Introduction

The 2006 Symposium

The series of international symposia on the Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice continued in 2006 with the seventh symposium, held in Prague at the Vila Lanna from 21-23 June. Twenty scholars from several countries made presentations at the trilingual meeting, which was supported by the Philosophical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and the Hussite Theological Faculty of the Charles University in Prague.

Once again, David R. Holeton and Zdeněk V. David organized the symposium; once again they have also prepared and edited this volume, which contains fourteen essays based on the presentations delivered at the 2006 symposium. All of us who have participated in these sessions and volumes owe both of them a great debt of thanks. Zdeněk David has furthermore translated all of the Czech contributions into English, making them accessible to a much wider audience. To the same end, the entire volume will be available in electronic form on the BRRP web page (www.brrp.org) shortly after it appears in print.

In 2008, twenty-eight scholars offered presentations at the eighth symposium on the Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice, this time with support of the Collegium Europaeum of the Philosophical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and the Philosophical Faculty of the Charles University in Prague. A selection of essays from that symposium is already in preparation and will appear in due course.

A dozen years have passed since the appearance of the first volume in this series. As the essays in this seventh volume demonstrate, its theme continues to attract new and challenging research on a broad range of topics. The Bohemian Reformation itself has drawn increasing attention in international scholarship over these years. Yet many of even its central figures and elements—several of which this volume's articles address—remain little-known except to specialists. To the larger community of scholars interested in Europe between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Bohemian Reformation can still seem difficult to place. It fits uneasily into the standard historical narratives that continue to shape our understandings of these centuries. Certainly the old categories of medieval heresy and of generic, early-modern Reformation are too small to encompass its complexities.

What was the Bohemian Reformation? Together the essays of this volume help to answer that question. But first, I offer here brief descriptions of two events in order to illustrate the challenge—and the fascination—presented by this theme. Each event took place within the cathedral of St. Vitus in Prague during the later fourteenth century.

The Emperor's Funeral, 1378

The first occasion was one of mourning. Charles IV, King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor, was dead. All Christendom, but especially the kingdom of Bohemia, lamented the loss of this exceptional ruler. In Prague, his elaborate funeral procession slowly wound its way across the city over four December days in 1378 until, finally, it entered the cathedral. There Charles's body was to be interred in the company of his royal predecessors. Two funeral orations, evidently delivered within the cathedral on that fourth day, solemnly celebrated the emperor's extraordinary virtue and piety.[1] They speak directly to the condition of religion in Bohemia at that moment

In his oration, Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov (Adalbertus Rankonis de Ericinio), a renowned Prague cathedral canon and Paris doctor of theology, enlisted a host of biblical, patristic and classical allusions to trumpet the king's deeds. Like a second King Josiah, Charles IV had been a true follower of God, the enemy of God's enemies, inspired by zeal for the faith. Like a second Constantine, this "most Christian emperor" had supported the holy Roman church in head and members, defending church statutes and canons and supporting the privileges and liberties of clerical and monastic institutions. Furthermore, the emperor had established the studia, especially the theological studia, that composed Prague's new university. His charitable deeds, almsgiving, prayer, fasting and vigils further testified to a deep, personal devotion. Now the body of this most Christian emperor lay before them, awaiting burial. Truly it was a day for Bohemia to mourn.[2]

Yet it was also a day to give thanks and even rejoice. The list of the emperor's accomplishments reminded Vojtěch's listeners that Bohemia had never before enjoyed such prominence within Christendom. Charles's 1346 election as King of the Romans (and his later coronation as Emperor) had raised Bohemia to new heights of privilege and power. Nowhere was this more evident than in Prague, the emperor's capital city. There Charles IV had established New Town in 1348; within a decade, new circuits of city walls had quadrupled Prague's urban area.[3] The same year had also seen the foundation of the university mentioned by Vojtěch, who himself had studied at the university of Paris.[4] Now Bohemia's brightest students no longer need travel to French- or Italian -speaking cities to attend the nearest universities. In Prague too the

1 Jiří Spěváček, *Karel IV: Život a dílo (1316-78)* (Prague, 1979) 480-83.
2 See Vilém Herold's discussion of Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov in this volume; see also Jaroslav Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften des Prager Magisters Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio, aus dem Nachlass von Rudolf Holinka und Jan Vilikovský* (Münster, 1971), which includes an edition of this funeral oration, pp. 155-74, here esp. 162-64
3 Vilém Lorenc, *Nové město pražské* [Prague's New Town] (Prague, 1973).
4 *Dějiny univerzity Karlovy 1: 1347/48-1622*, ed. Ivana Čornejová and Michal Svatoš (Prague, 1995); translated by Anna Bryson as *A History of Charles University 1348-1802*, 2 vols. (Prague, 2001).

