
The War of Symbols: The Goose and the Chalice Against the Cross

František Šmahel

(Prague)

The conceptual confrontation of two antithetical approaches to the biblical tidings escalated into a military conflict in late 1419 and early 1420. The spiritual sword yielded to the physical sword. It is significant that the banner with a cross did not find its counterpart in a banner with a chalice among the artistic symbols of the Catholic party, but in one with a goose. Perhaps it was also because the chalice was no less a sacred sign for the Catholics than for the Czech Utraquists¹ that the illuminators of the party *sub una* let the Hussites fight under a banner with the picture of the goose. While for Czech or Czech-speaking Catholics there was an obvious semantic connection between the name of the arch-heretic Hus and his followers the “Hussites”, it was not so in the German linguistic milieu, in which the bird, called *husa* in modern Czech or *hus* in medieval Czech, was designated by an entirely dissimilar word *Gans*. During his university lectures and elsewhere, Jan Hus deflected the mocking of his opponents and others by his own good natured self-identification with this domestic fowl. Even if occasionally a few of Hus’s partisans did so, the pejorative and mocking puns on Hus’s name stemmed mostly from the writings of Catholic polemicists who used not only the Czech word, but also the Latin equivalent (*auca*) by means of which the pejorative sense of *hus* became known to the non-Bohemian world.²

It did not take long from the oral expression of the pejorative symbol to its corresponding pictorial manifestation. Most likely, still before the year 1419, there appeared pictographs of the goose with a contrary allegorical significance. The positive symbolism of self-identification of this sign for the Hussites of diverse kinds is indirectly evidenced by one of the Taborite chiliastic articles, which admitted “the image of a lion, an eagle, a lamb, a goose, or a crown” on a banner or a seal.³ Two or three hitherto known examples of this type are not entirely unambiguous, permitting a double explanation. Probably the oldest one is an artless drawing of a goose with an inscription *Husska* in the margin of Hus’s treatise *De sanguine Christi sub specie vini*, held by the Library of the University of Basel (MS A X 66, f. 347^a).⁴

¹ A substantial documentation of the motif of chalice, in both Pre-Hussite domestic and foreign pictorial art, is offered in Milena Bartlová, “Původ husitského kalicha z ikonografického hlediska,” *Umění* 44 (1996) 167-173.

² For additional information on this topic see František Šmahel, “Husa na korouhvi a ve znaku: příspěvek k husitské symbolice,” in *Seminář a jeho hosté. Sborník prací k šedesátým narozeninám doc. Dr. Rostislava Nového* (Prague, 1992) 107-113.

³ See *Articuli et errores Taboritarum*, ed. František Palacký, in *Archiv český* III (1844) 244. It is worth mentioning that the Latin articles of the Taborite priests, included in the *Chronicle* of Vavřinec of Březová, do not permit any exception in that regard; see also FRB V: 405.

⁴ This manuscript became known to Czech researchers from František M. Bartoš’s “Hussitika a bohemika několika knihoven německých a švýcarských,” *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk*,

The manuscript, which in addition to several of Hus's writings contains, among others, *Tabulae veteris et novi coloris* by Nicholas of Dresden, lacks a date of origin, but it is probable that it was written after 1417 and before the end of 1436 when it was acquired by Jan Stojkovič of Dubrovnik [John of Ragusa] during his visit to Prague.⁵

