
Václav the Anonymous and Jan Příbram: Textual Laments on the Fate of Religion in Bohemia (1424–1429)

Thomas A. Fudge (Washougal, Washington)

Religion in the pre-modern period has sometimes been a force of considerable importance. From time to time it has been regarded as part of the social fabric. Writing in the fourth century, the Cappadocian bishop Gregory of Nyssa describes the social prevalence of religion in the city of Constantinople.

The entire city is filled with it. In squares, market places, at the cross-roads, in alleyways. Old-clothes men, money changers, food sellers are all busy arguing. If you ask someone to give you change, he philosophizes about the Begotten and the Unbegotten; if you inquire about the price of a loaf of bread, you are told by way of reply that the Father is greater and the Son inferior; if you ask ‘is my bath ready?’ the attendant answers that the Son was made out of nothing.¹

Fifteenth-century Bohemia is significantly removed from fourth-century Byzantium. Does the Gregorian observation have any viable religious parallel across more than a thousand years of history? It is tempting to resort to the racy tales of intrigue among the Czech religious reflected in the pages of a late fourteenth-century archiepiscopal visitation protocol carried out in the archdiocese of Prague and draw conclusions.² Here we find stories of concubinage, immorality, drunkenness, clerical brothels and priests examining female bodies under pretense of effecting a cure. Sixteen of thirty-nine parish churches in Prague evidently had priests of notorious moral reputation. But the irregular lives of some priests cannot be used in isolation to assess the nature of religious life. Thousands of faithful pilgrims were making the trip from Bohemia to Wilsnack in Brandenburg to see the miraculous hosts preserved after a fire in 1383. Pilgrim badges from the Wilsnack faithful have been discovered in Bohemia.³ The future Pope Pius II remarked after visiting

¹ *On the Deity of the Son*, PG 46: 557^b.

² Ivan Hlaváček and Zdeňka Hledíková, eds., *Protocollum visitationis archidiaconatus Pragensis annis 1379–1382 per Paulum de Janowicz archidiaconum Pragensem factae* (Prague, 1973).

³ Wilsnack rivaled Rome and Santiago de Compostela as a pilgrimage destination at the end of the Middle Ages. Hus denounced the Wilsnack miracles as fraudulent. *De sanguine Christi*, in

Bohemia that Czech women knew the Bible better than many Italian bishops.⁴ It is reputed that Jan Hus preached to as many as 3,000 hearers at a time on a regular basis.⁵ Clericalism abounded with some estimates judging that one in twenty in Prague belonged to the clerical orders.⁶

By 1424 the religious landscape of Bohemia had been disrupted, deconstructed, reconstructed, and mired in continuing controversy. Heresy had been institutionalized. This did not eliminate detractors either from the ranks of the now minority Roman Church or those within rival Hussite communities. The polemical literature between 1412 and 1437, much of it anonymous, is substantial.⁷ There are two texts of significance both in terms of length and content which address the state of religion in Bohemia. The first is called “Václav, Havel and Tábor, or a Discourse Concerning Bohemia”⁸ This is an anonymous satirical late medieval Czech composition dated in the prologue to the year 1424. It is 1,188 lines in length. Both Mařík Rvačka and Jakub Trch have been put forward as possible authors but these claims remain conjecture.⁹ The date of composition has been contested but the bulk of scholarly opinion (Palacký, Bartoš, Šmahel, et al.) prefer the internal testimony of the document itself. This high quality verse composition is set in the not uncommon form of a fictitious literary dialogue.¹⁰ There are three participants:

Václav Flajšhans, ed., *Opera omnia: Nach neuentdeckten Handschriften*, (Osnabrück, 1966) 1, 3: 3–37. For background and context see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia, 2007).

⁴ “Libros Antonii Panormitae poetae, de dictis et factis Alphonsi regis memorabilibus, commentarius,” Book 2, in *Aeneae Sylvii Piccolominei Opera* (Basel, 1571) 480.

⁵ Alois Kubiček, *Betlemská Kaple* (Prague, 1960) 49.

⁶ František Šmahel, *La révolution hussite, une anomalie historique* (Paris, 1985) 22.

⁷ A précis of this literature would include an anonymous anti-Hussite rhymed chronicle (1419–1420), MS Třeboň, State Archives A 16 f. 223r–v, the song “Listen all of you, old, young and children” (c.1417–c.1425), MS Prague, NK XX B 7, f. 37r–44v, a tract against Hussites (1432), MS Prague Castle Archive D 51 f. 305r–310v, satirical letter of King Sigmisund (1419) in UB 2:523–5, a song of woe against the new religion, in Karel J. Erben, *Výbor z literatury české* (Prague, 1868) 2: 250–1, verses about Jan Hus and the Táborites (1420s), in František Svejkovský, ed., *Veršované Skladby doby Husitské* [Versified Tracts from the Hussite Era] (Prague, 1963) 156–163, Štěpán of Dolany, “letters to Hussites”, in Bernard Pez, ed., *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus seu veterum monumentorum* (Augsburg, 1723) 4: 520–524, et. al.

⁸ The original manuscript “Václav, Havel a Tábor čili Rozmlouvání o Čechách” can be found in the Czech Republic in MS Mnichovo Hradiště, State Archives 1266 f. 194r–213v. The full text has been published in Svejkovský, ed., *Veršované Skladby doby Husitské*, 116–150.

⁹ Rudolf Urbánek, “Mařík Rvačka, jako protihusitský satiric [Mařík Rvačka as an anti-hussite satirist],” ČSPSČ 63 (1955) 73 suggests Rvačka as a possible author. František M. Bartoš, “A politické literatury doby husitské [Political Literature of the Hussite Period],” SH 5 (1957) 29 prefers Trch. Svejkovský does not venture to nominate a candidate for the authorship. *Veršované Skladby doby Husitské* 31

¹⁰ Jaroslav Kolár, “K tradici českých dialogických skladeb z husitský doby [The Tradition of Czech Dialogical Tracts from the Hussite Period],” LF 90 (No. 1, 1967) 30–37 and Karel Brušák, “Reflections of Heresy in Czech Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Rhymed Compositions” *Slavonic and East European Review* 76 (1998) 255.

