

# Crux of Telč on Interpreting and Glossing the Antichrist: Stanislaus of Znojmo and the Changing Position of Jakoubek of Stříbro

PATRICK OUTHWAITE\*

In a condensed version of Stanislaus of Znojmo's *Tractatus de Antichristo contra Jacobellum* contained in Třeboň, Státní oblastní archiv, ms. A 16, fol. 425r-v, there is a peculiar reference to the Taborites. Stanislaus wrote the text in 1413, before the community formed at Tábor, yet the annotation along with the shortened text was written much later, in 1464, by the scribe Crux of Telč (Kříž z Telče).<sup>1</sup> Třeboň A 16 is a codex devoted to recording tracts against various heretical groups, including the Waldensians, Wycliffites, Utraquists, and Taborites.<sup>2</sup> Crux had a particular interest

\* I would like to thank Michael Van Dussen and Pavel Soukup for their insightful comments and suggestions. Stephen E. Lahey also helped a great deal with his expertise and generosity in sending me forthcoming publications. I am particularly grateful to Lucie Doležalová for her patience and kindness in helping me refine this article and my thinking on Crux of Telč more broadly. Finally, I thank the anonymous reviewers who provided enlightening edits and suggestions.

1) This portion of the manuscript is recorded as being written in 1464, see Třeboň, Státní oblastní archiv (State Regional Archives; hereinafter referred to as SOA Třeboň), ms. A 16, fol. 424v. See also: Jaroslav KADLEC, *Oldřich Kříž z Telče*, Listy filologické 79, 1956, pp. 91-102, 234-238; Pavel SPUNAR, *Vývoj autografu Oldřicha Kříže z Telče. Příspěvek k poznání písařské osobnosti ve středověku*, Listy filologické 81, 1958, pp. 220-226, I-IV. Although Crux is often referred to as 'Oldřich Kříž' in secondary scholarship, Lucie Doležalová and Michal Dragoun have recently proved that the name 'Oldřich' was wrongly attributed to the scribe due to a misreading. See *Kříž z Telče (1434-1504). Písař, sběratel a autor*, edd. Lucie DOLEŽALOVÁ – Michal DRAGOUN, Praha 2020.

2) See for instance, the edition of a report of the Oldcastle Rising recorded by one William, canon of the Church of Olomouc, from Třeboň A 16, fol. 157r-v, in Michael VAN DUSSEN, *From England to Bohemia. Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge – New York 2012 (= Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 86), pp. 142-156.

in domestic Bohemian opponents of the Hussites and was responsible for copying a number of Stanislaus's works.<sup>3</sup> The *Tractatus* that Crux condenses in Třeboň A 16 was originally written by Stanislaus as a direct reply to Jakoubek of Stříbro (*Jacobellus de Misa*), whose *Posicio de Antichristo* asserted that the Antichrist had infiltrated the Church at its head. Jakoubek's *Posicio de Antichristo* was written in 1413 following a quodlibet at the University of Prague in 1412 where, according to some accounts, Jakoubek either explicitly claimed or heavily inferred that the Pisan antipope John XXIII was the Antichrist.<sup>4</sup> Much of Stanislaus's full *Tractatus* centres on condemning Jakoubek's definition and structure of the Church of the Antichrist that Jakoubek adopted from Matěj of Janov.<sup>5</sup> However, the condensed version of Stanislaus's treatise produced by Crux in Třeboň A 16 omits the entirety of Stanislaus's criticisms of Jakoubek's models of the Church and the Antichrist. As I contend, Crux's revisions seek to repurpose Stanislaus's text to address scriptural interpretation and the nature of glossing.

Interpreting apocalyptic passages of Scripture became a major point of contention around the 1420s and early 1430s between the leaders of Tábör and the moderate Utraquists of Prague University – of which Jakoubek himself was a leading member. As I argue below, in producing the shortened text of Třeboň A 16, Crux takes Stanislaus's claims against the immediacy of apocalyptic interpretation and the lack of authorities in the *Posicio de Antichristo* as a means of directly comparing Jakoubek to the Taborites. Through this comparison, Crux sought to condemn those in Bohemia that still held that the papacy was the seat of the Antichrist. This

3) Crux copies other works of Stanislaus in Třeboň A 16: *Replicacio magistri Stanislai contra replicationem Jesseniciz* (fol. 128v–144r), *Replicacio magistri Stanislai contra replicationem magistri Johannis de Hussinecz* (fol. 144v–149v), and *Sermo magistri Stanislai de Znojma doctoris* (fol. 168r–172r). Crux's other manuscripts that contain Stanislaus's works and extracts are: SOA Třeboň, ms. A 19, fol. 13r–35v, 37r–56v, 61r–84v; Praha (Prague), Národní knihovna České republiky (National Library of the Czech Republic; hereinafter referred to as NKP), ms. XI C 8, fol. 180r–182v, 264r–265v, and ms. I G 11c, fol. 83r–84r.