The second example is by coincidence also connected with the year 1438 that dates the Psalter in the National Library in Prague (MS Osek 71), which was later acquired by the Catholic prelate, Hanuš of Kolovraty (d. 1483). A drollery at the lower edge of f. 14^v depicts a hunchbacked dwarf, who is swinging his sword against a bird in a pugnacious pose with spread-out wings. That peculiar creature with a crown on his head could be regarded equally as either an ape or a king of fools. Inasmuch as his shield bears a black cross in a red field, the scene could depict the caricature of a crusader who is attacking a goose symbolizing – in a positive sense – Hussitism.⁶ It cannot, however, be excluded that the drollery aimed at both sides. If it is so, then the caricature applies not only the Catholic crusader, but also to the Hussite represented as the domestic feathered fowl. An illuminator, who worked for Catholic, as well as Utraquist, customers, would be justified in adopting such an approach.⁷ Finally, the third example also has the form of an artistic allegory, the meaning of which is not obvious at the first sight. The drollery is found on the title page of a Latin exegesis of St. Paul's Epistles by Jan Rokycana., and it depicts a goose which is threatened with a crossbow by a noble standing on a green hill. Inasmuch as the manuscript, held by the National Museum in Prague (MS II D 1b), which depicts the drollery on f. 1^b, was written in 1466, the image evidently refers to the militant League of Catholic nobles, which was established to combat the Hussites on Zelená Hora [i.e. Green Mountain] on 28 November 1465.⁸

Even if it is not possible to exclude isolated cases of self-identification with the goose among the Hussites, the fact still remains that from the very beginning the central symbol of the Bohemian Reform movement was the chalice. The adherents to the Four Articles of Prague viewed the reception of the Lord's blood under the species of wine as a broadening of the sacramental communication with the Saviour of such a significance, that – as early as 1420 – the Taborite captain, Jan Žižka,

Třída I (1931) 57. Dr. Karel Hruža called my attention to the reference to the drawing of the goose, mentioned here.

⁵ The description of MS A X 66 by Bartoš is the fullest one, as far as I know. Otherwise see Max Steinmann, *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Basel: Register zu den Abteilungen A I – A XI und O* (Basel, 1992). The codex comes from the estate of Jan Stojkovič, concerning whose participation at the Prague coronation of Albrecht II on 29 June 1438, see Rudolf Urbánek, *Věk poděbradský*, 4 vv. (Prague, 1915-1962) 1:339. The dating *post quem* was justified by Howard Kaminsky, "Master Nicholas of Dresden 'The Old Color and the New': Selected Works Contrasting the Primitive Church and the Roman Church," in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 51,1 (1965) 53.

⁶ This is the judgment of Karel Stejskal in a catalogue which he coedited with Petr Voit, *Iluminované rukopisy doby husitské* (Prague, 1991) 60-61 n. 45. The catalogue contains further details and references to literature.

⁷ I have already intimated this explanation in my study *Husa na korouhvi* 112.

⁸ This drollery is noted by Stejskal, *Iluminované rukopisy* 61 at n. 45. Concerning the preserved manuscript of Rokycana's exegesis see František Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna* (Prague, 1928) 47 n. 42.

chose the chalice as a sign on his seal.⁹ Žižka's example was followed not only by other individual captains, but also by entire Hussite leagues.¹⁰ It is definitely worth noting that the chalice on Hussite seals and banners is mentioned in the supplemental chapter of *Tractatus de longevo schismate* by Ludolf, the abbot of Žagaň, who died on 21 August 1421.¹¹ On the contrary, however, the illuminator of a Czech-language Old Testament (National Library, Prague, MS XVII A 34, f. 115^a) still in the 1430s left empty (without any symbol) the banner of the Hussite host fighting the Crusaders, although otherwise he characterized the Hussites with long shields, flails, and halberds.¹²

Although one can never be too careful, it is possible to assume that Hussite warriors likewise used the banner with a chalice when operating in the neighboring countries, and that the delegations of Hussite leagues rode into towns under this symbol. We know, for instance, that on reaching Nuremberg during his journey to Basel in December 1432, Matěj Lauda of Chlumčany raised over his wagon a banner which bore, on one side, the image of Christ on the cross, and on the other side, the image of a chalice surmounted by a host and an inscription "Veritas omnia vincit."¹³ A later rejoinder may be seen in the banner on the image of the Hussites' great battle with the crusaders in the Jena Codex. The author of the depiction, Janíček Zmílelý of Písek used as his model a woodcut from a Nuremberg publication of 1491, which he updated and expanded.¹⁴ Both famous depictions of Jan Žižka at the head of the Hussite host in the manuscripts of Göttingen and Jena show the chalice on a banner. Similarly, the chalice on a banner appears on the tiles with Hussite warriors from the second half of the fifteenth century. Here, however, partly the small dimensions of the image, partly the lack of technological skills of the time, precluded the inclusion of the inscription with a motto.¹⁵