Václav, Havel and Tábor. Václav is an adherent of the official church and his Roman allegiance is revealed in his steadfast opposition to the Hussite cause. The second debater is Tábor who is not only a Hussite but in fact a member of the Tábórite faction. The third individual is called Havel Vrtoch “the Waverer”; who stands undecided between the Roman Václav and the Hussite Tábor. The three meet together on a Friday in a burned-out church and considerable insight is given into the state of religious and political affairs in Bohemia. It is clear that the Hussite Revolution has polarized the country. The anonymous author speaks principally through the words of Václav, longer speeches allowed this participant provide a clue about the dominant perspective, and the tone throughout maintains consistent opposition to the Hussite perspective. The dialogue between the three can rightly be viewed as propagandist in orientation and the motivation doubtlessly aimed at those in Bohemia, like Havel “the Waverer”, who were undecided as to which side in the struggle was correct. The work sets forth clearly a portrait of a society ruined by war and divided along unyielding lines of religious persuasion.

The second document bears the title *Život kněží tábořských* [The Lives of the Tábórite Priests (hereafter, “Lives”) and comes from the pen of Jan Příbram.¹¹ Whereas we know essentially nothing about the author of “Václav, Havel and Tábor”, we know quite a bit about Příbram. Jan Příbram was a master of the university in Prague from 1413. Originally he was allied with Jakoubek of Střibro defending Hussite religion, especially the practice of utraquism. He publicly defended Jan Hus in 1414, though it should be noted that this approval was later qualified.¹² At one point he served as Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the university in Prague. In 1420 he was selected to undertake the inaugural reading of the “Four Articles of Prague” at a public meeting. After 1419 he became strongly opposed to the radical theology of the Tábórites and this uncompromising stance against Tábórite theology and practice continued for the rest of his life. Příbram took issue with the chiliast inclinations of the Tábórites arguing it fatally threatened the essence of the Christian faith.¹³ Tábórite religion is heretical and begets heresy and undermines the historic faith.¹⁴ Much of his polemical approach to the Tábórites is linked to his aversion to the theology of John Wyclif. Between the late second decade of the fifteenth century and the 1440s, Příbram’s Hussite religious persuasion became steadily more conservative.

¹¹ The original text can be located in Třeboň, State Archives MS A 16 fols. 60r–83v. The most recent edition is *Jan z Příbramě: Život kněží Tábořských*, ed., Jaroslav Boubín [Podbrdsko, Fontes 1] (Příbram, 2000).

¹² By 1430 Příbram was willing to accept Hus only to the extent that he was orthodox. *Professio fidei*. I refer to the printed edition in Johannes Cochlaeus, *Historiae Hussitarum libri XII* (Mainz, 1549) 540.

¹³ Příbram’s attack on the errors of Tábórite doctrine and practice of 1420 remains in manuscript. *Contra articulos picardorum*, MS Vienna, ÖNB 4749, especially f. 66r–79r.

¹⁴ *Cum ab inicio*, MS Prague Castle Archive D 47, f. 1r–25r *passim*.

In 1429, after another failed round of negotiations between Prague Hussites and their radical counterparts at Tábor, Příbram intensified his anti-Táborite propaganda campaign with a literary attack upon the priests of Tábor. Identifying himself as a heresy hunter and the “meticulous persecutor of all Wyclifite and Pikhart heresies”, Příbram infused greater energies into his long-standing battles with Václav Koranda, Peter Payne, Mikuláš of Pelhřimov and others of the Táborite wing of the movement.¹⁵ Among his most direct attacks on Táborite religion should be numbered his tract *Život kněží tábořských* [Lives of the Priests of Tábor], which he undertook in late 1429. The immediate background to this work may be found in the eucharistic debates which characterized so much of the early history of the Hussite movement.¹⁶

On 30 September 1429 a special committee convened at the university in Prague, in the Karolinum, to settle the persistent eucharistic disputes which had been created and cultivated by the work of John Wyclif. The two main speakers were the English Wyclifite Peter Payne and Jan Příbram. An eight member panel of theologians gathered to oversee the public disputation. Each of the main debaters was allowed to choose four members of the panel. Payne selected Václav of Dráčov, Jan Rokycana, Mikuláš of Pelhřimov and Petr Němec of Žatec. The names of the four selected by Příbram are unknown. The findings of the panel were submitted to a synod at which time Rokycana was appointed archiepiscopal vicar with the consent of the ailing archbishop Konrad of Vechta, who was now generally confined to his residence in Roudnice. Rokycana and Václav of Dráčov voted with Příbram’s four appointees (which must have annoyed Peter Payne to no end) and thus the vote went six to two against Payne and the Táborite doctrine of the eucharist. On 19 October Jan Rokycana spoke to the synod suggesting a via media between Payne and Příbram. This seemed amenable to the synod but no true unanimity could be reached. A truce on the eucharistic front was declared to have effect until June 1430. This solution displeased Jan Příbram. He had already written that unless there was a single rite the resulting schismatic confusion would be unbearable.¹⁷ So he composed his own account of the disputation and it was also at this time and for these reasons that he wrote his “lives of the

¹⁵ For Příbram’s self-designation, see his *Apologia* (1427) in MS Prague Castle Archive D 49 f. 333r.

¹⁶ Among many debates, Hussites met with a delegation headed by the archbishop of Magdeburg at Kutná Hora in 1420. MS Prague Castle Archive D 109.2 f. 167r–170v. In June 1423 a debate lasting several days convened at Konopiště. Six articles were produced. MS Prague, NK XVII A 16 f. 6v–7r. Příbram confronted the Táborite doctrine there. The discussions persisted into the 1440s. Some of the relevant texts appear in Zdeněk Nejedlý, ed., *Prameny k synodám strany pražské a tábořské v letech 1441–1444* [Sources of the Synods of Prague and Tabor During the Years 1441–1444], (Prague, 1900).

¹⁷ *Ad occurrendum homini insano*, MS Vienna, ÖNB 4937, f. 152v–153v. The dating of the text is disputed but see Howard Kaminsky, “O traktátu Ad occurrendum homini insano” ČČH 8 (1960) 895–904.