emperor's generous support of churches and monasteries, so praised by Vojtěch, had transformed the urban landscape and introduced new energy to the city's religious culture. New Town in particular gained new religious and clerical communities, adding to Prague's already considerable number. There Charles established a house of Augustinian nuns dedicated to St. Catherine, a community of Augustinian canons at St. Charlemagne, the collegiate church of St. Apollinaris, and communities of both Servite and Carmelite friars. The emperor's selection was eclectic. He invited Benedictines from Dalmatia to install their Slavic liturgy at the new monastery of St. Jerome (the Emmaus monastery); another group of Benedictines brought their Ambrosian rite from Milan. New Town also gained two new parish churches.[5]

An even more impressive testament to the state of Bohemia's religious culture enveloped the funeral mourners on that day in 1378: the cathedral of St. Vitus itself, begun in 1344 when Prague had been elevated to the status of archbishopric. Though the church still lacked a nave and even a completed choir, its gothic vaults already sheltered an impressive array of altars and chapels. Charles himself had acquired and adorned a remarkable collection of holy relics for it, gathered from across the empire and beyond. For this, the archbishop of Prague praised Charles that day in his own funeral oration for the emperor. Like Vojtěch, he too called Charles a second Constantine—for his manifest devotion to the relics of saints.[6] The archbishop's words would have reminded many of his listeners of the annual celebration in Prague that the emperor's obsessive relic-collecting had made possible: the Feast of the Holy Lance and Nail, also called the Feast of the Presentation of the Relics. Since 1355, this indulgence-laden ceremony had drawn massive crowds to one of New Town's new marketplaces (now Charles Square) to witness the public display of the most impressive relics of the city, the kingdom and the empire.[7]

5 Zdeňka Hledíková, "Karlovy církevní fundace a koncepce jeho vlády," [Charles's ecclesiastical foundations and his idea of governance] in *Mezinárodní vědecká konference doba Karla IV. v dějinách národů ČSSR pořádaná Univerzitou Karlovou v Praze k 600. výročí úmrtí Karla IV*, ed. Michal Svatoš (Prague, 1981) 142-51; Hledíková, "Fundace českých králů ve 14. století," [Foundations of the Bohemian kings in the 14th century] *Sborník historický* 28 (1982) 5-55.

6 edited in FRB 3.423-32, at 429: "Tercio ipse fuit in omnibus sanctis negociis diligens inquisitor: ubicunque enim sciebat sanctuaria et corpora sanctorum, acquirebat et auro fulso gemmisque preciosis obducebat et toto corde diligebat ea, sicut alter Constantinus."

7 Now see Kateřina Kubínová, *Imitatio Romae: Karel IV. a Řím* [Charles IV and Rome] (Prague, 2006) esp. 221-57. The chronicler Beneš Krabice of Weitmil pointed out that the success of this feast also inspired the establishment of a new annual market. See edition in FRB 4.519: "Et revera hiis temporibus, quando huiusmodi insignia in dicta solempnitate ostendebantur, conveniebat Pragam de omnibus mundi partibus tanta multitudo hominum, quod nullus crederet, nisi qui oculis suis videret. Propter hunc maximum concursum factum est et positum secundum annuale forum eo tempore in Nova civitate Pragensi."

But the mourners' thoughts need not have wandered so far. The archbishop's mention of the Emperor's devotion to the saints no doubt directed many gazes across the cathedral to the magnificent new chapel of St. Wenceslas, completed at Charles IV's direction.[8] No space in the kingdom could compare with it. The semi-precious stones encrusting its walls continue to provoke gawking admiration today. The emperor had also provided Wenceslas, the preeminent patron saint of Bohemia, with plenty of holy neighbors. Just across the choir lay the tomb and chapel of St. Sigismund, the sixth-century Burgundian king whose relics Charles had brought to this cathedral in 1365 and whose cult he had strenuously promoted. Pilgrims had quickly thronged to the cathedral to pray at Sigismund's shrine; within months, dozens had publicly announced his miraculous interventions in their lives. Many brought candles and other gifts of thanksgiving for his tomb. Charles himself and an archbishop both claimed to have been healed by Sigismund, who almost immediately entered the elite ranks of Bohemia's patron saints. For that reason, everyone at the funeral was familiar with multiplie images and depictions of Sigismund, such as the mosaic of the Last Judgment over the cathedral's south porch and his sculpted figure on a tower guarding Prague's stone bridge.[9]