⁹ See also *Katalog výstavy na paměť Jana Žižky z Trocnova*, ed. Václav Novotný (Prague, 1924) 16-17, n. 14 (with description and copy).

¹⁰ For an inventory of seals with the sign of chalice see Václav Vojtíšek, "O tábořských pečetích a erbech," in his *Výbor rozprav a studií* (Prague, 1953) 380-397; subsequently see also František Šmahel, *Dějiny Tábora do roku 1452 I,2* (České Budějovice, 1990) 584-85, and illustrations 104-107; and also *idem*, *Husa na korouhvi* 109-110.

¹¹ Ludolph von Sagan, *Tractatus de longevo schismate* in Johannes Loserth, ed., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hussitischen Bewegung* III [Archiv für österreichische Geschichte 60] (Vienna, 1880) 533: "Dederunt eciam intelligere diversis nacionum populis se propter hoc in suo signeto calicis uti figura, quod secundum impiam et mendosam assercionem eorum omnes fideles populi tenerentur ex necessitate salutis communicare sub utraque specie..." On the Anti-Hussite tendency of this work see in detail Franz Machilek, *Ludolf von Sagan und seine Stellung in der Auseinandersetzung um Konziliarismus und Hussitismus* (Munich, 1967) 159-77. On Ludolf's death date *ibid.* 49.

¹² See Josef Krása, *České iluminované rukopisy 13.-16. století* (Prague, 1990) 317, with an illustration on 354. Stejskal, *Iluminované rukopisy* 60, n. 44, likewise dates this manuscript prior to 1440.

¹³ See František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě* III,3, 3rd ed. (Prague, 1877) 65, whose testimony has passed on to all subsequent literature.

¹⁴ See Václav Hnízdo, "Příspěvek k umělecko-historické analýze husitského kodexu z Jeny," *Umění* 4 (1956) 338-42.

¹⁵ See the recent work of Zdeněk Hazlbauer, *Krásy středověkých kamen: Obraz náboženských idejí v českém uměleckém řemesle* (Prague, 1998) 202-208, and illustrations 119-120. Earlier literature is also listed, in particular, Jaromír Kouba, "Středověké kachle s husitskými bojovníky," *ČNM* 135 (1966) 25-34. The dating of the individual specimens remains an open question.

The symbol of the chalice was, among others, also affixed on shields,¹⁶ bucklers, tents, and military garments. As an example, we can cite the caricaturized depiction of the Taborite “brother” with a flail over his shoulder and a goose under his belt.¹⁷ There is still a dispute about the meaning of the chalice, which appears on the shield of King David, shown as a victor over superior forces. This scene is included as an illustration in the “Mirror of Human Salvation” [*Zrcadlo člověčího spasení*] in the so-called *Krumlovský sborník* (National Museum, Prague, MS III B 10, f. pag. 40). According to Josef Krása, Karel Stejskal, and other authors the scene reflects the Hussites’ self-confidence, enhanced by their victory over the crusaders’ superior forces.¹⁸ If, as Bartlová has tried to demonstrate, this illuminated codex originated as early as 1415, and not some five years later, then the scene with the chalice could not be interpreted as an allegorical portrayal of a few Utraquists’ victory over the crusaders’ armies.¹⁹ Bartlová was challenged by Stejskal, who defended his hypothesis by citing a number of historical factors, all of which, however, were not relevant to the dating of the illustration.²⁰