Táborite priests". A synod at Tábor on 6 January 1430 condemned Příbram, stating agreement with the doctrinal position advanced by Jakoubek (who had died four months earlier), and disassociated its entire constituency from the perspective advanced by Příbram.¹⁸

Jan Příbram maintained ties to Menhart of Hradec, a Hussite baron who, though elected to go to the Council of Basel in 1433 refused, but entered into a plot with the council fathers to bring about the reunification of the Hussites with the official church. Příbram's antagonism against all but the most conservative Hussite views, and his unabashed vitriolic attacks upon them, caused him to be expelled on more than one occasion from the capital. Frequently, he found refuge on the estates of Menhart of Hradec where he continued his persistent assault upon heresy in Bohemia. He did go to Basel with Prokop of Plzeň in 1437 in an unsuccessful effort to convince the council fathers of the merits of utraquism and infant communion. Between 1439 and 1448 Příbram served as administrator of the Lower Consistory and likewise acted as the surrogate abbot of the Emmaus Monastery in Prague.¹⁹ His conservative posture softened with age and he was reconciled to Jan Rokycana upon the latter's return from exile in Hradec Králové in 1448. Despite rumors that he embraced the theology of the Roman Church and died in that communion, he maintained his Hussite faith to the end of his eventful life and died on 20 December 1448. Together, these works of Jan Příbram and Václav the Anonymous may be regarded as textual laments on the fate of religion in Bohemia.

"Václav, Havel and Tábor" features three voices, each identified by one of the names in the title. There is a prologue but the voice there must be heard as Václav. His is the dominant voice in the narrative reflecting authorial perspective. From the prologue we are presented with the basic outline of religious affairs in Bohemia in the form of a lament.²⁰ The land is convulsed by "great misery". There is not a single person unaware of the "evil things" which have befallen the country. A "great division" has splintered the Christian faith. The clergy have been "ruined". The religion which began to emerge in those days was "hypocritical" and "very strange". Criminal activity – including murder and arson – became sanctioned under the pretense of defending the law of God.²¹ The result of this created a three-fold division in the land. These were the Praguers, the Táborites (called maniacs in the prologue) and the adherents of St. Wenceslaus. I suspect a deliberate double entendre in the naming of the defender of the Roman faith and the patron saint of Bohemia. The author then points out there are those undecided among

¹⁸ The declarations of the Táborite synod can be found in UB 2: 87–9.

¹⁹ David, *Finding*, 32.

²⁰ "Václav, Havel and Tábor" 116. All references to this text are from the Svejkovský edition.

²¹ The term appears at least thirty times in "Václav, Havel and Tábor". For a synthetic overview of the Hussite concept "boží zákon" see Thomas A. Fudge, "The 'Law of God': Reform and Religious Practice in Late Medieval Bohemia", in BRRP 2 (1996) 49–72.

these three groups who are confused by the “damned heresy”. The reference is to Hussitism broadly speaking. The author then proposes to explain how the “horrible things” which transpired in Bohemia came to pass.

Sitting together in the burned-out church, Tábtor is given the first words in the dialogue. He is presented as a “pale man staring like a cow” who has no regard for religious convention for he suggests the three men eat pork roast even though it is a Friday and a holiday. Václav, being orthodox, refuses and denounces Tábtor as “vicious” and a “hungry dog”.²² Tábtor’s reaction is a literary device aimed to clarify that the leaders of the radical reform movement are deranged, dangerous and combative. “His face monstrous and pale, Tábtor stood up with a club and began shouting.” His opening statements reveal a commitment to the law of God and utraquism as well as a denunciation of the official church: “popes, legates, cardinals, bishops, monks, and parish priests are greedy simoniacs, sacrilegious persons, and great fornicators.”²³ In an effort to convince Havel of the righteousness of his cause Tábtor asserts that if God were not pleased with the Hussite initiative then God would have already put an end to it.²⁴ Václav intervenes saying, “Tábtor, would you stop your shouting and [waving] your sword.”²⁵ Tábtor retorts by calling Václav “the enemy of God” but now it is Václav’s turn to try and persuade the vacillating Havel.

St. Paul writes to the Romans in his epistle, / Do not the priests teach you in a Tábtorite school / that while breaking the law of God, you take pride in it? / And under the slogan of the law of God you are destroying the Czech land? / Did you not hear the words of Jesus Christ, the holy master, / which the holy apostles received from this master: / and saying: If you do all that is commanded, / Saying that you are despicable servants, you are really accusing yourselves? / So by also calling me an enemy of the law of God, / you are right, but you also touch your own conscience, / because if we say that we are not sinning, / we are deceiving ourselves, as St. John says, / because every sin is against the order of God. / You too are an adversary of God with the other Tábtorites. / An honest man should first blame himself, / he should not boast about good or evil deeds. / Therefore if you want to speak with me about the law of God, / speak with forethought as many wise people do.²⁶

This is an altogether reasonable reply and functions as a literary device aimed at providing a counterbalance to the emotional outbursts of Tábtor. Václav

²² “Václav, Havel and Tábtor,” 117.

²³ *Ibid.*, 118.

²⁴ This declaration is repeated in the text on several occasions. It is Tábtor’s *prima facie* argument for divine sanction. Direct statements appear in “Václav, Havel and Tábtor,” 118, 136, 140, 147, 149 and implied on 147.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 119.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 119–120.

admits in principle – somewhat grudgingly – that some of the Hussite ideas are good, namely the reform of abuses, but he takes strong exception to the flawed methodology employed to correct those abuses. This leads the reformers perhaps unwittingly to “commit many heresies”. It would be quite wrong to assume that Václav had much sympathy for the followers of Jan Hus and this may be judged in part from his dismissive statement on the central plank of Hussite doctrine: “there is no need for those Four Articles of Prague.”²⁷ The battle lines are clearly drawn.