Vojtěch had good reason to dry his tears on that day in 1378. Yes, the emperor was dead. But he had left Prague and the entire kingdom of Bohemia in a strong condition. Decades of Charles IV's dedicated patronage had caused its religious culture in particular to flourish. The cathedral, the new religious communities, the university and vibrant cults of saints had helped to transform Prague and invigorate its religious life. So too had popular (if at times controversial) preachers such as Conrad Waldhauser (†1369) and Milíč of Kroměříž (†1374), who both enjoyed the emperor's direct support.[10] The practice of religion was flourishing. Vojtěch himself offered his listeners solace in the person of their new sovereign, the adolescent Wenceslas IV (1361-1419), already crowned both King of Bohemia and King of the Romans. He would be like a Joseph to his

8 Klára Benešovská and Ivo Hlobil, Peter Parler & St Vitus's Cathedral 1356-99, trans. by Derek Paton (Prague, 1999) 44-58. For a survey of relevant literature, now see Hana Šedinová, Drahokamy Svatováclavské kaple [The precious stones of St. Wenceslas Chapel] (Prague, 2004) 13-24 .

9 I have written about Sigismund's cult in "A Holy and Faithful Fellowship: Royal Saints in Fourteenth-century Prague," in *Evropa a Čechy na konci středověku. Sborník příspěvků věnovaných Františku Šmahelovi* , ed. Eva Doležalová, Robert Novotný and Pavel Soukup (Prague, 2004) 145-158; also "Remembering Bohemia's Forgotten Patron Saint," BRRP 7 (Prague, 2007) 17-32; now also see the important article by Milada Studničková, "Kult svatého Zikmunda v Čechách," [The cult of St. Sigismund in Bohemia] in *Světcí a jejích kult ve středověku* (Prague, 2006) 283-324 .

10 For both, Olivier Marin offers an excellent introduction in *L'archevêque, le maître et le dévot: Genèses du mouvement réformateur pragois, années 1360-1419* (Paris, 2005); for Milíč, see Peter Morée, *Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Bohemia: The Life and Ideas of Milicius de Chremsir (†1374) and his Significance in the Historiography of Bohemia* (Heršpice, Czech Republic, 1999) and Mengel, "From Venice to Jerusalem and Beyond: Milíč of Kroměříž and the Topography of Prostitution in Fourteenth-century Prague." *Speculum* 79 (2004) 407-442.

father Jacob.[11] It is difficult to suppress doubt about the sincerity of Vojtěch's politic proclamation. It was, one suspects, more hopeful than confident. Nearer the mark may have been his earlier comparison of Charles IV to King Josiah, the last great king of Judah before the Babylonian Captivity. But we of course have the benefit of hindsight; on that day in 1378, Vojtěch did indeed have good reason to hope that religion would continue to flourish as it had under Charles IV, in step with the Bohemian kingdom itself.

An Abjuration, 1389

Eleven years later, a great crowd of Bohemian prelates and priests gathered once more within the cathedral of St. Vitus, likely in the recently (1385) consecrated choir; the nave still remained to be built. The occasion this time was a diocesan synod. This particular synod, held on the feast of St. Luke in 1389, attracted an unusually large crowd. Even priests appreciate a good scandal. They were not disappointed. Just before the delivery of the synodal sermon, three priests stood up to abjure a series of errors they had been preaching in Prague. The first and most prominent to speak was Matthias (Matěj) of Janov, a Paris master of some reputation in Prague.[12]

> Let all the faithful know that I, master Matthias, have preached some things without as much correctness, caution and prudence as would have been due and fitting. For some people, this was or may have been a cause or occasion of error and scandal. Therefore, in order to remove such occasions and so that the truth may not be hidden and the faithful may know what they ought to believe and hold in these matters, I proclaim the following . . . .[13]

It was a humbling revocation, to be sure. At its end would come his equally humbling sentence: a half-year suspension from preaching as well as from hearing confession and celebrating the Eucharist outside his own parish church. Matthias's public proclamation consisted of six statements, each evidently countering a specific error he was accused of propagating. Four deal with the practice and meaning of the Eucharist. Of these, three directly address frequent communion. In one, for example, Matthias affirms that "people, and especially lay people, should not be encouraged or exhorted to [the practice of] daily communion of the Lord's sacrament."[14] These Eucharistic statements especially