Although the Hussites considered the chalice as a symbol of the laymen’s expanded interaction with the divinity, they always stood for an integrity of the sacrament of the altar as a communion in both kinds. The host, therefore, was never subordinate to the chalice in the Utraquist theology, but an indispensable part of the twofold nature of the eucharist, as attested by the earliest Hussite seals. This is true both of Žižka’s seal from 1420, and of the seals of Taborite communes, in which at times the chalice with a host is encircled by a crown of thorns. The oldest seal of the commune of Hora Hradiště, attached to a document of October 10, 1424, depicts the chalice on a round mountain which symbolizes pilgrimages to elevated grounds in general and to the mountain of Tábor in particular. In addition to the eucharist, Tábor is guarded by a flail on one side and, on the other, by an unsheathed sword pointing upwards.²¹

The clearest symbol of the paramountcy of communion *sub utraque* is the chalice with a host on the banner of Žižka’s troops depicted in the Göttingen Manuscript (f. 38^a). The host appears here once more in the so-called radial monstrance, carried by a priest at the head of a crowd. The Jena Codex depicts the same scene, but with the difference that the chalice on the banner lacks a host (f. 76^a). The First Defenestration of Prague was allegedly triggered by a stone, cast from a window of the New Town’s city hall at an unspecified monstrance, which a

¹⁶ Let it suffice to refer here to the shield of Kutná Hora from the period 1470-80, which is inventoried in Vladimír Denkstein, “Pavézy českého typu I,” *Sborník Národního musea*, Series A Historia 16,4-5 (1962) 188-89, n. 2.

¹⁷ Caricature of the “Taborite brother,” on the overleaf of the New Testament (Okresní archiv Tábor, ms. n. 195), was last reproduced in František Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, 2nd ed., 4 vv. (Prague, 1993) 3: illustration 120. On the problems of Hussite military symbols see also Vojtíšek, “O tábořských pečetích,” 389-90, and Bartlová, “Původ husitského kalicha,” 177-79, including also additional evidence.

¹⁸ Stejskal, *Illuminované rukopisy* 51-52, n. 27, including also earlier literature.

¹⁹ Bartlová, “Původ husitského kalicha,” 167-83.

²⁰ Karel Stejskal, “Poznámky ke Krumlovskému sborníku,” *Umění* 45 (1997) 93-96, and “Odpověď [Mileny Bartlové] Karlu Stejskalovi,” *ibid.* 96.

²¹ On the symbolism and seal markings of the Taborite communities see František Šmahel, *Dějiny tábora* I,2 illustrations 104-107 following pp. 408 and 584-85.

priest carried at the head of a Hussite procession on 30 July 1419.²² Let us leave aside the question of this report's reliability, because one way or another it may be assumed that priests and preachers carried the sacrament of the altar in processions on various occasions. The radial monstrance itself, however, quite certainly was not a Utraquists' innovation, so that it cannot be considered in itself an attribute of Hussite iconography.²³

Of uncertain significance, because of its iconographic ambivalence, is the depiction of the chalice and the radial monstrance with a host in the Krumlovský sborník (p. 190). The two liturgical objects are exposed on the altar, and viewed by a kneeling group of three men and two women with devout expressions and with their hands clasped together. The scene is virtually identical with the liturgical innovation described by Vavřinec of Březová, according to whom – when images were not tolerated in churches – the body of Christ was exhibited for adoration by the faithful in a monstrance, placed in a stone tabernacle on the main altar.²⁴ The denominational neutrality of the radial monstrance, and of the solar disk in general, is attested by the earlier incidence of these symbols in the devotional cult of St. Bernardine of Sienna, which the Observants of the Order of St. Francis had promoted particularly in Moravia in the second half of the fifteenth century.²⁵