Tábor curiously is presented as defending the “voice of the new faith.”²⁸ This suggests a deliberateness on the part of the author to associate the Hussite movement with heresy. Hussites believed their doctrine and religious practices were not new but rather rediscovered old practices and ideas of the apostolic age. Once Tábor sets forth an argument for ultraquist practice he appears to have won an adherent to the faith. “Havel ‘the Waverer’ gives thanks and starts to kneel.”²⁹ But this conversion is averted at the last moment by the intervention of Václav.³⁰ Denouncing all Hussite parties as “muddle-heads” and “disciples of Satan”, Václav frames a clear injunction that all must submit to holy mother church without qualification. The “damned speech” of Tábor is heresy, pure and simple. Václav’s counter argument is linked by a connection to the fathers, tradition and the point is made that in order for reform and religious practice to be valid and viable it cannot be established apart from the magisterium of the church. The Hussite initiative is rooted elsewhere – in the condemned John Wyclif – and Havel is advised not to be too hasty in his decision lest he “become possessed by the devil of the Tábórites” and led into the commission of “desperate acts”. Havel is now further perplexed and points out that since both Václav and Tábor cite Scripture in support of opposite views he cannot be certain one way or the other.³¹ This is a critical juncture in the narrative for it underscores that the issue is rooted in interpretation.

Meanwhile, all of this serves only to enrage Tábor who seems to have listened with growing agitation. Our anonymous author constructs a vitriolic outburst to suggest instability. “Tábor, his eyes dimmed, shouted appallingly at the top of his voice” ‘Oh Václav, you bloodthirsty and low-minded adversary!’³² Whereupon he engages in a litany of allusions to Biblical and Patristic authorities. This is characteristic of our text in which there are mutual and passionate references to Scripture and selective appeals made to traditional authorities. Part of Tábor’s campaign appeal is that all faithful

²⁷ Ibid., 121.

²⁸ Ibid., 122. Hussite propaganda always referred to the contemporary church as a new form of religion to be contrasted with the old, apostolic ideals.

²⁹ Ibid., 123.

³⁰ Ibid., 123–125.

³¹ Ibid., 125.

³² Loc. cit.

Christians should take the sacrament in both kinds, “old, young, wise, lunatics and also all children.”³³ Václav admonishes Havel not to be carried away by the cunning arguments of Tábor: “every heretic wants to defend himself with the Scriptures.”³⁴ He contests the inclusivity of the eucharist as advocated by Tábor. The apostles did not give communion to the common people in both kinds. Faithful Christians are thus advised to follow the apostolic practice and thereby avoid the “damned heresy” of the “Wyclifites”. It is apparent that the eucharist as a subject of discussion and debate reflects the wider preoccupation with it in the period under consideration. But Václav takes the polemic one step farther by suggesting that “this communion causes separation from the common faith.” Utraquism, in other words, is divisive and leads its practitioners to bad behaviour. To wit, “recalcitrance, murder, robbery, arson, violence, and eternal damnation.”³⁵ A series of “proofs” is then advanced by Václav to prove divine sanction for *communio sub una specie* only. One example makes the point.

In the chronicle of St. Donatus is written, / That the giving of the holy blood was stopped / when a chalice broke to pieces in the hands of a deacon. / He accepted this as a sign and did not give the holy blood any longer.³⁶

Václav asserts that the “undermining Wyclifites” cannot show a single example from the apostolic writings mentioning the chalice for the laity and no suggestion that *communio sub utraque* has any salvific connotation.³⁷ The significant space devoted to the eucharist in this dialogue underscores once more the crucial issue of the sacrament in the early Bohemian Reformation. In one of the longest speeches in our text, covering lines 548–695, Václav enumerates a formal *apologia* for “traditional” eucharistic practice.³⁸ Admitting that he does not have a Bible with him, or for that matter any other books in the burned-out church, noting they have either been destroyed (ostensibly by the Hussites) or that Tábor has taken them, Václav nevertheless forges ahead. The argument which follows is rather torturous. God gave the wandering children of Israel bread from heaven to eat and this bread was only for them. But the water came from the earth and thus even the animals were permitted

³³ Ibid., 126.

³⁴ Loc. cit.

³⁵ Ibid., 127–8.

³⁶ Ibid., 128.

³⁷ Ibid., 133. The claim is astonishing. The Hussites had assembled a rather fulsome dossier of authorities for the practice. A discussion of the sources for infant communion provides significant material. David R. Holeton, *La communion des tout-petits enfants: Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Âge* (Rome, 1989) 257–293. For an overview of the genesis of the practice in Bohemia see Helena Krmíčková, *Studie a Texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* [Studies and Texts for the Origin of the Chalice in Bohemia] (Brno, 1997).

³⁸ “Václav, Havel and Tábor,” 132–6.

to drink. No celestial drink was provided. Likewise when a ram was sacrificed there is no mention of drinking. The examples are multiplied. Applied to the sacrament of the altar, there is no precedent or command to drink. “Just as faith without love is insufficient for salvation, receiving the holy blood without mixing it with the body is inappropriate.”³⁹ In one fell swoop, the medieval soteriological doctrine *fides caritate formata* is advanced and utraquism is denied. An allusion to the doctrine of concomitance is used to cover all his bases. Václav attaches a bit of a postscript attempting to argue his case from natural law. God has not required the lay chalice because some countries do not have enough vineyards to produce the required wine. The argument is clinched by Václav’s fabulous declaration that had God intended for all the faithful to partake of communion in both kinds then God would have given sufficient wine to all countries. That God did not is sufficient proof that the Hussite cause is preposterous.⁴⁰

Moving from nature to morals, our anonymous polemicist suggests that improper observation of the sacrament can have dire consequences. Judas Iscariot, upon receiving the sacrament “in an improper way” immediately left the upper room and went out and committed foul deeds. The Pikarts, normally regarded in fifteenth-century literature as a depraved lot, are shown by Václav to have “lived in peace, faith and love” until they began to drink from the chalice. Once they commenced this unspeakable practice “they began to steal, to engage in arson, murder and commit blasphemies.” The lay chalice has also divided the Bohemian reform initiative into “Pikarts, Taborites, Praguers, Wyclifites [and] Hussites.”⁴¹ An allusion is made to the definition of heretics formulated at the fourth Lateran Council: “though their heads are different, their tails are the same.”⁴² So while there are numerous heretical groups in Bohemia spawned by the illicit use of the chalice, they are fundamentally all the same in their several errors. Václav’s argument reaches a climax and he sets forth the bedrock of his objection to utraquism.

Therefore every faithful Christian should strongly avoid / taking in both kinds, that is what I am ordering! / Look at these many people, while they did not take the sacrament in this way, / they did not commit any evil deeds nor did they have evil desires. / But once they started to take

³⁹ Ibid., 134.

