
What Was Known About Matěj of Janov During the First Four Centuries After His Death?

Ota Halama

(Prague)

Matěj of Janov (d. 1393) has enjoyed in the last few years much deserved attention.¹ It has been shown that Matěj's ideas affected not only his famous disciple, Jakoubek of Stříbro, but also other theologians of the Bohemian Reformation whose work inspired generations of their successors: the Utraquists and the Brethren alike.² Even so Janov remains elusive, and scattered bits of information do not afford a coherent picture of what the succeeding generation knew about him, and what sources have preserved concerning him during the following four centuries. Therefore, I shall present a systematic discussion of what was known about his life and about his work at various times, and finally deal with the individual translations of his writings into the Czech language.³

The earliest known report about the life of Matěj of Janov is in the St. Stephen's Day sermon of the priest Mikuláš Mníšek from the years 1415–1417:⁴ *In Bohemia beatum Adalbertum in Prussiam expellentes relegaverunt, Milicium Avinione, Mathiam de castro Pragensi, Johannem, gloriosum martirem, Constancie cremaverunt etc.*⁵ František M. Bartoš, who discovered this document, assumed that it referred to Matěj's deposition from the canonry at St. Vitus's Cathedral in connection with his restoration in 1389. We can agree with Bartoš, because subsequent documents confirm this assumption. Otherwise, however, despite the appeal of Matěj's writings to Jakoubek, Nicholas of Dresden, Jan Rokycana, and Mikuláš of Pelhřimov, by and large we do not find biographical data concerning

¹ Above all, the fifth and last book of Matěj's *Regule* finally appeared in a published form: *Matthiae de Janov Regularum Veteris et Novi Testamenti Liber V De Corpore Cristi*, eds. Jana Nechutová and Helena Krmíčková (Munich, 1993). A collection edited by Milan Machovec and Jana Nechutová, *Mladá Vožice k počtě M. Matěje z Janova* [(The town of) Mladá Vožice to the memory of Matěj of Janov] (Mladá Vožice, 1994; 2nd ed. 2000), gathered papers presented at a symposium in Mladá Vožice, held on 3 December 1993. Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova. Jeho život, spisy a učení* [Matěj of Janov. His life, writings and teaching] (Brno, 2000) appeared as a reprint of the original edition from 1905. The latest biography of Matěj is included in Jana Nechutová, *Latinská literatura českého středověku do roku 1400* [Latin literature of the Czech middle ages to the year 1400] (Prague, 2000), 205-207. Finally, a collection, *Mistr Matěj z Janova ve své a v naší době*, [Matěj of Janov in his and our age] eds. Jan Blahoslav Lášek and Karel Skalický (Brno, 2002), contains papers from a symposium, sponsored by the Theological Faculty, South Bohemian University in České Budějovice, 29-30 November 2000.

² For a partial account of Matěj's influence on the succeeding generations, see Ota Halama, *Otázka svatých v české reformaci* [The question of the saints in the Bohemian reformation] (Brno, 2002).

³ For a survey of recent scholarship on Matěj, see Jana Nechutová, *M. Matěj z Janova v odborné literatuře*, [Matěj of Janov in academic literature] SBFFBU E 17 (1972) 119-133.

⁴ See Spunar II: 52, no. 36.

⁵ See MS Prague NK VI F 16, 113a. Reference by František M. Bartoš, "Husův ctitel na faře v Trhových Svinech," JSH 12 (1939) 33-35, here 34.

Matěj in the writings of the theologians of the Bohemian Reformation. For Hus's successors, Janov is the *Master of Paris* and his works are cited most often anonymously. Nevertheless Rokycana's speech in Basel of 1433 gives an inkling how the younger generation of the Utraquists understood Janov: *Magister Parisiensis, Bohemus tamen nacione, Mathias nomine, primo incepit predicare et communicare sub utraque specie...*⁶ As far as the younger Utraquists were concerned, Janov was the initiator of communion *sub utraque*, and this view was projected into Matěj's own works through interpolation by younger Utraquists into the original texts.⁷

In this spirit we learn further biographical data about Matěj toward the end of the fifteenth century from Václav Koranda the Younger, administrator of the Utraquist church. In his note, "*Proti jinému pikúsovi bez peří,*" from 1470–1480 we find a report that *Master Matěj of Paris was a faithful Bohemian under Emperor Charles, who wrote a book about the sacrament of the altar.*⁸ The same Koranda in "*Odpověď na matrykát bosákuov*" (1496) gives more precise information about his subject: *God-fearing and pious Master Matěj of Paris, a canon and preacher at the castle of Prague during the glorious memory of King Wenceslaus and Archbishop Jan.*⁹

Another Utraquist of the Jagelonian period, Václav Písecký, whom later even Bohuslav Balbín would cite, gives a more substantial biographical reference to Janov in his own "*Disputatio de communione utriusque speciei inter magistrum et doctum theologum monachum ad instar dialogi digesta.*"¹⁰ Písecký calls Janov *doctissimus*, and as did Koranda he places him into the reign of Charles IV, but he is the first to maintain that Matěj likewise prophesied "a reform of the church."

