifo. 2, 706 ff.

(20) J. Jorga: Documente privițeare Vol. XV. 29. When in 1443 a. Polish-Hungarian King Vladislav was preparing to do the great attack against the Turks, the Duke of Transylvania, John Hunyadus was preparing also and beside other things he armed his army with the "Tabor wagons" etc

(21) Cronica Minorum, 40-41.
(22) J. Jireček: Dej. Nar. bulh. 295 ff. (History of Bulgaria.)
Valentinus' companion Thomas remained in Moldavia, and, after a long time, according to the words of the Chronicler, "he died in the heretical errors." It is quite possible that he was still alive when in the year 1450-1451, there came to the Moldavian Hussites, the mysterious Constantine Anglicanus who then established relations with the Czech Utraquists and the Church in Constantinople, (23) and was perhaps a hearer of the enthusiastic sermons of other foreign Hussite clergy, which had a marked success in Moldavian territory in the second half of the 15th century. The most prominent of these clergy was a certain Constantinus Romanus, who, according to the report of the Moldavian bishop Peter, introduced himself as a secular priest and canon, openly preached heresy and assaulted the condemned heretics, and proclaimed openly "terrible errors and encouraged the sect of the Bohemian rejected-Czech-sect." (24) The Holy See turned their attention to the Hussite influence in the diocese of Baia, but their endeavour to suppress it by the inquisition, did not propper to any extent. In the year 1442 Dionysus (25) was sent there. In 1445 (26) and again in 1446 (27) Pope Eugen IV appointed Habianus of Baia inquisitor against the numerous adherents of the Hussite sect in the Moldavian dukedom, who were not only infecting with their heresy a great part of the population there, but a great number of the "believers" in the Hungarian Kingdom. Neither inquisition had marked results, however. Therefore, some time about the beginning of 1451 the task was given to the general vicar John Fapistranus, a man of reputation, in order that he might as inquisitor not

(23) J. Goll: Quellen und Untersuchungen, I, 27.
J. Pavlova: Styky ěčs.husits. c caňínskou církví C.C., 1918-1919
(Contacts of the Czech Hussite with the Church in Constantinople).
(24) K. Ebal: Uv. sp. p.125-125. Quidam etiam Constantinus Romanus,
qui se pro presbytero sacullari et canonico s. Johannis Lateranensis
serit, publice hæresim praedicat, et damnatam sectam Boheminorum
affirrat et quamplures alii presbyteri sacullares in dicta diocesi sunt
hereticici at schismatici et multos adhaerentes sibi singulis diobus
acquirunt. (The Bishops further ask the Pope for help).
Herruzachi: Documento I, No 2, 509.
Herruzachi: Documento I, No 2,706.
only try to uproot the "abominable heresy which was to be found in nearly the whole of the Czech kingdom", and bring the Czechs to the catholic faith, (28) but that he should come to the help and rescue of the Moldavian Bishop Peter, and combat the "Czech heresy" in his diocese. But because Kapistranus saw his life work in the Czech lands, he sent four priests to Moldavia under the leadership of a certain Ladislaus Uhrus.

The activities of these missionaries in Moldavian territory are not preserved, but it is possible that when the missionaries came, the mood of the inhabitants, through the work of foreign Hussite preachers against the Roman Church, was at the height of its fury. Scarcely had they crossed onto Moldavian soil when a crowd of local Hussites went out against them and spoiled every chance of their success and expelled them beyond the frontier to Poland. The banished missionaries reached the city of Cracow some time in the spring of 1452, where they begged the King of Poland, Kazimir and Archbishop Olesnicky for some small place where they could rest, after the grief and calamity which had befallen them through the "Moldavian followers of the Czech heresy."(29) The failure of their mission was the cause of Kapistranus' proposal to visit Moldavia as soon as possible. During the first half of 1455, after a long stay in Cracow and in Moravia, he went to Hungary which was threatened after the fall of Constantinople by a Turkish attack. His main task was to preach for the undertaking of a crusading expedition against the Turks, but besides that, he was active in support of the Catholic Church against the remainder of the Hussite movement in the bishoprics of Czanads and Temeshvar, and especially on the estates of John Hunyad in

also R. Urbanek: Čes Řezj. III, c.2. 552.