⁴⁰ Loc. cit.

⁴¹ “Václav, Havel and Tábor,” 135–6. It is impossible to decipher exactly which communities our author has in mind with his five-fold category. The first three are clear but the terms Wyclifite and Hussite, though used in the contemporary literature as synonyms for the Czech reformers are never applied specifically to any one group. It is possible that Václav the Anonymous has in mind the Chelčice Brethren and the Orebiters of east Bohemia but nothing could justify calling one or the other Wyclifite or Hussite in distinction to the other terms.

⁴² Lateran IV famously used the image of heretics as foxes with different faces but with a common tail. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 1: 233.

both kinds, / they became possessed by the Devil like Judas. / Because they take the holy blood against the regulations, / they daringly shed Christian blood, / rob, burn to death good people all the time, / and they say that they are in this way following the proper regulations of God.⁴³

Put simply, utraquism is too dangerous. The reaction is unpredictable. Tábör is not persuaded and repeats his first and last line of defence: "If God did not like our good work, God would have stopped it long ago."⁴⁴ Tábör likens the purges of the radical Hussites to the Hebrew conquest of foreign territories narrated in the Hebrew Bible (Numbers 13–14, 21 and Joshua 1–11). From the Tábörite perspective there is no difference between a fifteenth-century radical reform agenda in Bohemia and the advance of Yahwism 3,000 years earlier in the ancient Near East. Did not Almighty God sanction genocide in the command to exterminate seven entire nations?⁴⁵ Beyond this appeal to early Hebrew history, Tábör refers to late Judaism and the Maccabean rebellion (1 Maccabees 1–16) and urges these historical and Biblical examples upon Václav as both precedent and justification. And if this argument is found wanting, Tábör appeals to the words of Jesus who declared that he had not come to bring peace to the land but rather a sword (Matthew 10:34).⁴⁶

Václav remains unmoved and continues with his consistent denigration of Tábör by accusing him of completing his heresy by deliberately breaching ecclesiastical custom in giving the sacrament to children and lunatics.⁴⁷ The speech of Václav is altogether successful for Havel now leans toward Rome and praises the words of Václav. Before Tábör can submit a rejoinder, Václav seizes the moment and drives his point home. Alluding to the high priestly prayer in the Gospel in John 17, Václav addresses the matter of unity and centres its

⁴³ "Václav, Havel and Tábör," 136.

⁴⁴ Loc. cit.

⁴⁵ Deuteronomy 7:1–2 sets forth the conquest philosophy. "When the Lord your God brings you into the land which you are entering to take possession of it, and clears away nations before you, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than yourselves, and when the Lord your God gives them over to you, and you defeat them; then you must utterly destroy them; you shall make no covenant with them, and show no mercy to them." The policy is then reiterated in practical terms citing Deuteronomy 20:13–17: texts which constitute a religious-based uncompromising demand for genocide.

⁴⁶ "Václav, Havel and Tábör," 136–7 for the Hebrew invasions and the assertion of Jesus. The reference to the Maccabean revolt comes on 145 and the words of Jesus on 137.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 128–9. The Synod of Elvira (c.305) excluded demoniacs from participation in divine service. The Synod of Orange (441) placed restrictions on the insane (canon 13). Mansi 2 for Elvira and 6: 438 for Orange. Similar restrictions can be found in medieval canon law. Gratian *Decretum*, II, 6,7 in Friedberg. Thomas Aquinas attributed a lack of reason (presumably madness) to demonic possession. *Summa Theologica*, 3a.80,9 (Cambridge, 1964) 59: 70. Devotion and self-examination are required for those receiving communion. Those lacking reason are incapable and thus should not communicate.

realization in the papacy.⁴⁸ What is required? “Respect the judgment and verdict of the supreme bishop.” Václav summons an impressive dossier of authorities to support his contention.⁴⁹ The issue clearly is the magisterium and strict obedience thereto. Heresy as choice is fatal because all those looking for new ideas and practices which result in division only lead their souls to damnation. Accordingly, Václav repeats one of the philosophical themes of the medieval church: “the Roman Church is the mother of all churches... whoever wishes to be saved must obey her.”⁵⁰ The error of the Czech reformers quite simply is rooted in a failure to observe those doctrines and practices confirmed by the official church. That tradition of deviance goes back to at least Hus.⁵¹ Tábör rejects the argument with what appears to be an allusion to the Donatists.⁵² He calls into question the integrity of declarations made by “fornicating popes” and priests who are both “sacrilegious men and evil liars.”⁵³ Václav counters by accusing Tábör of being consumed by anger.

Havel finally gets a word in, and sides with Václav declaring “what I do not like about you, Brother Tábör, is that you are always storming like a sea in the wind.” Havel seems concerned that the destruction caused by the Hussite wars could result in renewed German domination. He thinks Tábör’s ideas are quite immature.⁵⁴ Václav becomes frustrated with Havel informing him the issue is not about materialism or domestic peace. Václav and Tábör argue back and forth about violence but Václav refuses to mount a reply to the suggested parallels between Tábörite reforms and the military conquests of ancient Israel. In fact Václav seems carefully to ignore Hebrew history in the post-deluvial period when he attempts to argue from the divine command given to Noah that human blood should no longer be shed (Genesis 9:6).⁵⁵ Václav does allude to “the cruelty of the Scriptures” but fails to reply adequately to Tábör’s argument. The best he can muster is the comment, “Maccabee defended the law against heathens, you are waging war against

⁴⁸ “Václav, Havel and Tábör,” 129–31.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 130–1.

⁵⁰ In terms of development, the tradition runs from the 3rd to the 14th c. The phrase “*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*” can be found in Cyprian, *Epistola ad Iubaianum*, 21 PL 3:1123 and the papal bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII (1302) made obedience to the pope, as head of the church, necessary for salvation. The bull became codified in canon law. Friedberg 2: 1245. It is not without merit to note that this pronouncement was accepted without qualification by Clement VI (1342–52). MGH 8:156.