At the start of the sixteenth century, the Unity of Brethren seizes on the person of Matěj, and inserts him into its own concept of an historical genealogy, that – unsurprisingly – culminates in the work of the Unity itself. In this spirit, Matěj is mentioned by Tůma Přeloučský in his treatise of 1502, dedicated to Albrecht of Štemberk: "Just as God sent John the Baptist before the coming of his Son to

⁶ Cited by Helena Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* [Studies and texts on the beginning of the chalice in Bohemia] (Brno, 1997) 8. The study contains the latest views on the so-called Janovite theory, concerning the origin of communion *sub utraque*.

⁷ See *ibid.*

⁸ Josef Truhlář, ed., *Manualník M. Václava Korandy* [The manual of M. Vaclav Koranda] (Prague, 1888) 178.

⁹ "bohobojný a nábožný mistr Matěj Pařížský, kanovník a kazatel na hradě Pražském za slavné paměti krále Václava a arcibiskupa Jana;" *ibid.* 49.

¹⁰ Citation from Písecký's work in: Bohuslav Balbín, *Bohemia docta* (Prague, 1777) 107: "Magister Mathias Parisiensis natione Bohemus, Vir doctissimus, et Theologus sui temporis summus vixit temporibus Caroli IV. et multos erudicissimos conscripsit Libros, in quibus de communione utriusque speciei pluribus egit, suitque scriptis non solum in Patria, sed etiam in Imperio Magni Theologi nomen adeptus est; vidi ego plura ejus volumina idiomate latino, et bohemico conscripta, summaque cum voluptate legi, conservo defacto plurima et quoad vixero, conservabo, et hoc mirabile, quod ex arcanis scripturis, et Prophetarum abstrusioribus oraculis reformationem Ecclesiae suo tempore secuturam praedicat." Concerning Václav Písecký, see Josef Hejnic and Jan Martínek, *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě* [Handbook of humanist poetry in Bohemia and Moravia] (Prague, 1973) 4:185-188. Surprisingly, the excerpt from the *Disputace* in Písecký's letter to Michal of Stráže, cited by Balbín (in Bohuslav Ryba, ed., LF 60 [1933] 115-126, 273-287, 436-440), is not found in the translation by Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení (MS Prague NK XVII D 38, f. 92b-104a).

prepare his way, so also, when the Roman priests, for some time, were satisfied to conduct all business according to their own will, and wallow in simony, pride, impurity and other sins that surpassed those of laypeople, and there was no one to punish or restrain them, at that point the Lord God raised against them Wyclif in England, and the Master of Paris and Master Jan Hus in Bohemia, who publicly announced [the priests'] sins and hypocrisy, by which they deprived the faithful of their properties and also of their souls when offering false hopes through observation of man-made rules, false indulgences," and so forth.¹¹

It must be said that the label of "Hus's precursor," and thereby also precursor of the Unity, would remain attached to Matěj in Brethren literature forever. Janov is seen in such a light by the Brethren's *Apology* of Lukáš of Prague from the year 1503, when the latter states in criticizing the Catholic church: "As time progressed, the Brethren were becoming increasingly convinced that the witness [of Jan Rokycana and Martin Lupáč] was truthful, not solely because of their own words, but also because of the support from many doctors, from ancient writings, from the English masters, from the masters who had preceded them (such as Master Milíč, Master Matěj of Paris, Master Jakoubek [about the Antichrist], Master Jan Hus, Petr Chelčický), from the Taborite priests, from Holy Writ, and – above all – from their works, in which one cannot err, and according to which, as Christ teaches, you will know them."¹² In the like tenor, the same is repeated by Brother Vavřinec Krasonický in his treatises, *Co se dalo předešlých let mezi Římany a Čechy* [What was happening between the Romans and the Bohemians during the past years] (1525),¹³ and *O učených* [About the erudite] (1530), although he adds that Matěj was "a canon in the Prague Castle, who now lies buried in the Castle (the canons several years ago chiselled an epitaph of a few lines over his grave); he wrote two major books about the very Antichrist."¹⁴ Likewise, Jan Blahoslav lifts the same information from Krasonický for his own treatise, "*O původu Jednoty bratrské a řádu v ní*" [The origin of the Unity of Brethren and of its rules] (1547).¹⁵ Again, the same account is contained in the treatise of Brother Jan Jafet, *Historie o původu Jednoty bratrské* [A history of the origins of the Unity of Brethren] (1614), with the added information that Matěj belonged among the champions of communion *sub utraque*,

¹¹ See Vojtěch Sokol, *Tůmy Přeloučského Spis o původu Jednoty bratrské a O chudých lidech* [Tůma Přeloučský's "Writings on the origins of the Unity of Brethren" and "On the poor"] (Prague, 1947) 46.