The chalice and the radial monstrance with a host in the Krumlovský sborník can be interpreted without a doubt as an adoration of the sacrament of the altar in both kinds. A very early specimen of this topos, here certainly of Utraquist provenance, can be found on several tiles from the ruins of the Sión Castle. Two floating angels support the chalice with a host from each sides. The tile relief is complemented under the long stem of the chalice by a rounded escutcheon with a wound arrow, the heraldic sign of the Hussite captain, Roháč of Dubá. Of extraordinary value is not only the identification of the owner, but also the dating of the relief's origin *ad quem*, inasmuch as the castle was destroyed after the conquest of Sión and the capture of Captain Jan Roháč in the summer of 1437.²⁶ The topos

²² See particularly the report in Manuscript "R" of the *Old Bohemian Annals* [*Staré letopisy české*] in F. Šimek, ed., *Staré letopisy české z vratislavského rukopisu* (Prague, 1937) 19: "A v tom, že by někdo s rathúzu na kněze kamenem lučil, kterýžto monstranci s tělem božím nesl...." Other, mainly less trustworthy sources are gathered by Howard Kaminsky, "The Prague Insurrection on 30 July 1419," *Mediaevalia et Humanistica* 17 (1966) 106 n. 1; see also František Graus, *Struktur und Geschichte: Drei Volksaufstände im mittelalterlichen Prag*, Vorträge und Forschungen. Sonderband 7 (Sigmaringen, 1971) 62 n. 46. Contrary to the two authors, Amedeo Molnár, *Pohyb teologického myšlení: Dějiny dogmatu* (Prague, 1982) 240, is of the opinion that the challenge to the eucharistic symbol became the psychological catalyst of the defenestration and thereby of the entire revolution.

²³ Much convincing evidence, of earlier date, has been gathered by Dana Stehlíková, "K českému zlatnictví doby husitské a pohusitské," *Umění* 40 (1992) 303-306. I regret to have to call attention to the imprecision of references in n. 45.

²⁴ Vavřinec of Březová, *Kronika*, ed. Jaroslav Goll in FRB V: 411. This report is emphasized, as a reason for dating the Krumlovský sborník to early Hussitism, by Stejskal, *Iluminované rukopisy* 52, n. 27. To the contrary, Bartlová, "Původ husitského kalicha," 181 n. 4, is of the opinion that the radial monstrance cannot be considered a Hussite innovation because of this first reference to it.

²⁵ Further discussion in Stehlíková, "K českému zlatnictví doby husitské," 306; and Ivo Hlobil, "Středověké ochranné nápisy v Olomouci," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 31 (1979) 182-89.

²⁶ According to Jaroslav Čechura, "Sión a Kunětická Hora: Hrady husitské revoluce?" *Husitský Tábor* 5 (1982) 153-57, Jan Roháč rebuilt Hrádek of the metropolitan chapter, which he had seized at the beginning of the wars of the Bohemian Reformation. On the fall of Sión and its owner's execution see Petr Čornej and Bohdan Zilynskyj, "Jan Roháč z Dubé a Praha," *Pražský sborník historický* 20 (1987) 35-61.

of adoring the sacrament *sub utraque specie*, and not merely the chalice – as has been often erroneously maintained – was greatly favoured in the Hussite milieu, a fact attested by numerous variant types from several urban and fortress sites.²⁷ The second half of the fifteenth century is the likely period of the Taborite variant of two standing angels with crosses on their heads.²⁸ Impressive is also the later tile relief from the Lichnice Castle – this time with only one angel holding the chalice. An adoration of specifically the chalice can be seen in the depiction of the Jena Codex (f. 28^b), in which the Virgin Mary looks piously at her child, while an old man – in a parallel manner – gazes at a chalice.