⁵¹ Hus once wrote there was no good reason to regard the Roman Church as “mother”. *Tractatus De ecclesia*, ed., S. Harrison Thomson (Cambridge, 1956) 49–50. This creates a disjunction with Cyprian’s adage, “one can no longer have God for one’s father who has not the church as one’s mother.” *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*, 6, CC 3:253.

⁵² The pioneering study is W.H.C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford, 1952).

⁵³ “Václav, Havel and Tábör,” 131.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 137–8.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 138–41.

Christianity.” Is this a valid point? Tábor does not think so and thus remains unmoved by the lengthy speeches delivered by Václav and turns the tables on his adversary by declaring that Václav and his supporters are all “bloodthirsty heretics.”⁵⁶ The discussion in the burned-out church turns nasty. Václav attempts to appeal to the internal divisions within the Hussite movement and exploit those for his own gain. When this does not succeed he resorts to ad hominem defamation: the country has been damaged, even the heathen accuse the Hussites of lunacy, their lives are debauched, they are “crazy horny creatures”, they bring reproach upon the entire nation.⁵⁷ Tábor’s response is to laugh and assert the proverbial notion that “no Czech has ever been called a heretic.”⁵⁸ Moreover, Tábor asserts that the reform effort ultimately will be positive and productive. Václav counters by affirming the end does not justify the means and accuses the Hussites of being worse than the Devil. Tábor retreats to his last line of defence... again. “Should God not approve of what we are doing, God would not have left any of us alive.”⁵⁹

The dialogue comes to an end. We are told that Tábor’s eyes have once again become dim but Havel wishes to know why God has granted so many victories to the Táborites.⁶⁰ As late as 1462, the former humanist Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini who once visited Tábor and later was elected Pope Pius II, claimed Hussites won battles only because God wished to punish their opponents.⁶¹ Therefore success was no means of ascertaining divine approbation but a method of punishing others who had sinned. Václav accuses Tábor of contradiction, heresy, Satanic influence, and then finishes by asserting that the spokesman for the Hussites has committed the unpardonable sin. So far as Václav is concerned, Tábor is a lunatic and his defences have been demolished by counter arguments.⁶² Tábor almost wearily invokes once more his conviction that if God did not approve of what his colleagues were doing they would be rendered incapable of continuing.⁶³ Predictably, it is Václav who gets the last word in the burned-out church. The Hussites are heretics and are recalcitrant in their heretical ways. A warning is issued: those who persist in the religion of Tábor “will have to atone for it in hell.”⁶⁴

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 142. Of note and interest is František Holeček, “Makkabäische Inspiration des hussitischen Chorals ‘Ktož jsú boží bojovníci’ (‘Ihr, die ihr Kämpfer Gottes und seines Gesetzes seid’),” in: *In memoriam Josefa Macka*, eds., Miloslav Polívka and František Šmahel, (Prague, 1996) 111–25.

⁵⁷ “Václav, Havel and Tábor,” 144.

⁵⁸ *Loc. cit.* Among a number of examples, “Czechs, may you remember, tell it to your children: no Czech has ever been a heretic, neither can one be found in these days either!” From an anonymous invective against the Hussites (1432) MS Prague Castle Archive D 51 f. 305r–310v.

⁵⁹ “Václav, Havel and Tábor,” 147.

⁶⁰ *Loc cit.*

⁶¹ Frederick G. Heymann, *George of Bohemia: King of Heretics* (Princeton, 1965) 271–2.

⁶² “Václav, Havel and Tábor,” 147–8.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 150.

Turning to the “Lives of the Taborite Priests” we find a text purporting to be a history of its subject but it is a narrative which uses historical narrative to support a polemic.⁶⁵ The phrase “false and devious, cruel and completely unjust” is the descriptive point of departure for an examination of the Taborite priests.⁶⁶ Příbram deliberately portrays the priests of Tábor in the sharpest contrast with Christ and his apostles.⁶⁷ Jan Hus had done the same thing a generation earlier when he juxtaposed the papacy and Christ with vivid language.⁶⁸ The “Lives of the Taborite Priests” show that these ecclesiastics are as different from the apostles as demons are from angels.⁶⁹ While the apostles were truthful preachers, the Taborites are unbelievable liars. Where the apostles were faithful leaders in all things, the Taborites are false. Whereas the apostles were pure and spiritual, the Taborites are brutish and carnal. The apostles were quiet and patient but the Taborites are filled with revenge and are ferocious beasts. While the apostles of Christ avoided bloodshed, the Taborites are bloodthirsty murderers. Elsewhere Příbram presents his opponents as unbridled hypocrites.

The Taborite priest appears to be holy and calm on the outside but on the inside he is a wicked tyrant. Outwardly, he seems harmless and undefiled but within there is stench and filth on account of blood.⁷⁰

Příbram’s deep hatred of the Taborites and their religious practices and teachings is unmistakable. He is not seeking an acceptable compromise or means of reconciliation between the Taborites and his own reforming caucus. The “Lives” is an exercise in demonstrating incompatibility. Příbram’s language and method of presenting his argument is emotive and clearly such a vernacular piece intended to strike an immediate cord with his readers.

There is no indication that Příbram read “Václav, Havel and Tábor” but there are common themes: Taborite religion is a “terrible heresy” which creates “hellish traps” for ordinary Christians and the result of such deviance is

⁶⁵ The most recent editor of the “Lives” suggests it is possible to read this text as a work of history. I disagree. While there is history in the “Lives”, the work itself is not history. Jaroslav Boubín, ed., *Jan z Příbramě: Život kněží Táborských* 16–17.

⁶⁶ “Lives,” 39. All references are to the Boubín edition.

⁶⁷ In 1412 contrasting pictures of the followers of Christ and those of antichrist were carried through the streets of Prague. These visual images had been created shortly before by Nicholas of Dresden and were called “The Tables of the Old Color and the New”. There is a significant textual and visual tradition of such contrast. See Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Aldershot, 1998) 226–8 and Howard Kaminsky, et al., eds., *Master Nicholas of Dresden: The Old Color and the New – Selected Works Contrasting the Primitive Church and the Roman Church* [Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 55] (March 1965) 5–88.

⁶⁸ See Hus’s 1413 letter to Křišťan of Prachatic in Novotný 164–8 at 167.

⁶⁹ “Lives,” 63–4.