¹² "A bratří čím dál, hojněji poznávali jich svědectví obojích pravé byti, (totiž Jana Rokycany a Martina Lupáče) ne tak z řečí jich, ale z mnohých doktorův, i z písem starých i z mistrův Anglických, mistrův předkův těchto, jako mistra Miliče, mistra Matěje Pařížského, mistra Jakoubka o Antikristu, mistra Jana Husy, Petra Chelčického, kněží Tábořských, písem svatých, a nade všecko z skutkův, v nichž se mýliti nesnadné, po nichž, řekl Kristus, poznáte je." See Ivan Palmov, *Cheshskie bratia v svoikh konfessiiakh* (Prague, 1904), 211. See also *ibid.*, 242: „Také i to vezmi v soud každý, že nemůž z toho dvého než jedno přijíti, než neb aby Římská církev, což o ní píše její vlastní zlého, od církve svaté vzdáleného, o Antikristu nejvlastněji příležícího, jako sv. Bernard, Gerson, kancléř Pařížský a děkan Mohoutský, ... František Petrarcha ... a mnozí jiní ... Ale k tomu se obrátíme, nechajíce cizozemcův, co Čechové i učení a nábožní předkové kázali a psali o ní, jako mistr Matěj Pařížský, mistr Milič, mistr Jakoubek, mistr Jan Hus..."

¹³ See Vavřinec Krasonický, *Sepsání bratra Vavřince Krasonického o tom, co se dalo předešlých let mezi Římany a Čechy*, MS Prague KNM V F 41, f. 29a-62a, here f. 35b.

¹⁴ See *O učených* [On the educated] in: Amedeo Molnár, ed., *Českobratrská výchova před Komenským* [The Unity's upbringing before Komenský] (Prague, 1956) 81.

¹⁵ See Jan Blahoslav, *O původu Jednoty bratrské a řádu v ní*, [On the origin of the Unity of Brethren and its order] ed., Otakar Odložilík (Prague, 1928) 36.

that he had *prophetic inspirations* about the renewal of the Church (not surprisingly, via the Unity of Brethren), and that he died in 1394.¹⁶ Finally, it is understandable that Komenský in his *Historie o těžkých protivěnstvích* [A History of Heavy Adversities] (1632) should also assign a place to Matěj in the spiritual pedigree of Hus's and the Brethren's precursors.¹⁷

Komenský offers a more substantial account about Matěj than the preceding biographers. According to Komenský, Janov was a confessor of the Emperor Charles IV and one of the leading proponents of communion *sub utraque*. Komenský tells us: "When Charles ascended to the imperial throne – as they write – the Master of Paris with several learned men visited him, and requested that he convoke a public ecclesiastical council for the reform of the Church. The Emperor

¹⁶ See Jan Jafet, *Historie o původu Jednoty bratrské* [History of the origins of the Unity of Brethren], MS Unitäts Bibliothek Herrnhut A. B. II. R 1 N°, ff. 6b-7a, 8b, 36b-37b: "Similarly also Master Matěj Pařížský (who was so called, not because he was from Paris, but because he had been at the University there, otherwise a native Czech) priest and canon of the Prague Castle. He also eagerly defended the teaching of Milíč and that of other Bohemians faithful to the religion sub utraque, wrote books against the Church of Rome, and described his prophetic visions that a renewal of the Church should occur in Bohemia; these writings are still available. He died in the year 1394... These students then in a hurry carried even to Rome [the news of] what had happened in Prague and accused masters Hus and Jerome as leaders in that teaching and that cause. The pope, therefore, imposed an interdict on the Bohemians, and prohibited all services in churches and chapels. The Bohemians, however, paid little attention to this, and some burghers, according to the King's will, transformed their houses into colleges and chapels, and let the Bohemians come in. At that time, the pope sent indulges to Bohemia so that he would gain help against the King of Naples. Master Jan Hus preached and argued against these indulgences. Then Archbishop Zbyněk, to disparage the books of Wyclif, Hus, Milíč and Matěj Pařížský, let them be burned in his courtyard. And the students, in turn, to disparage the pope, having collected a full pushcart of indulgences and bulls with seals, burned them all together with the cart in the square in the presence of the king and the bishop. ...What did the Brethren do, as well as those early persons before their separation from others? They had been prepared and selected by God so that through them a true and perfect renovation could take place in these regions in the unity of our holy Church, for which the way was partially prepared by God through our ancestors. It was done, in the first place, through the priests, who had announced the straying of the Church and, like roosters, awakened many from their dreams before the dawn, for instance, through Milíč and Matěj Pařížský. [It was done], in the second place, through those who demolished and destroyed the Babylon and trashed its ruins, and then laid the foundations of the New Jerusalem. This was done through Master Jan Hus and Master Jerome and other helpers, and then through the Bohemians, Žižka and the Taborites, who stood up to the wild beasts and cleared them out of Bohemia. God deigned to use them thus, and once they had served him according to his will, he let them rest, because he did not wish to use them as builders of the renewed temple. Similarly, he had not wished that King David should build him a temple, because he had shed too much human blood. David was to do the spade work, prepare the ground, clear out the enemies, and install peace, so that only later in peace, his son, the wise Solomon, would build it...This was also shown in the metaphors of the ruins of Jerusalem and of the temple, as well as of its building and restoration, and especially in the Babylonian captivity (which was a metaphor of the captivity and the renewal of the Church). Likewise, they [i.e. the early Proto-Brethren] paid attention to what some old Bohemians had foretold about the renewal of the Church in the Kingdom of Bohemia, like that Master Matěj Pařížský, who received divine revelations on the subject and also described them in writings that are still available to us. And Rokycana, the Caiaphas, being the bishop in those times, used to talk about the captivity of the Church under the image of a ruined city, already overgrown with thorn-bushes and a forest, where grass and wild fauna had spawned, so that it would be difficult to clear these accretions, and get down to the solid ground."