Since we have established that the Hussites, both at home and abroad, represented themselves under the sign of the chalice, the question which must be answered is to what extent the symbolism of the goose bore pejorative connotations for them.²⁹ Although Hus himself could rise above the various forms of ridicule concerning his name,³⁰ most of his followers were offended by the designation of themselves as “Hussites”. This was brought home to the initial delegates of the Council of Basel in Bohemia, and resulted in their recommendation to the Council Fathers to avoid the designation of “Hussites” for the Bohemian schismatics.³¹

The fact that the Hussite warriors inspired respect not only in Central Europe by 1430 is attested by a copper engraving of the so-called Great or Burgundian Battle in the Rothschild Collection of the Louvre Museum. According to Lilly Fischel, the engraving is a reverse copy of an early Dutch painting from the period 1419-1433, depicting an indecisive encounter between the crusaders and the Hussites. While the alleged crusaders battle under the banner with a lion, the standard of their opponents bears the distinct sign of a goose.³² The assumption of Hussite presence is supported by the incidence of weapons like flails, clubs, and face shields, the last of which were particularly characteristic of the applied art of Bohemia. The Hussite theme of this work was also suggested by Charles Sterling, who interpreted the scene as a reflection of the battle between Sigismund of Luxembourg and the Hussites in front of Kutná Hora toward the end of 1421. In disagreement with Fischel, however, he views the engraving as a German product in the period of transition from the 1420s to the 1430s.³³ Despite the divergent views

²⁷ For a summary and enrichment of older literature see Hazlbauer, *Krásy středověkých kamen* 213-15.

²⁸ Recently discussed by Rudolf Krajíc, *Středověká kachlová kamna v Táboře* (Tábor, 1997) 129. Aeneas Sylvius saw the topos of angel with a chalice on one of the two shields of the outer fortress gate of Tábor in 1451, see “List Eneáše Silvia o cestě na sněm do Benešova a dvojí zastávce v Táboře,” trans. Augustin Kadlec, *Jihočeský sborník historický* 22 (1953) 107.

²⁹ As far as I know, the existence of Hussite banners with a goose was admitted only by Stejskal, *Iluminované rukopisy* 33. The pejorative thrust of the hitherto known depictions of geese on banners is emphasized by the bird’s facing away from the flagpole. According to a kind information from Dr. Zdeněk Uhlíř, such a pose involves a serious breach of heraldic protocol.

³⁰ On this topic see Šmahel, *Husa na korouhvi*, 107-108.

³¹ See Ferdinand Seibt, *Hussitica: Zur Struktur einer Revolution*, 2nd ed. (Cologne and Vienna, 1990) 14.

³² Lilly Fischel, “Die ‘Grosse’ Schlacht: Analyse eines Kupferstiches,” *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch* 21 (1959) 159-72.

³³ Charles Sterling, *Études Savoyardes* 1 (1971) 14-19.

on the origin and date of the “Great Battle”,³⁴ it is by and large agreed that the goose on the banner reflects the military history of Hussite Bohemia.

The goose on one of the banners, depicted in the “Great Battle”, was not necessarily a mark of slander. It might have served merely to identify one of the parties in combat. In any case, the artist obviously was aware of the allegorical meaning of the goose, whether or not he knew that the Hussites themselves preferred to use the chalice for self-identification. We find similar uncertainty in other imagery. Two apposite scenes from the Bohemian wars in a manuscript of the Austrian National Library (cod. 3062, f. 147^a-148^b) became known, thanks to Hugo Toman, already at the end of the nineteenth century.³⁵ Subsequently, both images were reproduced several times, but they were not subject to scholarly investigation until eighty years later in the work of Volker Schmidtchen.³⁶ The Codex, dating to c. 1450, has been thought to contain the *Liber de arte bellica* by Hans Hartlieb, but this attribution is most likely without a foundation.³⁷ For our purposes it is sufficient to touch on the two war scenes. The image on the left side depicts a battle between the crusaders and the Hussites with both sides seeking protection behind movable shields. While a black cross on a white field adorns the banner fluttering above the heads of the crusaders, the other warring side is emblemized by a goose drinking from the chalice. Many years ago I understood this unprecedented image as a blasphemy of a revered Hussite symbol,³⁸ at present I wish to suggest that the image is a product of associated connotations. This is evident from the second image on which the two Hussite symbols also appear, but this time separately from each other. The scene depicts the Hussites enclosed by phalanxes of wagons. While a white goose striding on a red field flutters on a banner, a golden chalice on a red coat of arms decorates the commander’s tent in the middle of the enclosure.