⁷⁰ *Professio fidei*, in Cochlaeus, *Historiae Hussitarum libri XII* 516–17.

the cause for Příbram's lamentation: "great commotion to the detriment of our country."⁷¹ Josef Pekař is one modern scholar to regard Příbram's "patriotic anxiety" heightened by the activities of the Tábórites into fear of disaster. Pekař himself favoured Příbram because he regarded the Tábórites as a destructive force which cut the Czechs off from the mainstream of contemporary Renaissance developments⁷² and Příbram's concerns are linked with nationalistic consequences. According to Příbram, Tábórite error is a series of "heresies, infidelities and incredible lies" inspired by Satan⁷³ and this is crucial as his *a priori* assumption: Tábórite teaching originates with the Devil. Twenty-six names of Tábórite priests are given and allusions made to an indeterminate number of their companions all of whom are derided for heretical teachings, diabolical prophecies, and false religion. Like Tábó in the burned-out church, the radical priests are characterized as promoting religion by "shouting out with terrible voices"⁷⁴ resulting in disorder and chaos.

If Václav the Anonymous charged Hussite warriors with violating young girls, then Příbram claims many women, girls and virgins who went to the hills in response to the message of the Tábórites returned, in Biblical terms, great with child. Elsewhere the priestly impostors are vilified because "they uncovered parts of young girls' bodies, which is inappropriate for priests, and it would be improper to say to what this led." Příbram asserts that nuns were turned out of convents and made to become either whores or wives and many of the Tábórite priests, though married, turned to whoring as well.⁷⁵

Apocalyptic imagery abounds in the "lives of the Tábórite priests" and eschatological themes are apparent.⁷⁶ Příbram complains the Tábórites assert themselves as the one true church and go so far as to claim this one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church exists only in Bohemia!⁷⁷ The implications were insufferable. Once the social order of the world has been eclipsed, those "cruel beasts" masquerading as priests at Tábó called for the massacre of the wicked en masse.⁷⁸ Václav Koranda preached in the city of Plzeň that one day morning would break to reveal all of the evil ones lying dead with their noses sticking up.⁷⁹ For Příbram, religion at Tábó remained essentially violent.

⁷¹ "Lives," 39.

⁷² Josef Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba* [Žižka and his Time] (Prague, 1933) 1:143 and *passim*.

⁷³ "Lives," 39.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 40, 53 and 61. Václav's claim of sexual immorality among the Hussite warriors under Jan Žižka's command cannot be relied upon. Žižka's military ordinance was strictly enforced and a breach of discipline severely punished. The ordinance text appears in Thomas A. Fudge, *The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418–1437: Sources and Documents for the Hussite Crusades* (Aldershot, 2002) 167–71.

⁷⁶ On the overall subject see František Šmahel and Alexander Patschovsky, eds., *Eschatologie und Hussitismus* (Prague, 1996).

⁷⁷ *O poslušeství* [On Obedience], (c.1427), MS Vienna, ÖNB 4314, f. 149r.

⁷⁸ "Lives," 42.

⁷⁹ *Loc. cit.*

They invented new and even worse cruelties. And they started to preach about unheard of cruelties, saying the time of vengeance had come, when all sinners should be destroyed by every means as described in Ecclesiasticus [39:35–6] that is by sword, fire, weapons sharpened on both sides, the teeth of beasts, scorpions and snakes, by death, bloodshed, strangulation, hunger, lashing and hail, cane, clubs and by other blows.⁸⁰

Taborite ministers do not deserve to be called priests. They are more properly “tyrants, misleaders, liars, arsonists and bloody butchers.”⁸¹ Příbram is aghast at what he describes as the mass murder of clerics and asserts that a preferred pastime of the Taborite priests was to catch and kill Roman priests. Some evidently were butchered while they celebrated mass at the altar.⁸² And they even extended their cruelty to the extent of slaying their own former episcopal patron who had fallen into disfavour.

They allowed their bishop Hermann, doctor of Holy Scripture, who ordained many of them, to be drowned. As he was carried away by the river, confessing the truth of God, and willing to do anything, they did not care but allowed stones to be thrown at him, and watched, and while they could stop it by giving the order, they did not do it as they did not wish to.⁸³

The murder of the ungodly enabled the butchers of Tábor to assert that the righteous might sanctify themselves by washing their hands in the blood of sinners.⁸⁴ Příbram is particularly critical of the writings of Jan Čapek (which he describes as “cruel and murderous”)⁸⁵ of which he incorporates

⁸⁰ Loc. cit.

⁸¹ Ibid., 48.

⁸² Ibid., 60. For example, an old priest was killed at the altar in Kutná Hora in 1421. Vavřinec of Březová, “Historia Hussitica,” in FRB 5: 534.

⁸³ “Lives,” 60. Hermann of Mindelheim, titular bishop of Nicopolis had previously been suffragan bishop of Prague. In January 1417 he was kidnapped by Čeněk of Vartemberk and taken to Lipnic Castle where he was forced to ordain Hussite priests on 6 March, a good number whom were later to be found among the Taborites. On 15 March the archbishop of Prague, Konrad of Vechta, condemned the action at Lipnic, deposed Hermann from his office, and nullified the ordinations. Evidently, whatever complicity he might have had with the Hussite ordinations, Hermann returned to the full graces of the Roman Church and repented of having “ordained all those rascals”. Back in hostile Hussite hands, Hermann was condemned to die on the orders of Koranda. Despite pleas and promises to join the radical movement and ordain more priests, he was drowned in the Lužnice River. *Starí letopisové čeští*, in SRB 3: 42–3.

⁸⁴ “Lives,” 44. Further examples can be found in Fudge, “More Glory Than Blood’: Murder and Martyrdom in the Hussite Crusades,” BRRP 5,1 (2004) 117–137.