¹⁷ See Jan Amos Komenský, *Historie o těžkých protivěnstvích* [History of the difficult adversaries], eds. Amedeo Molnár, Věra Petráčková, Zuzana Pospíšilová, and Noemi Rejchrtová, in Komenský, *Opera omnia*, vol. 9, pt. 1 (Prague, 1989) 67.

responded that it was not in his power, but in the competence of the Holy Father, the Pope of Rome. Therefore, he would write to the pope with that request. But when it happened, the angered pope wished to tame those, whom he perceived as meddling and heretical people. Hence he turned on Charles who –intimidated by the papal dignity – finally banished the Master of Paris (whom he loved) from the kingdom. Although he later returned, the Master spent the rest of his life in seclusion, and died on 30 November 1394. And it happened that after the exile of the Master of Paris from Prague, the opposing party stopped communion *sub utraque* not only in the chapel of the Prague Castle, but also everywhere in Prague and in the entire kingdom.”

Komenský’s augmented version of Matěj’s life is not simply his invention; it derives from another tradition that circulated in sixteenth-century Utraquism thanks to Bohuslav Bílejovský’s *Kronyka česká* (1532). Bílejovský’s attempt to document a virtually uninterrupted practice of communion *sub utraque* in Bohemia, from the mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius into the reign of Charles IV, gave rise to the “legend” of Matěj, as a champion of the communion *sub utraque* (even communion for infants), and as a confessor of Charles IV. Yet, Bílejovský also offers valid evidence, that can be accepted without any reservation and that augments Krasonický’s information about Matěj’s grave, namely that Janov was “buried in his own chapel in St. Vitus’s Church to the side of the great altar, on the same side as the chapel of St. Wenceslaus; above the grave a large part of a text is engraved in gold on a tablet.¹⁸

Beside the two major traditions, Utraquist and Brethren, we find more sober and more probable information about Matěj’s life in other sixteenth-century sources. A role was played here by the famous work, *Catalogus testium veritatis*, of Matthias Flacius Illyricus, the first edition of which had left the printing house in 1562.¹⁹

¹⁸ Reprinted as Bohuslav Bílejovský, *Kronika církevní* [Church chronicle], ed. J. Skalický (pseudonym of J. V. P. Dittrich) (Prague, 1816) 9.

¹⁹ See Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Catalogus testium veritatis, qui ante nostram aetatem pontifici Romano, et papismi erroribus reclamationum, pugnantibusque sententiis scripserunt* (1562). Cited from a more recent edition (Frankfurt, 1666) 766-767 and 771: “316. M. Matthias Parisiensis. – Matthias cognomento quidem Parisiensis, forte quod ibi diu studuerat, sed natione Bohemus, ut opinor (certe in Bohemia diu vixit ad docuit) circa annum 1380. valde prolixum librum De Antichristo scripsit, ac probat cum jam venisse; subinde non obscure ipsum Papam esse Antichristum subindicans. Insectatur alioqui graviter vitia turpitudinesque Cleri, et officii sui in regenda Ecclesia Dei neglectationem. Locustas in Apocalypsi descriptas, dicit esse hypocritas in Ecclesia regnantes. Dicit quoque opera Antichristi esse, quod fabulae et adinventiones hominum in Ecclesia regnent, quod passim statuae et falsae reliquiae colantur. Item quod alii alios Sanctos ac servatores pro Christo colant; nam ait, unumquemque hominem, et unamquamque civitatem suum Christum habere, jactare hic aut ibi esse Christum, et vel hunc vel illum Sanctum pro Christo ac suo servatore colere. Negat esse alligandam pietatem aut cultum divinum, ad loca, personas, aut tempora, tanquam hoc loco magis exaudiaris quam illo, aut hoc tempore quam alio, etc. Reprehendit Monachos, quod relicto unico servatore Christo, sibi suos Franciscos, Dominicos, etc. elegerint, quos pro suis servatoribus habeant, ac de quibus triumphant et gloriantur, plurima de eis comminantes ac mentientes. Negligere ait Monachos, vel potius sepelire verbum Christi: et pro eo celebrare, ac omnibus obtrudere suas regulas et canones. Affirmat id vehementer pietati obesse, quod sacerdotes, Monachi, et Monachae, sese solos spirituales, reliquos mundanos ac seculares vocitent, ad se opinionem sanctitatis et pietatis trahant, et alios homines totamque istam politicam et domesticam vitam, tanquam prophanam prae sua contemnant. Sic enim partim desperare de salute laicos, partim etiam pietatis curam remittere. Scribit quoque, Antichristum omnes universitates, et eruditorum

Matthias Flacius, in a section devoted to witnesses to the truth prior to the emergence of Martin Luther, devotes a relatively large space to Matěj of Janov, and it seems that he was fairly well familiar with Matěj's principal work, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. For one thing, he is aware that Matěj included in his *Regulae* the polemical treatise of William of Saint-Amour, *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, targeting the mendicant orders. Likewise, he knows that Matěj's *Regulae* contain the text of the treatise *De Antichristo* by Milíč of Kroměříž. Flacius likewise interprets the principal ideas of Janov, in particular the critique of human inventions in the church, of the cult of holy images, and that of false relics, although – for reasons unknown – he entirely neglects Janov's crucial concern, namely the issue of frequent communion.