Eastern Hungary and in Transylvania. From there he went over the
Carpathians to the capital of Moldavia. To his astonishment, in a
very short time he won the ruler of Moldavia, Duke Peter Aron (30) to
the catholic faith, and with his help he hoped to suppress Hussitism.
The conversion of their ruler to catholicism awakened immense indignation in the whole country. Dissatisfied warriors dethroned Peter
and helped Duke Alexander, who was Orthodox by faith, to the throne. (31)
Under these changed conditions even Kapistranus did not remain long in
Moldavia and in 1456 we meet him in Budin, from whence he wrote
complaining to the Pope that the Hussites had spread not only in
Bohemia and Moravia, but that also the Dukedom of Moldavia was infected
with their "cursed heresy". (32) When Kapistranus had to leave and go
to the Hunyad army near Belgrade new Hungarian missionaries were sent
to the Baia diocese to try afresh to gain at least the Orthodox
inhabitants, if not the Hussites, to the Catholic faith. It is
interesting that these new missionaries at the end of sixty years sent
a boastful report to Rome that, through their influence, "a great part
of the country was converted to the Catholic faith and that many of the
heretics from the Armenians and Rusinians accepted the Church's doctrine."
(33)
As a reward, the Pope, in October, 1461, gave them great privileges,
especially in the Moldavian dukedom, where until that time there were
no bishopric or parishes. We have no more detailed information about
the work of these missionaries but that they were busier, and that their
endeavour was greater than was the case with any of the other
missionaries before them, is witnessed by a writing of about 1461, which
has a roll of articles, in which the Moldavian Hussites transgressed
the teaching of the Catholic church. It is entitled, "Reprobationes

(31) A.D.Xenopol: Istoria III, 184-187. (History of Rumania.)
(33) C.Aumer: Episcopia Cath. p.115 ff.
Triginta octo articulorum, quos tenent heretici Usiti de Moldavis" (34)

These articles were sent to Rome for inspection, and they also requested instructions as to how they should proceed against the Moldavian Hussites, "so that they could easily destroy the heretical doctrine."

About a year later there appeared among the Hungarian and Saxon colonists round Siret new Catholic missionaries (quite probably through the instructions of the Holy See) under the leadership of Sebastianus but because he behaved impudently not only among the Hussites, but also among the Orthodox inhabitants, they were expelled from Moldavian territory the same year by order of Stephen himself, for an interesting reason. (35) An orthodox woman, possessed by an evil spirit, was said to have come to them and pleaded with them to be cleansed, giving a promise that she would accept the Catholic faith. The missionaries did as she asked and afterwards baptised her. When the orthodox clergymen heard about it they sent a delegation to them with a message that they should first look after their own herd, namely Hungary, and not the Orthodox believers, because they have not and can not have any right.

Hearing this, the missionaries attacked them with very rude remarks. After this report one of the Orthodox clergy went and complained to the ruler about their bad behaviour. Duke Stephen called Frater Sebastianus to him. There the latter tried to make a speech, which caused some to laugh and others to show anger, and, ignorant of what he could say as an excuse, he proclaimed: "If we had not been active in your land you would have been long ere this dragged away from here by the Turks into captivity and would have died in a foreign country." Duke Stephen was offended by this bold statement and passed sentence on him and on his brethren.