11 Kadlec, Leben und Schriften des Prager Magisters Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio, 171-2.

12 The amount of research devoted to this fascinating figure remains surprisingly small; the standard study remains Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova: jeho život, spisy a učení* [Master Matthias of Janov: His life, writings and teaching] (Prague, 1905; rpt. Brno, 2000). For a more recent survey of relevant scholarship, see Jana Nechutová, "M. Matěj z Janova v odborné literatuře" (Master Matthias of Janov in the scholarly literature), Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské univerzity E 17 (1972): 119-32. Now also see Marin, *L'archevêque, le maître et le dévot*.

13 Jaroslav Polc and Zdeňka Hledíková, eds. Pražské synody a koncily předhusitské doby [Prague synods and councils of the pre-Hussite era] (Prague, 2002) 245-6: Noveritis omnes fideles quod ego, magister Mathias, predicavi aliqua non tam recte, caute at provide, sicut debitum fuisset et oportunum, per que vel fui vel esse potui aliquibus causa vel occasio erroris et scandali. Ideo ad tollendum ista et ne lateat et quod fideles sciant quid in hiis credere debeant vel tenere, dico . . . ."

14 Ibid. 246: "Item dico, quod homines, et presertim layci, non sunt inducendi vel hortandi ad cottidianam communionem dominici sacramenti."

have attracted the attention of scholars of the Bohemian Reformation, and rightly so. Frequent communion and lay communion were hallmarks of the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation, traceable at least to Jerusalem (1372-74), Milíč of Kroměříž's experimental religious community in Prague.[15] Matthias's abjuration certainly demonstrates that frequent communion was a matter of some contention by 1389.

I suspect, however, that still more scandalous to the clerical ears listening that day were the claims implied in Matthias's first two statements. Despite his previous statements, Matthias publicly affirmed:

…first of all, that images of Christ and the saints do not give cause or occasion for idolatry, nor should they be burned or destroyed on account of any misuse. Rather, according to the institution and tradition of holy mother church, images ought to be honored and venerated to the honor of those whom they depict. I myself honor and venerate them, and desire that they be venerated.

[I affirm] that in this way it is fitting and right to kneel and set burning candles before images. Also, we should piously believe that the miracles which occur to those who venerate images are the result of divine power. Whatever I may have said in contradiction to any of these points, I did not say correctly; now that I am better informed, I no longer wish to hold or express such opinions.[16]

One can nearly imagine the bones of Charles IV stirring in his nearby tomb. A centerpiece of his promotion of the cult of saints had come under attack. The precise nature of Matthias's previous criticism of the devotional use of images can of course only be inferred from his official renunciation, but he certainly seems to have articulated ideas that would have been at home in Zwingli's Zurich. Here, they foreshadow the complicated place of iconoclasm in the Hussite move ment and the role of image-making more generally among Utraquists.[17]

15 In this volume, the essays by Vilém Herold, Peter Morée and especially Pavel Černuška discuss frequent communion in the fourteenth century. On connections between frequent communion and subsequent Utraquist demands for the lay chalice, see David R. Holeton, "The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement in its European Context," BRRP 1 (1996) 23-48.

16 Polc and Zdeňka Hledíková, eds. *Pražské synody a koncily*, 246: "Primo quod ymagines Christi et sanctorum non dant causam nec occasionem ydolatrie, nec quod propter cuiuscumque abusum debent comburi vel destrui, sed quod secundum institucionem et consuetudinem sancte matre ecclesie debent ymagines ad honorem illorum quos designant adorari et venerari et egomet adoro et vereor eas et volo venerari, et quod dignum et iustum est dicto modo coram ymaginibus flectere ienua et candelas accensas annectere et quod miracula que fiunt venerantibus ymagines pie credendum est fieri virtute divina, et cuiuscumque horum contrarium dixi, non recte dixi, et amplius nolo tenere vel dicere iam melius informatus."

17 These two topics are addressed in this volume by Milena Bartlová and Kateřina Horníčková, respectively. See Bartlová also for a detailed discussion of the nature and influence of Matthias of Janov's opinions about religious images.

Matthias's second statement was still worse, certainly from the perspective of Charles IV. For in it Matthias undermined a foundational pillar of the religious culture that the emperor had so carefully fostered in Prague: the veneration of saints and their relics.