A sober characterisation, such as in Flacius, can be found also in the treatise, *Kalendarium historicum* (1584), by Prokop Lupáč of Hlaváčov.²⁰ According to Lupáč, Matěj of Janov is “vir et presbyter bonus, pius, fervens zelator veritatis Christi et doctrinae evangelicae; acerrimus impugnator eius corruptelarum et abusuum; que nomine et persecutionem est passus.”

The period of the Counter Reformation did not favour sober assessments, such as we have just found in Flacius and Lupáč, but rather inclined in its Protestant variant toward the hagiographic fantasies in the style of Komenský. Another Protestant exile, Pavel Stránský, in his book, *O českém státě* [The government of Bohemia] (1633), resorts to fiction, when he writes that under King Wenceslaus IV “Matěj of Janov, with the sobriquet of Master of Paris, performed liturgy, in a manner close to the Greek ritual, before sizable crowds in the church of the Royal Castle next to the higher tower.”²¹ Therefore, a testimony from the opposing camp is especially valuable; it is offered in the work of Bohuslav Balbín.

Radomír Malý, in his recent study, “Matěj of Janov a další Husovi předchůdci v díle českých obrozenců,”²² maintains that Balbín pays scant attention to Matěj of

collegia seduxisse, ita ut jam nihil sani doceant, aut Christianis recte sua doctrina praeluceant. Denique praedicit futurum, ut Deus adhuc semel pios Doctores excitet, qui spiritu ac zelo Eliae ferventes, errores Antichristi, ipsumque Antichristum mundo patefaciant ac refutent. Inseruit autem sub Opusculo de Antichristo, et aliorum de eadem materia scripta ac sententias, ut Scholae Parisiensis, Conciones Wilhelmi de S. Amore, et M. Militzii (de quo mox) ac aliorum quorundam veterum. Iacobus Misnensis testatur in suo libello de Antichristo, multos praedicto M. Matthiae eximum testimonium honestissimae vitae sumaeque; pietatis praebere. Optandum esset, utrunque librum et M. Parisiensis et Militzii de Antichristo, aliquando in publicum prodire. Ego utrunque habeo.”

²⁰ See Prokop Lupáč z Hlaváčova, *Rerum Boemiarum Ephemeris, Kalendarium Historicum: ex reconditis veterum annalium monumentis erutum* (Prague, 1584) n1a: “30. Novem. ... A. D. 1394. Wenceslavo E. N. III., Boëmorum Rege XII. eodemque Imperatore Romano, obiit in Domino Mathias de Ianow, natione Boëmus: Parisiis studuit 9. annos: unde illi cognomentum Parisiensis: Pragae 8. annos. Sepelitur in Ecclesia Pragensi: vir et presbyter bonus, pius, fervens Zelator Veritatis Christi, et doctrinae Evangelicae: acerrimus impugnator eius corruptelarum et abusuum: quo nomine et persecutionem est passus. Scripsit inter caetera librum de Antichristo, qui a quibusdam inscribitur Hussio: Scripsit item librum seu opus de crebra communione sacramenti Corporis et Sanguinis Iesu Christi: In eo sub finem sic legitur: Explicit opus etc. Magistri Mathiae Parisiensis ac Pragensis, mira devotione insigniti, qui propter predicationem assiduam; multam perpessus est persecutionem, et hoc propter veritatem Evangelicam.”

²¹ See Pavel Stránský ze Zápské Stránky, *Český stát. Okřik* [The Czech state. Okřik], ed. Bohumil Ryba (Prague, 1953) 171.

²² In: Mistr Matěj z Janova ve své a v naší době (Brno, 2002) 89-99.

Janov, adopts a chilly attitude toward him, and – while he devotes a few brief kindly sentences to Tomáš of Štítné – he refers to Matěj merely in a curt mention as a disciple of Milíč.²³ Malý's impression is based on Balbín's *Miscellanea*, but apparently he had not examined another work of Balbín, although he mentions it, namely *Bohemia docta*, which devotes two entire pages to Janov.²⁴

Balbín bases his account of Janov on the earlier-mentioned text of Master Václav Písecký, *Disputatio de communione utriusque speciei inter magistrum et doctum theologum monachum ad instar dialogi digesta*. He also uses the formerly cited *Kalendarium historicum* by Lupáč of Hlavačov (1584), the treatise, *Hussitenkrieg*, of Zacharias Theobald (1609), and even Matěj's own writings, which, however – for reasons cited below – he evidently did not study, and let himself be influenced by the tradition of the Utraquists and the Brethren. Balbín considers Janov a heretic because of his sermon in favour of communion *sub utraque* that he had to repudiate at the Synod of 1389. He also notes that in 1410 his writings, together with those of Milíč, Wyclif, and Hus were consigned to fire in the courtyard of Archbishop Zbyněk Zajíc of Hasenburk. Before Balbín, this information is found only in the earlier-mentioned treatise of Brother Jafet.²⁵