After 1461 when the Moldavian missionaries, who


(35) Cronica Minorum 52...anno 1462....tunc enim Frater Sebastianus Janosii electus custob Transylvaniae missus fuit ad moldaviam cum frateribus....etc.
inform about the Moldavian Hussites, were forced to leave Moldavian soil, we have no further news of the Hussite movement there until the first half of the 16th century. But that Hussitism did not disappear in Moldavia during this period is seen from the fact that about the middle of the 16th century there penetrated to the districts round the Eastern Carpathian rivers, Prut, Siret, Suczav, Moldav and Trotuse, anti-reformation missionaries from Poland and Hungary. They found there strong Hussite colonies, which had originated, for the most part, in the first half of the 15th century. The main centre of the Moldavian Hussites was probably the town of Husi, not far from the river Prut. The number of Hussites who lived in Husi, Romanu, and nearby, was over 2000, believers mostly of Hungarian nationality, although before the end of the 15th century some of them had gone to the Black Sea, to the mouth of the Dneister, to a little town Csábőcsök. Besides this, many Hussites lived on the Transylvanian-Moldavian border in a Hungarian village, Trotus, and in the German market town, Noam.(38)

Also a new colony, near to one of the Moldavian Hussite colonies, was founded by the Czech brethren who were expelled in 1481 from Moravia by King Matthias, and who found in Moldavia a new refuge. Under the organisation of their own priestly Order the Czech brethren undertook the long journey to the foreign land, to find Christians who were not under the obedience of the Catholic Church, "who have really faith in Christ and Christian deeds and virtuous clergy, as belongs to the officials of the Holy Church," and in accord with such a class of believers they wanted to build their religious community.

(37) Husi lies on the west side of the river Prut in a very deep valley, surrounded with steep mountains, which gave to the town natural fortress and it was from the end of the 15th century a refuge place during the battle with the Turks.
(38) Codex Bandinus, p.240.
One of the brethren, Túna, "writer, Latinist, who travelled through different countries, in Hungary founded a sect called Paulins." (40) It is possible that Túna passed through some of the Western Slavonian countries and there spent some time among the Bogomils. Other brethren visited the Eastern lands first of all, the regions of Russia and Moldavia, as we can see from their declaration in the tract "How the people should behave to the Roman Church," and other writings. (41) In them they betray an enormous knowledge of the religious relations between Russia, Armenia and Moldavia. The experience the brethren gained from their travels did not satisfy them because they did not find anywhere such believers as they were looking for, and so they founded for themselves their own Clergy. For this daring step the second persecution of the Catholic Church fell upon them, which lightened only after the death of King George of Poděbrad in 1471, when the new King Vladislav gave them an amnesty.

On 27th October, 1478, after long misunderstandings, an agreement was arrived at between King Matthias of Hungary and the Bohemian King Vladislav, under which only Bohemia belonged to Vladislav and Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia to Matthias. The Utraquists in Prague made use of this opportunity, and on 25th November of the same year they sent out a letter to their clergy "for the protection of the articles of faith against their attack and to admonish and even to comfort and solace the clergy." It speaks broadly about the "shameful sect of the Brethren" and warns them that nobody must join them and, with the consent of the King, they appealed to the "believers" not to suffer them in their midst. The pastoral list which the Utraquists sent to the clergy in the Margrave of Moravia had an even stronger tone.