> On what should be believed about saints, living and in heaven, I say that the saints in heaven as well as their bones and other holy objects or relics—such as the clothing and treasures of Christ, the Blessed Virgin and the saints—are to be venerated here on earth. Also, these saints in heaven are more beneficial and more able to be beneficial to us through their merits and intercessions than are living saints. If my words have given occasion for someone to believe the opposite of any of these things, that person is in error, as am I and whoever leads or has led him into this error.[18]

It seems that Matthias had questioned not only the practice of venerating relics but even the underlying premise that saints in heaven can aid those on earth. Without this belief, the cult of St. Sigismund and the other Bohemian patron saints could hardly be sustained. Without it, the Feast of the Holy Lance and Nail could never attract crowds of pilgrims. Matthias was not alone in expressing such radical criticisms, criticisms such as we might expect to hear from the mouths of radical reformers in sixteenth-century German and Swiss lands. At the same synod, one of Matthias's companions had to admit still more bluntly to similar teachings: that saints in heaven cannot help us, that the bones and relics of saints should not be ornamented or venerated, that it would not matter if someone were to burn them or crush them under foot, and that no one should fast because of devotion or a vow to a saint. He further questioned the power of the Blessed Virgin to intervene on behalf of the faithful and even condemned the archbishop's issue of indulgences for those who venerate images of the Virgin.[19] It is little surprise that this priest, who also lacked the academic reputation of Matthias, received a far longer, ten-year suspension from preaching.

The Bohemian Reformation

By juxtaposing these two occasions, separated by eleven years, I do not intend to provide a pair of before-and-after pictures illustrating the fundamental character of the Bohemian Reformation. Nor is my aim to paint Matthias of Janov as the singular founder of a Czech Reformation. Matthias's 1389 abjuration may indeed represent a critical moment in this religious reform movement. Yet the broader movement, the early stirrings of the Bohemian Reformation (understood broadly, as this series of symposia does), was already well under way in the city of Prague during the reign of Charles IV.[20] Manifestations of the

18 Polc and Zdeňka Hledíková, eds. *Pražské synody a koncily*, 246: "Item de sanctis in via et in patria tenere et tenendum dico, quod sancti in patria et corpora ac ossa eorum alia quoque sancta vel sanctuaria sicut vestes et clenodia Christi, beate Virginis et sanctorum hic in terra sunt veneranda et quod ipsi sancti in patria plus prosunt et prodesse possunt nobis meritis et intercessionibus suis quam sancti existentes in via. Et si quis dictorum occasione meorum crederet contrarium alicuius predictorum, erraret, et egomet et quicumque eum ad huiusmodi errorem induceret vel induxisset."

19 Ibid. 247-8.

20 Olivier Marin prefers the term, "Prague reform movement," for the period of 1360-1419: Marin, *L'archevêque, le maître et le dévot.*

Bohemian Reformation can be witnessed, in other words, in both the fondly remembered religious activism of Emperor Charles IV and in the public humiliation of Matthias of Janov. Composed of multiple, interwoven strands, the Bohemian Reformation defies simplistic categories. For that reason it demands (and repays, I might add) careful study.

This volume offers precisely such studies. **Vilém Herold** not only points out that Jan Hus praised the trio of Matthias of Janov, Milíč of Kroměříž and Conrad Waldhauser (the latter two supported, to a point, by Charles IV), but also persuasively argues that Vojtěch Raňkův of Ježov deserves more recognition for his own role in the early Bohemian Reformation. The canon who delivered the emperor's funeral oration also, for example, befriended both Milíč and Matthias, and quite likely Waldhauser as well. **Pavel Černuška** similarly draws our attention to the contribution of Heinrich of Bitterfeld († c. 1405), a reforming Dominican in Prague who advocated frequent communion. In his essay, **Peter Morée** uses a close study of sermons to offer new insight into the thought of Milíč of Kroměříž, long remembered as the father of the Bohemian Reformation, and his community of Jerusalem.