4) Sources and scholarship are imprecise on whether Jakoubek explicitly labelled Pope John XXIII the Antichrist in the 1412 quodlibet or merely inferred it. Stephan Pálec, contemporary of Stanislaus and fellow critic of Hus, refers to 'a certain of Hus's fellow-apostles' who publicly called John XXIII the Antichrist during this quodlibet, whereas Jakoubek himself is cagey. Jan Sedlák explains that although Jakoubek did not explicitly label the pope the Antichrist, he inferred it in such a manner that everyone knew that he was talking about the pope: 'ne sice výslovně, ale tak, že to mohl každý poznati.' Jan SEDLÁK, *Spis Stanislava ze Znojma „de Antichristo“*, Hlídká 24, 1907, pp. 1–6, here p. 2. In his treatise on the Antichrist, Jakoubek explained that the End Times had begun and thus the Antichrist had to be present on earth, as he recognised a causal link between the two occurrences. In other words, the End Times necessitated the Antichrist coming to earth and entering the head of the Church, and so by stating that the Apocalypse was occurring, one of the popes necessarily had to be the Antichrist. Following the theories of Matěj of Janov, who in turn followed the likes of Adso of Montier-en-Der, Jakoubek believed that this Antichrist had penetrated the Church and had begun the task of bringing it to ruin. Vlastimil KYBAL, *M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Stříbra. Srovnávací kapitola o Antikristu*, Český časopis historický 11, 1905, pp. 22–37.

5) There is not space here to treat the complex issue of Jakoubek's reliance on Matěj of Janov, which at this point is well documented in secondary literature. For more, see: Stephen LAHEY, *Matěj of Janov: Corpus Mysticum, Communionem, and the Lost Treatise of His 'Regulae'*, *Religions* 9/1, 2018, article 16, pp. 1–21; V. KYBAL, *M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Stříbra*; Pavlína CERMANOVÁ, *Čechy na konci věků. Apokalyptické myšlení a vize husitské doby*, Praha 2013, pp. 55–67.

is initially demonstrated by the text's incipit: *Nota quidam in Bohemia heretici, Jacobellus unus fuit ex eis et Taborite multi in revocacione habentur; dicta de Antichristo trahunt ad papam et cardinales et negant adventum Antichristi in carne, scilicet quod nunc multi sunt.*<sup>6</sup> ('Note that Jakoubek and the Taborites are the predecessors of the idea that is now held by many heretics in Bohemia today, that the words about the Antichrist apply to the pope and cardinals, and these heretics deny the advent of the Antichrist in the flesh.') For Crux, the Antichrist would not disguise himself as a pope, but would arrive openly in the flesh. In other words, Stanislaus's work had a continued significance in fifteenth-century Bohemia because it was converted from a riposte to a single scholar and applied to contemporary debates about the papal Antichrist.

Nevertheless, the intricacies of the association between Jakoubek and the Taborites is not immediately apparent in Crux's annotation.<sup>7</sup> Jakoubek in fact condemned the Taborites for their interpretations of Scripture *in esse*, that is, taking apocalyptic passages out of context as if they directly applied to their situation in contemporary Bohemia.<sup>8</sup> He also objected to the Taborite distrust of the Church Fathers in glossing Scripture. Jakoubek and other Utraquist theologians of the University in the 1420s and 1430s rejected some contemporary scholastic commentaries and glossae on Scripture, but they relied heavily on a selection of exegetes that they deemed to be representative of the Primitive Church.<sup>9</sup> From one perspective, then, it is peculiar that the Třeboň manuscript mentions Jakoubek and the Taborites as being originators or propagators of the belief in a papal Antichrist. Still, as many scholars have noted, there was a sense in which Jakoubek helped to establish the movement that the Priests of Tábor further developed.<sup>10</sup> Jakoubek was, for instance, in contact with Jan of Jičín and Nicholas (Mikuláš) Biskupec of

6) This incipit is added in the margins of the page. SOA Třeboň, ms. A 16, fol. 425r.