In a great leap forward, we now proceed to the time of the Empress Maria Teresa to examine the work of another Protestant exile, who trumped the fictitious accounts of his various predecessors of the preceding three centuries. It is no one else, but Josef Jireček's *strange raving enthusiast* of Bohemia's history – Jan Šlerka.²⁶ This idiosyncratic personality left behind a notable work, *Historie církve české* [A history of the Bohemian church], which spanned the period from Great Moravia to the present – the reign of Maria Teresa.²⁷ The account of Matěj's life is to a large extent based on Komenský's *Historie o těžkých protivenstvích*. The rest is the product of Šlerka's own imagination.

According to Šlerka, Matěj is once more the favourite confessor of Charles IV, who opposed Archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice's prohibition of communion *sub utraque*, and tried to induce the Emperor to convoke an ecclesiastical council that would restore the lay chalice. At this point, Šlerka inserts a letter from the archbishop to the pope, in which Arnošt describes Matěj as the leader of heresy in Bohemia, and asked the pope for corrective measures to calm the situation. The pope intervenes and Matěj is sentence to the stake. Charles IV, however, loves Matěj and does not wish to see him burned. Hence, he exiles him from Bohemia.²⁸ Matěj finds refuge in Moravia at the castle of Lord Vaněk in Boskovice. Šlerka includes an entire letter that Matěj writes to his followers in Bohemia.²⁹ The latter

²³ Ibid. 90, 98.

²⁴ See Balbín, *Bohemia docta* 106-107.

²⁵ See Jan Jafet, *Historie o původu Jednoty bratrské*, MS Unitäts Bibliothek Herrnhut A. B. II. R 1 N°, f. 8b.

²⁶ For his biography see Vladimír Míčan, *Pod Páně korouhví. Ze života našich exulantů* [Under the banner of the Lord. From the lives of our exiles] (Brno, 1940) 81-122; František Michálek Bartoš, "Bludný syn Jednoty bratrské, [The wandering son of the Unity of Brethren]" in: *Bojovníci a mučedníci* [Warriors and martyrs] (Prague, 1946) 213-215.

²⁷ MS Seniorátní knihovna Rimavské Sobota, Slovakia; copy in UK ETF is used in references.

²⁸ See Jan Šlerka, *Historie církve české* 90-91.

²⁹ See, *ibid.* 218-221: "List mistra Matěje Janovského jinak Pařízkého poslán do Prahy z margrabství Moravského svým posluchačům. [The letter of M. Matěj of Janov or Paris sent to Prague from the Margravate of Moravia to his hearers]"

can return to Prague only after the death of Charles IV. In Prague, Matěj writes another letter to *his faithful* [svým věrným],³⁰ and passes away there on 30 November 1394.

The alleged letters of Matěj, fabricated by Šlerka, resemble St. Paul's epistles in language and in style. They paint the picture of Matěj as a defender of the latter day Brethrens' simplicity. He warns against the study of the *proud Latin language* and worldly wisdom in general; he prophesizes the fall of Rome and of the pope; and he opposes the doctrine of transubstantiation, as well as German influence in Bohemia.

Šlerka's fictitious letters in his *Historie církve české*, including those allegedly from Petr Chelčický, were soon forgotten. Not much later, in the period of the Josephist Enlightenment, interest in Janov is revived in the work of the Catholic priest, Augustine Zitte, a native of Česká Lípa. He includes Janov in his treatment of Hus's predecessors, published in 1786, dealing also with Konrad Waldhauser and Jan Milíč.³¹ According to Zitte, Janov also celebrates the liturgy according to the Greek rite; the Emperor supports his request for the convocation of a church council; but under pressure from the pope Charles is forced to issue a bull against the heretics, and thereby the Greek rite is terminated and Matěj's endeavours are annihilated. Zitte does not offer anything new; his account is based on Stránský (especially concerning the Greek liturgy), and on other sources that we already know.

The book of the liberal Catholic, Zitte, which included Matěj's name in its title, concludes our coverage of the literature concerning Janov's life. At this point, we shall turn to what was known of Matěj's writings during the first four centuries. Our attention will be directed mainly toward partial Czech translations of Janov's *Regule* that we encounter in the sixteenth century.

The authors, on whom we relied for biographical information, also tend to mention Janov's writings, most often in Latin, but also Czech ones, or those translated into Czech. The Utraquist administrator, Václav Koranda the Younger, knows Matěj's books, *O svátosti oltární* [The sacrament of the Altar].³² The Humanist, Václav Písecký, at the start of the sixteenth century, states: "vidi ego plura ejus volumina idiomate latino, et bohemico conscripta."³³ The leader of Unity, Vavřinec Krasnický, refers to Matěj's *two books about Antichrist*.³⁴ The Utraquist theologian, Bohuslav Bílejovský maintains that Matěj "wrote notable books about communion in both kinds for the laity (including little children),...about virtuous life,

³⁰ See, *ibid* 107-108: "Matěje Janovskéhoho svým věrným napomenutí před smrtí po navrácení se do města Prahy [Matěj of Janov's warning before death to his true followers after his return to Prague]."