If the origins of the Bohemian reform movement were multiple and at times nearly contradictory—the virulently antimendicant Conrad Waldhauser, for one, would have denied any commonality with Heinrich Bitterfeld, OP—its later expressions were likewise various. Matthias's attacks on images helped to inspire Hussite iconoclasm, as **Milena Bartlová** shows, but the connection between theology and act was never one of simple causality. Moreover, Utraquists continued to use images to construct and present religious identity, as **Kateřina Horníčková** argues. Nor did Matthias's doubts about saints lead to their strict exclusion from Utraquist religious practice, as is nicely demonstrated by **David Holeton** and **Hana Vlhová-Wörner** in their study of a previously unknown manuscript of the liturgy for the feast of St. Jan Hus.[21]

Other essays in this volume look closely at individual people and events whose ideas and experiences are allowing a richer picture of the Bohemian Reformation to emerge. **Stanislaw Bylina's** study of the ideas of the layman Vilém

21 See also Ota Halama, *Otázka svatých v české reformaci* [The question of saints in the Bohemian Reformation] (Brno, 2002).

of Klatovy offers important insight into the theological debates between various branches of the Bohemian Reformation in the early 15th century. **Pavel Soukup** similarly explores the division between radical Táborites and the moderate Utraquist university masters by comparing their exegetical strategies. **Thomas Fudge** uses Prokop Holý's untimely bath at the Council of Basel in 1433 to illustrate the divisions that prevented a peaceful resolution to the divisions between Utraquists and Roman Christians in Bohemia. **Pavel Kůrka**'s account of Jan Kotva provides a unique glimpse at the life of a low-level but prolific urban bureaucrat in later Utraquist Prague.

Modern scholars are not the only ones who have contested the meaning and significance of the Bohemian Reformation. **Petr Hlaváček** explores the Czech development of the concepts of Christianitas and of Europe. He describes the fascinating character of Pavel Židek († 1471), born of Jewish parents and raised as an Utraquist before converting to Roman Catholicism. Židek, as Hlaváček shows, believed that only a rejection of Utraquism could allow the kingdom of Bohemia to return to the heart of Europe and of Christendom, the place it had occupied during the reign of Emperor Charles IV before the Bohemian Reformation. In his essay, **Michael Van Dussen** considers Bohemia's reputation in England, where competing interpretations of the Bohemian Reformation as Wyclif-inspired heresy or proto-Protestantism inspired polemical invocations of "Bohemia" by writers as diverse as Thomas Netter, Thomas More and John Foxe. Among Czechs too, the significance of the Bohemian Reformation has remained a point of contention for centuries. **Petr Pabian**'s account of the 1869 commemoration of the anniversary of Jan Hus's birth highlights the competing political and religious agendas that continued to swirl around this central figure of the Bohemian Reformation; even the minority Czech Protestants at the time championed at least two distinct interpretations of Hus's significance for modern Czechs. Finally, **Zdeněk David** opposes misperceptions of the Bohemian Reformation in modern historiography, challenging the idea that it was nationally exclusive, idiosyncratic or even quixotic. Instead, David argues, the Utraquists intended to bring universal reform to the western church. Together these fourteen essays—and indeed, all seven volumes in the BRRP series—provide an increasingly rich picture of the Bohemian Reformation.

David Mengel
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio, USA

***

The BRRP web page (www://brrp.org), on which all volumes of this journal are posted, appears to be well used and from comments sent to the editors reg-

ularly attracts the interest of those for whom access to specialist literature on the Bohemian Reformation is difficult. It also seems that the journal's availability on the internet has facilitated its use in the classroom as articles can be cited in course bibliographies with the assurance that students will have easy access to the material. Professor David Mengel of Xavier University in Cincinnati, who is responsible for the web site, has assured that what appears on the internet is page accurate with the printed volumes so that bibliographical citations can safely be made from the web.

At the Business Meeting of the 2008 symposium, members voted to discontinue indexing the journal. As the web page is equipped with a search device for the entire series, it is now much faster and easier to search on the web than it is to look through the printed indexes bound with each volume. We are most grateful to Christopher Montoni who worked with the editors on indexing volumes 4-6.

At the 2008 Business Meeting, it was announced that sponsorship of the Symposium would pass into the hands of the Collegium Europaeum: Research Group for the History of European Ideas – jointly sponsored by the Philosophical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and the Philosophical Faculty of the Charles University. As will beclear from the format and appearance of this volume, this transition is well underway. We are grateful to Mgr. Ota Pavlíček, Secretary of the Collegium Europaeum, for his valuable help in seeing this volume to the light of day during this time of transition. We would also like to express our thanks to the Library of the National Museum, Prague for to use the illumination from the Jena Codex on the front cover of this volume.

We look forward to the ninth symposium of BRRP which is scheduled to be held in June 2010.

Zdeněk V. David
Woodrow Wilson Center
Washington, DC
Co-Organisers of the Symposium

David R. Holeton
UK – HTF
Prague