(41) J. Bidlo: Acty Jednoty Bratřské 92.
It warned them and the "believers" about the "false brethren", who besmirch baptism and other sacraments and said of them "that they had left the fountain of living water and dug for themselves pitchers full of holes, which cannot hold any water." It said also that they denied the real consecration of the Roman clergy that "they have nothing permanent, nothing firm, nor even anything near the true faith", that they are "blind and leaders of the blind," and at the end it proclaimed them as stubborn obstinate and sentenced, and requested King Matthias not to suffer them to stay in his newly acquired Moravian lands, but to uproot them or expel them to some far place. This time the plan of the Utraquists Masters might have been quite successful, because at that time the Hungarian Bishops induced King Matthias to take an oath to expel the brethren from Moravia. (42) It was not necessary to press King Matthias to act against the Brethren because he also was afraid of a new "heresy" springing up in Moravia, where it would be strengthened by the coming of Waldensians from Brandenburg. In Slovakia, in particular, not long before, in January 1467, at the Castle of Kostolan, he had ruthlessly massacred troops of agitating "Bratricku" (Brethren), (43) and in "Bratřičcích" in Moravia he saw in them fellow-believers because the name connected them, so in 1481 he gave strict orders that they must leave Moravia immediately. And through the decision of the administrators of Jednota (Unitas) about whom we do not know very much, they chose for a new home the faraway Dukedom of Moldavia, and their leader was Mikuláš Slansky. (44) The question which interests us is why the "Brethren" went into a far-off country with conditions to which they were unaccustomed, perhaps with anxiety? It is probable that they

(42) Rukopis Pražské Univ. XVII. C.3. f.97 f. (Document from the Univ. of Prague.)

(43) Bratřičci sojourned in Slovakia about the middle of the 15th century. They were great part of the Czech Taborites, specially after the battle at Lipan and the fall of Tabor 1452 and some of them sought refuge in Slovakia.

considered many lands. They did not want to choose as their refuge the German lands because even there they feared persecution. They could not settle down in Hungary because of the ruler, King Matthias, who had expelled them from Moravia. (45) Also there were difficulties with regard to Poland, whose conditions they knew too well, and Russia did not perhaps draw them, so the only country left to them was Moldavia. The Brethren did not choose this country only because they did not have anywhere else to go, but also because they knew that the Moldavian Hussites lived in some kind of religious separation. So they also hoped for a quiet life in that land, for the reasons above-mentioned, and also because Czech Hussites were already living there. (46)

It is also possible that the lower Hungarian Hussites went there in 1437 and were in contact with some remnants of the Czech Taborite troops, who that same year had fought in Syrmia, and perhaps even with other Czech warriors or teachers who had learned the Taborite way of war. We come in contact with them during the fight with the Turks in Transylvania and very often, too, in both Romanian dukedoms, especially in the second half of the 15th century. Under these conditions the brethren hoped that in Moldavia they would be able to spread their propaganda. (47)

When the Brethren entered Moldavia they were, as their leader tells us, very kindly received by the ruler Duke Alexander (1457-1507). Their kind reception was probably partly due to the fact that they came from the land whose former ruler, George Poděbrad, was allied with Stephen in the fight with the Hungarian King Matthias. It was partly

also due to the fact that the Duke saw in them new colonists, who
would help to strengthen the native stock of his land. He also
expressed his sympathy with them, and allowed them to live as free
inhabitants "according to the Moldavian law" and to settle anywhere they
liked. It is probable that the Brethren acted accordingly and settled
down together, but it is not known where.

Reports are meagre about the stay of the Brethren in
Moldavia so that it is impossible to say what were their relations with
the local Hussites, but the opinion is that no closer contacts between the
Brethren and the local Hussites did not materialise. In the stormy
years of 1485 and 1486 difficulties arose for them through the sudden
raids by the Turks into Moldavia, when whole countrysides were destroyed
and many people murdered, so that their first concern was self-preservation
before starting any attempts to spread their teaching. When they
tried their propaganda on religious questions among the Moldavian
inhabitants, the results of their labour were not great. (48) The
failure of their mission work, and the stormy political conditions in
Moldavia caused the greater part of the Brethren to wish to return home
to their Moravian fatherland, and it is rather surprising that their wish
was fulfilled. While the Brethren were in exile their friends in
Moravia, especially the provincial captain, Ctibor Tovačovský of Cimburka
and Vílem of Pernštejna endeavoured to gain permission for their return
home. After a long struggle they succeeded in inducing the King to
allow the Brethren to return and besides that persuaded him to assure
the Brethren that should they be expelled again, they would be given one
year's grace to sell their belongings. (49)