³¹ See Augustin Zitte, *Lebensbeschreibungen der drei ausgezeichnetsten vorläufer der berühmten Johannes Hus von Hussinecz, benanntlich: des Konrad Stiekna, Johannes Milicz und Mathias von Janow* (Prague, 1786). Here I am following Arnošt Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře zejména německé. [The Hussite movement in literature – especially German] Vol. 2: Husitství v literatuře barokní a osvícenské [The Hussite movement in baroque and enlightenment literature]* (Prague, 1918) 190-191.

³² See Josef Truhlář, ed., *Manuálík M. Václava Korandy* (Prague, 1888) 178.

³³ See Písecký "Disputatio" in: Balbín, *Bohemia docta* 107.

³⁴ See Krasnický, *Co se dalo* f. 35b.

about the hypocrite, and also about the Antichrist.”³⁵ Lupáč of Hlavačov states in his *Kalendarium* that Matěj “scripsit inter caetera librum de Antichristo, ... item librum seu opus de crebra communione sacramenti Corporis et Sanguinis Iesu Christi.”³⁶ Finally, Bohuslav Balbín refers to a codex, held by the Prague Chapter, that contained the following treatises of Matěj: *De frequenti communione, Hypocrisi, Unitate Ecclesiae, Antichristo, et Praeceptis Domini. De abominatione in Ecclesia Dei. Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti.*³⁷

If we exclude Bílejovský’s unreliable reference to Janov’s text concerning infant communion, we can attempt, on the basis of Balbín’s list, to determine which of Matěj’s writings our authors knew.³⁸ Likewise, we can estimate with relatively reliability the popularity of individual parts of Janov’s work. Almost all the mentioned authors agree that Matěj wrote about the Antichrist, which is undoubtedly the Fifth Treatise of the Fourth Book of the *Regulae*. There is also a preponderant agreement about a text on frequent communion, which we know as the Third Treatise of the Third Book of the *Regulae*. Yet, we succeed in indubitable identification only in the case of the manuscript in library of the Prague Chapter, described by Balbín. It has the signature D55, and it actually contains excerpts from all the mentioned parts of the *Regulae*, including Matěj’s treatise *De decem preceptis*.³⁹

The agreement, which we find among all the authors, concerning the treatise *De Antichristo*, undoubtedly points to a great popularity of this work in the Bohemian milieu. This popularity is further affirmed by the fact that, as early as the start of the sixteenth century, it was translated into Czech by Jan Zaječinský of Kunčín,⁴⁰ as we are informed from the earlier-mentioned account of Krasonický.⁴¹ No exemplar has survived, but Jan Blahoslav still knew the translation, and, in his *Grammatika česká*, he characterized the rendering as “dosti dobrý a vlastní” [fairly good and original].⁴²

³⁵ See Bílejovský, *Kronika církevní* 9.

³⁶ See Lupáč z Hlavačova, *Kalendarium historicum* n1a.

³⁷ See Balbín, *Bohemia docta* 107.

³⁸ See Spunar 1:162-171.

³⁹ See MS Archiv Pražského hradu, fond Kapitulní knihovna D 55: “De crebra communione” (f. 24b), “De yppocrisi” (f. 15b-21a), “De unitate ecclesiae” (f. 29a), “De Anticristo” (f. 34r) and “De abhominacione in loco sancto” (f. 44b); treatise “De decem preceptis” (f. 180a-187b). In addition to this manuscript, about which Balbín informs us, we can find another text of Janov in the catalogue of the College of the Bohemian Nation from the 1460s; see Josef Bečka and Emma Urbánková eds., *Katalogy knihoven kolejí Karlovy university* [Catalogues of the college libraries of the Charles University] (Prague, 1948). Two treatises of Janov are listed on f. 136 with the signature K 24; according to the contents of the whole manuscript, they can be safely identified as MS Prague NK, currently with the signature III A 10.

⁴⁰ See Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII. věku* [Handbook of the history of Czech literature to the end of the eighteenth century], 2 vv. (Prague, 1875) 1:432-433.

⁴¹ See Krasonický, *Co se dalo* [What happened?] f. 35b: “A pan Jan Zaječický přeložil ty oboje knihy z jazyku latinského v český.”

⁴² See Jan Blahoslav, *Grammatika česká* [Czech grammar], eds. Ignác Hradil and Josef Jireček (Vienna, 1857) 285: “Těž i pan Jan z Kunšic a na Zaječicích. Ten drahnou knihu mistra Matěje Pařížského o Antikristu z latiny do češtiny přeložil, dosti dobře a vlastně.” A more recent edition of Blahoslav’s *Grammatika česká* was not available to me.

Another Czech translation, this time by an unknown author, involves a section of Matěj's work, *De yppocrysi*.⁴³ The treatise is likewise mentioned by Krasonický and Blahoslav, and its translation, albeit just partial, undoubtedly attests to the popularity of this segment of Janov's literary corpus as well.