It remains to mention the illuminated manuscripts, “The Memorabilia of the History of Emperor Sigismund’s Time,” among which particularly the Codex of the Austrian National Library (MS 13. 975) contains the most extensive collection of illustrative materials for the wars of the Bohemian Reformation.³⁹ The manuscript,

³⁴ For additional opinions see Jarmila Vacková and František Šmahel, “Odezva husitských Čech v evropském malířství,” *Umění* 30 (1982) 336-37 n. 55; see also detailed commentaries *ibid.*, 317-18 and 322-25.

³⁵ Hugo Toman, *Husitské válečnictví z doby Žižkovy a Prokopovy* (Prague, 1898) tab. 4-5, description on 203-204.

³⁶ Volker Schmidtchen, “Karrenbüchse und Wagenburg: Hussitische Innovationen zur Technik und Taktik im Kriegswesen des späten Mittelalters,” *Wirtschaft, Technik und Geschichte: Festschrift für Albrecht Timm zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Volker Schmidtchen and Eckhard Jäger (Berlin, 1980) 92-96. The author addressed the narrative content of these illustrations also elsewhere, see particularly in *Kriegswesen im späten Mittelalter: Technik, Taktik, Theorie*, Acta Humaniora (Winheim, 1990) 214-17.

³⁷ At least, the work is not included in the bibliography of this encyclopedic savant by Klaus Grubmüller, “Hartlieb, Johannes,” in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* (New York and Berlin, 1983) v. 4, col. 480-96. See also entry “Hartlieb, Hans,” by Volker Schmidtchen in *ibid.* col. 497-99. A “Kriegsbuch” in the MS of Freiburg University Library (n. 362) is identified as a work of Hans Haertlieb by the *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon*, 3rd ed. (Bern and Munich, 1968-) 7: col. 391-93.

³⁸ František Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* (České Budějovice, 1971) 197, illustration 5. The banner with the goose was considered “a mocking sign” also by Josef Krása, “Studie o rukopisech husitské doby,” *Umění* 22 (1974) 22.

³⁹ The High German text of the *Memorabilia* was published by Wilhelm Altmann as *Eberhard Windeckes Denkwürdigkeiten zur Geschichte des Zeitalters Kaiser Sigismund* (Berlin, 1893). A copy in the library of Ladies’ College in Cheltenham was used for a more or less incidental illustration of King

bearing the date 1443, was illustrated in Diebold Lauber's prospering workshop in the town of Hagenau of Lower Saxony.⁴⁰ Altogether forty-six full-page illustrations refer specifically to the Hussite history of Bohemian Lands, beginning with Jan Hus's immolation in Constance on 6 July 1415, and ending with Emperor Sigismund's death in Znojmo on 9 December 1437. The diverse sign and banners assist in the identification of the depicted persons, whose sketchily drawn features tend to resemble each other like several peas in the same pod. Most of the emblematic designations are authentic, which is not particularly surprising, inasmuch as the coats-of-arms of Sigismund, the electors of the Holy Roman Empire, and the foremost Central European rulers (including the dukes of Bavaria and Austria) must have been well known in Lauber's workshop. The representatives of Czech Roman Catholic aristocracy display uniformly the Bohemian lion, while a sketch of the Lithuanian coat-of-arms can be distinguished on the banner of Duke Sigismund Korybut.