The Brethren moved from Moldavia in parties and some of them
reached Moravia by the end of May, 1490, while King Matthias was still

Archiv Česky: 282 ff.
alive. After 1490 some of the emigrant Brethren were still living in the Moldavian dukedom, those who were not inclined to return to their fatherland. (50) It was this circumstance which brought from Bohemia in 1491 four members of the Unitas: Lukas of Prague, Kaspar Branibrosky, Mares Kokovec and Martin Kabatnik. (51) Because of the internal discord of the Brethren they set out in March of that year on a reconnoitring journey to the Eastern lands, to find the "first holy church nourished constantly from the tradition of the apostolic faith" and to examine their "method and rule" by which they would solve disputes in their own circle. What conditions these travellers found in the Moldavian districts is never mentioned in their writings. Brother Lukas only once forced his way into the Balkan and Valach lands, and then with pain recalled only the many hardships and adventures which befell him. (52)

If some of the Czech Brethren were still in Moldavia at the time when Lukas was travelling there, their fate is not to be envied. At that time Turks appeared in the Moldavian regions and also hordes of Crimean Tartars, so that torment, trouble, hardship and grief were pressed during those times, on all the inhabitants of Moldavia, whatever confession they might be.

Russsitism then did not acquire a greater following in the Eastern European countries than in other lands, for example in Germany and Poland, but even so it has a greater significance. In

Poland it resembled a kind of momentary convulsion and often
manifested itself more as a political movement than as a religious
one (53). In the above-mentioned lands it spread among the lower
classes and acquired the nature of a popular movement as it was in the
Bohemian lands. When the Hussite movement spread in Germany or
elsewhere in the western countries it was restricted to individuals
only, or : small narrow circles, some of which went back on
their boldness by recanting, while others went to the stake for their
religious convictions.

Not one of the inquisitors who came to Moldavia or
Transylvania in the 15th century ever succeeded in completely destroying
Hussitism there. It was actually destined to further endurance and,
therefore, ultimately accomplished far more than the temporal movement
in other countries. It was on Moldavian-Transylvanian soil that,
through Hussite influence, the translation of the Scriptures into the
Hungarian, German and Rumanian languages took place. The Moldavian
Hussites used their mother tongue at their services, even when they
were squeezed into the narrow frame of the Conservative Order of the
Latin Church through the efforts of the agressive counter-reformation.

J. Bidlo: Czech Emigrants-C.C.M.1895, 123, 256, 450.
CONCLUSION.

Though I am concluding this study of Hus, I feel I will always have to return to him, not because he was a fellow countryman or a hero, or the great spiritual leader of a nation, but because he knew God, and lived with God, and his whole life was surrendered to God. It was this surrender to God, which induced Hus to bring others, Bohemians and the people of other lands alike, to the foot of the Cross.

The influence of the life and work of Hus has persisted. It first appeared amidst the confusion caused by many complicated and conflicting issues, but it was finally gathered up and absorbed by various parties and bodies.

Though the Hussite spirit was crushed, it was not extinguished. Sparks smouldering beneath the ashes of oppression sprang into flame again and again, breaking out in various parts of Europe. As we have seen, its spread was chiefly limited to Central and Eastern Europe, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the age. The name of Hus is honoured and revered everywhere. This is becoming ever truer as the knowledge of the history and culture of Czechoslovakia increases as a result of the exile of many Czechs in the Western lands. It is thus possible that a renewal of Hus's influence may emerge even from the tragedy of war.

The memory of a great and good man cannot perish. The towering excellence of Hus, his unselfish devotion, his large and
generous aims, his pure passion for mankind, have yielded abundant instruction and inspiration. The good and great men of God have an immortality on earth that death cannot touch.

Hus's spirit lives in all the efforts of humanity to emancipate itself from the chains of spiritual oppression and to achieve that liberty of soul, that freedom, of which John Hus himself was one of the noblest prophets.
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