The road to further translation into Czech and to an enhanced knowledge of Matěj's work in Bohemia was paved by the German Reformation via its several publications. This route has been already explored by Vlastimil Kybal and Jaroslava Prokeš and, therefore, we can safely omit the erroneous inclusion of Matěj's works into Otto Brunfels's edition of Hus's writings (Nuremberg, 1558 and 1715).⁴⁴ It is only worth noting that this error had been already pointed out by Lupáč of Hlavačov in 1584, and much later by Balbín.⁴⁵

Although the error was noted by the author of the *Kalendarium*, it escaped the attention of other early translators of Janov's writings into Czech and German. In 1525, Václav Linck reissued a part of Brunfels's German edition, once again under Hus's name.⁴⁶ The same edition was used by Viktorin Anxigin Skutečský, a priest in Kutná Hora, who published in Magdeburg (1554) in Czech two treatises, *Mistra Jana Husi kázání dvoje o Antikristu a šelmě, která bojuje proti svatým* [Two sermons of Master Jan Hus about the Antichrist and the beast that wars on the saints], and *Napomenutí kněžstvu, aby zanechajíce učení a nálezkuov lidských, sebe a lid slovem božím zpravovali* [Admonition to the clergy to forsake human learning and inventions, and guide themselves and the faithful by the word of God].⁴⁷ The publication by Skutečský, ascribed to Hus, but actually containing excerpts from Matěj's writings, remained for a very long time the last Czech translations from Matěj's oeuvre. Not until four centuries later did Rudolf Schenk's translation appear (1954).⁴⁸ That was, however, after Neander, Palacký, Kybal, and Odložilík.

Now I shall summarize my article. The traditional image of Matěj of Janov as a precursor of Hus originates in the milieu of the Unity of Brethren. The Unity gave birth to the apostolic sequence: Waldhauser-Milíč-Janov-Hus-Chlečický, etc. and this paradigm found its way from Brethren historiography into the subsequent history of the Bohemian Reformation, including Palacký's work. It is also possible to maintain that direct knowledge of Matěj's texts vanishes in the 1520s. Echoes of Matěj's ideas, however, are ever present in the literary activity and cogitation of the Roman Curia's opponents in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, albeit in fragmentary form and hidden under the pseudonym of Hus. Janov is most often

⁴³ See Spunar, *Repertorium* 1:168 no. 10; Stanislav Souček, "Staročeský výňatek z Regulí Matěje z Janova, [An Old Czech extract from the *Regulae* of Matěj of Janov]" LF 54 (1927) 113-123.

⁴⁴ See Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova* 77-81; Jaroslav Prokeš, "Brunfelsova edice domněle Husových spisů z r. 1524 a autorství antikristovských traktátů Sermones de Antichristo a Anatomia Antichristi," ČČM 93 (1919) 149-164, 238-256. Brunfels's edition was reprinted as Matthias Janov, *Opera* (Hildesheim and New York, 1975).

⁴⁵ See Lupáč z Hlavačova, *Kalendarium historicum* p. n1a; Balbín, *Bohemia docta* 107.

⁴⁶ See Václav Linck, Joannes Husz. Von schedligkeit der menschensatzungen oder Tradition (Oldenbourg, 1525); according to Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova* 67.

⁴⁷ In: Karel Jaromír Erben, ed., *Mistra Jana Husi sebrané spisy české* (Prague, 1868) 3:301-315; 336-337. See also Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova* 59, 63, 66-67, 70.

⁴⁸ See *M. Matěj z Janova, Výbor z Pravidel Starého a Nového zákona* [An anthology from the *Regulae* of the Old and New Testaments], trans. Rudolf Schenk (Prague, 1954).

presented as a champion of communion *sub utraque*, as a critic of the Roman Church, as a moralist, and a visionary. These characterizations of Janov evidently had their source in the writings of the early Utraquist authors, whose writings were constantly read, even republished in the following years. Of course, such latter day characterizations of Janov might have well been inspired by the very titles of Matěj's treatises. If Matěj wrote about frequent communion, then surely he wrote also about communion *sub utraque*. If he referred to a struggle between the faithful and the unfaithful ones, or about scandals in the holy places, then evidently he criticized the existing condition of the Roman Church. If he composed a treatise about hypocrisy, then he was surely a moralist. If he could "innovatively" treat about Antichrist, whose person was tied up with the end of ages, then surely he must have been a recipient of a divine inspiration.

With the advance of time, Matěj's personality was acquiring traits that were almost legendary. A century after his death, he was already included in the lists of saints, martyrs, and prominent personalities of the Bohemian and the wider European reformations. His biography gradually acquired new details, whether entirely fictitious, or possibly true. Finally, the living being, as well as the writer, become reduced to just a symbolic figure, whose essence is expressed by a handful of catchwords.

Scholarly interest in Matěj of Janov crops up only in the nineteenth century, but since then it remains virtually uninterrupted to our own days. New problems, however, are steadily emerging in relation to the life and work of the Master of Paris, and they call for reviews and novel solutions. May my article stand as at least a minor contribution to this scholarly progress.

(Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David)