⁸⁵ “Lives,” 44. Jan Čapek originally was connected with Jakoubek but always maintained radical leanings associated first with the Dresden School, later with Jan Želivský, Jan of Jičín, and eventually with Tábor. Some conjecture that Čapek was the author of the Czech mass and, according to Bartoš, was likely ordained at Lipnice Castle by the hapless kidnapped bishop

extracts into his own work. The “Lives” consists of a long litany of impious acts all of which seem intended to discredit Taborite religion in the same sense as attempted in “Václav, Havel and Tabor.”⁸⁶ Implicit in the narrative is the assumption that radical Hussite doctrine and practice destroys the fabric of true Christian religion. To make his point, Příbram puts shocking words into the mouth of Prokop Holý for the purpose of scandalizing his readers:

When they robbed a church where they found chrism [consecrated oil], they took it and some spread it over their boots, others over their dogs.... Similarly, one of the first ones who blasphemed this sacrament was Prokop Holý, when he said: ‘I have used a lot of this oil – I beg your pardon – by spreading it on my ass, when I was wounded!’⁸⁷

Jan Příbram has many of the same concerns as Václav the Anonymous and central to his preoccupation is the eucharist. It is important to note that eucharistic theology in the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries agreed with Aquinas that blood more than body signified the *passio* of Christ. In other words the appeal for the cup in Bohemia was a plea for the blood of Christ. Chapters 112 to 187 form the bedrock of Příbram’s critique of Taborite doctrine and his lament on the pitiful state of religion in Bohemia.⁸⁸ This is the core of the polemic against the priests of Tabor. A close reading of the “lives of the Taborite priests” reveals Příbram’s conviction that the eucharistic errors of the radical Hussites lay at the root of all calamity which befell the Czech kingdom.⁸⁹ There is a parallel here between the two texts under consideration. Václav the Anonymous considered the lay chalice the cause of moral corruption and a stimulus for criminal activity. Příbram seems to regard a rejection of transubstantiation as the first long step down a treacherous slope for the radical reformers. The signal error of the Taborite priests lay in the acceptance of Wyclif’s teaching on the sacrament.⁹⁰ However, it is a questionable interpretation of the Taborite doctrine on the eucharist for

Hermann. František M. Bartoš, “Kněz Jan Čapek” SH 5 (1957) 32–36. In 1417 Čapek wrote a book on the subject of the Eucharist “Knížky o večeři Paně”; a lay instructional manual on the significance of the sacrament. A number of songs also extant were written by Čapek attempting to set forth Hussite doctrines. He might well be classified as a chiliast especially in the 1420s when his writings seem to have literally called for the extermination of the old world order.

⁸⁶ “Lives,” 42–47.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 59. Comments like these help the reader understand why Příbram elsewhere in the text refers to Prokop as a “desperate and heretical man.” *Ibid.*, 85

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 64–87. A concise overview of the Taborite position in Paul De Vooght, “L’Hérésie des taborites sur l’eucharistie (1418–1421),” *Irenikon* 35 (1972) 340–350.

⁸⁹ František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* [History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia] (Prague, 1877) 4: 384.

⁹⁰ “Lives,” 66.

Příbram then to devote several pages of text to a discussion and refutation of the tracts of Martin Húška.⁹¹ More relevant perhaps is his later treatment of the works of Mikuláš of Pelhřimov on the subject of the Mass.⁹² The “Lives” present Příbram’s interpretation of orthodox religion and especially his doctrine of the eucharist. But this lament on the fate of religion in Bohemia falls upon deaf ears for when the priests of Tábor were confronted with the truth they “refused to accept it and they shook their heads like mad dogs.”⁹³ Following Biblical texts the dog was not infrequently regarded as a synonym for heretics.⁹⁴

It is difficult to know who read these works and to what effect.⁹⁵ Despite being written in the vernacular this does not mean the readership was any wider than that of academic Latin texts. Neither seems to have enjoyed a particularly wide circulation at the time though it is difficult to essay a judgment on this point with much certainty. Příbram’s narrative about the Táborite priests seems to have languished in obscurity until Palacký rescued it, along with so many others, more than four centuries later.⁹⁶ That these texts reflect a useful perspective on Czech society at the end of the Middle Ages should not be doubted. Both authors were defenders of traditional religion. Religion was innovated in thoroughgoing ways – some would say reformed, others would say wrecked – and clashes from iconoclasm to crusade bear witness to the undercurrent of lamentation present in the work of Václav the Anonymous and Jan Příbram. Both authors seem to have been in debate about the nature of identity. In other words, could radical Hussite religion really be considered “Christian”? For the former, the purity of medieval Christianity had been debased while for the latter positive religious reform had suffered unfortunate subversion by negative social revolution. It is clear that in praxis and in discourse the eucharist became the moderator of orthodoxy in Hussite Bohemia. The identity of the author of “Václav, Havel and Tábor” remains a mystery. Příbram’s legacy is arguable. Palacký considered him unnecessarily contentious.⁹⁷ Nejedlý judged Příbram narrow-minded and opposed to progress.⁹⁸ On the other

⁹¹ Ibid., 66–70.

⁹² Ibid., 74–79.

⁹³ Ibid., 86–7.

⁹⁴ Boubín, ed., *Jan z Příbramě: Život kněží Táborských* 20.

⁹⁵ Historiographical discussion on the anonymous text see Miloš Hájek, “Příspěvek k bádání o skladbě Václav, Havel a Tábor čili Rozmlouvání o Čechách roku 1424 [Contribution to Research on the Text of Václav, Havel and Tábor or the Conversation on Bohemia in 1424],” *LF* 92, 2 (1969) 120–3 and Petr Čornej, “Příspěvek ke sporu o skladbu Václav, Havel a Tábor [Contribution to the Polemic of the Text Václav, Havel and Tábor],” *Slavia* 52, 3–4 (1983) 362–72.

⁹⁶ Boubín, ed., *Jan z Příbramě: Život kněží Táborských* 25–27.

⁹⁷ Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* 4: 384–5.

⁹⁸ Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Dějiny husitského zpěvu* [The History of Hussite Song] (Prague, 1955) 5: 59.

side, Pekař considered him a great patriot and a significant thinker.⁹⁹ Others present Příbram as a man of historic importance.¹⁰⁰ The two texts fulfil several functions: carefully crafted propaganda, slashing polemic, and lamentation on the state of religion.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba* [Žižka and his Time] 1:139–140.

¹⁰⁰ Kaminsky, HHR 444.

¹⁰¹ I wish to acknowledge a research grant from the University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand which enabled me to study manuscripts in Vienna and Prague noted in this paper.