Roughly until the spring of 1428, the Hussites in this set of illustrations appear without any visible emblematic markings. A banner with a red geometric form on a white field appears for the first time above the heads of the Orphans, who penetrated from Tachov to Bavaria between the end of May and the beginning of June 1428.⁴¹ With a bit of imagination, a schematic suggestion of a chalice could be discerned in the two juxtaposed triangles with their tips touching. The first evidence of the Hussite symbol, already familiar to us, appears on a banner, which flutters above a camp encircled by a wall of wagons, at which the forces of Hanuš of Polensko and Albrecht of Koldice ambushed the Orphans in November 1428. A white goose on a red field can be discerned on the banner. Henceforth all the Hussite factions, including the Praguers, appear under this emblem in the remaining illustrations.⁴² In connection with the allegorical meaning of the goose, it is also relevant to mention at least briefly the iconographic topos of a wolf, or a similar beast, deceiving a flock of feathered creatures by their preaching. An allegory of false preachers, such as the

Sigismund in a Crusaders' Camp near Prague by Frederick G. Heymann, *John Žižka and the Hussite Revolution*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1969) illustration n. 2 at p. 147 (without an indication of the provenance). A richly illustrated manuscript in Vienna (Austrian National Library, MS no. 13.975) had for a long time escaped the attention of Czech scholarship. I mentioned it for the first time in my article "Husitské války v obrazech," *Dějiny a současnost* 14 no. 3 (1992) 10-13; subsequently I have reproduced a series of sixteen images pertinent to Hussitism in my *Husitská revoluce*, 2d ed. 4: illustrations 124-139 at p. 168.

⁴⁰ From earlier literature see Arthur Wyss, "Eberhard Windeck und sein Sigmundbuch," *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 11 (1894) 433-83; Rudolf Kautzsch, "Diebold Lauber und seine Werkstatt in Hagenau," *ibid.* 12 (1895) 1-113; *idem*, "Diebold Lauber und seine Werkstatt," *Archiv für Buchgewerbe und Gebrauchsgraphik* 63 (1926) 42-45. More recent literature about Lauber's atelier is rather extensive, but the illustrations to Windeck's opus are neglected. Only Michail A Bojcov, "Ephemerität und Permanenz bei Herrschereinzügen in Spätmittelalterlichen Deutschland," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 24 (1997) 95-97, has used, in order to illustrate his exposition, four images from the Vienna MS 13.975.

⁴¹ Austrian National Library, MS Cod. 13.975, f. 268b. See also Altmann, *Eberhardt Windeckes Denkwürdigkeiten* 236-37.

⁴² Austrian National Library, MS Cod. 13.975, f. 275a. See also Altmann, *Eberhardt Windeckes Denkwürdigkeiten* 242-43. For additional examples see Austrian National Library, MS Cod. 13.975, f. 343^a, 422^a. It may also be noted, that a small coat-of-arms with a goose on the red field likewise appears on the chest of a messenger, who is delivering a Hussite manifesto to Sigismund and to the dukes of the Empire in February 1431, *ibid.* 312^b, and Altmann, *Eberhardt Windeckes Denkwürdigkeiten* 300-309.

Franciscan Observants, and their gullible listeners suggests itself.⁴³ The case for dating to the Hussite times, however, has been recently weakened by archeological findings in Jihlava and in Rokštejn Castle that indicate the incidence of this topos as early as the end of the fourteenth century.⁴⁴

To sum up: The collection of the individual pieces of evidence, taken together, indicates that the depictions, preserved in contemporary manuscripts and artistic specimens, give us a fairly close sense of the authentic identity of the Hussite emblems.

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

⁴³ See Zdeněk Smetánka, "Ad lupum predicantem: Relief pozdně gotického kachle jako historický pramen," *Archeologické rozhledy* 35 (1983) 316-26, 360, and my note in *Husitský Tábor* 6/7 (1984) 479-81. New discoveries are discussed in Hazlbauer, *Krása středověkých kamen* 222-26, together with relevant literature.

⁴⁴ See Zdeněk Měřínský, "Iterum 'ad lupum predicantem' ," in *Život v archeologii středověku* (Prague, 1997) 459-66.