7) It is important to note here that there was no unified Taborite theology, and so those associated with the radical wing of the Hussites could thus hold different views. The present study draws from the limited pool of surviving Taborite texts alongside the works of those who condemned them in an effort to compare the texts of Jakoubek and Stanislaus with theological tenets that are often associated with the Taborites, even if they were not universal. For more on this thorny issue, see: Josef MACEK, *Táborské chiliastické články*, Sborník historický 1, 1953, pp. 53–64; Pavlína CERMANOVÁ, *Husitský radikalismus*, in: Husitské století, edd. Pavlína Cermanová – Robert Novotný – Pavel Soukup, Praha 2014, pp. 84–107.

8) For more on the works in which Jakoubek criticised the Taborites, see: Miloslav RANSDORF, *Kapitoly z geneze husitské ideologie*, Praha 1986, pp. 143–156.

9) The debate over who was an acceptable authority became the basis of the Judge of Cheb, see: Adam PÁLKA, *Papoušek versus Lupáč: polemika o výklad basilejských kompaktát z poloviny 15. století*, Studia mediaevalia Bohemica 8, 2016, pp. 41–87; Amedeo MOLNÁR, *Chebský soudce*, in: Soudce smluvený v Chebu. Sborník příspěvků přednesených na sympoziu k 550. výročí, ed. Jindřich Jirka, Praha 1982, pp. 9–37, especially pp. 27–28.

10) There is a large amount of scholarship devoted to Jakoubek's influence on the Taborite movement, which has been summarised by Jindřich MAREK, *Jakoubek ze Stříbra a počátky ultravistického kazatelství v českých zemích. Studie o Jakoubkově postile z let 1413–1414*, Praha 2011, pp. 44–48. See also Jiří KEJŘ, *Mistři pražské univerzity a kněží táborští*, Praha 1981, pp. 71–73. Pavel Soukup maintains that Jakoubek held something of a middle position between the Utraquists and the Taborites, and of all of the Prague masters he was perhaps the most likely to accept some of the more radical assertions of the Taborite movement. Pavel SOUKUP, *The Masters and the End of the World: Exegesis in the Polemics*

Pelhřimov, two leading theologians of the Taborite movement, while they were at the University of Prague.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, as will be demonstrated, Jakoubek's *Posicio de Antichristo* shares a number of similarities with Taborite texts. In 1413, Jakoubek had not fully formulated his thinking on scriptural interpretation and used similar methods of exegesis that the Taborites later adopted. There is, then, some logic to connecting Stanislaus's critiques of Jakoubek to the Taborites, particularly with regard to his writings to 1413, if not after. His *Posicio* is distinctive among Jakoubek's oeuvre because it captures a moment in which enthusiasm, and perhaps naivety, led him to trust a small selection of authorities over scholastic glossae and commentaries. Following the Council of Constance, Jakoubek changed his opinions on scriptural interpretation, and ended up adopting a position very similar to that of Stanislaus of Znojmo. The Třeboň version of Stanislaus's *Tractatus* is, therefore, significant not only as a record of the debates about the Antichrist in 1412–1413, but also as an aid for considering Jakoubek of Střibro's quick shift in his approach to exegesis. It is, nonetheless, unlikely that Crux of Telč intended his readers to make such connections. Still, his annotations and condensed text unintentionally reveal the nuances of the thought of Stanislaus, Jakoubek and the Taborites in relation to the Antichrist.

### Literal and Allegorical Senses

Stanislaus of Znojmo was an early proponent of Wycliffism at the University of Prague. He, like numerous other Bohemian scholars of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, was particularly drawn to the realist philosophy of John Wyclif.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, Stanislaus distanced himself from Wyclif's more radical assertions, particularly concerning remanence. Stanislaus, in fact, travelled to the Council of Pisa in 1408 to explain how his thinking differed from Wycliffite heresies.<sup>13</sup>

with *Chiliasm*, *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice* 7, 2009 (= *Filosofický časopis*, Supplement 1), pp. 91–114, here p. 99.

11) Howard KAMINSKY, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1967, p. 344, note 87; see also the list of Taborite priests in František ŠMAHEL et al., *Dějiny Tábora I/1. Do roku 1421*, České Budějovice 1988, pp. 314–322, here pp. 317–318, nos. 16 and 31.

12) One of the key figures in establishing Wyclif's realist philosophy at the University of Prague was Matěj of Janov, who was greatly influenced by the English-German *natio* at the University of Paris. S. LAHEY, *Matěj of Janov*, pp. 1–3. The position of Stanislaus in relation to Wycliffism has been explored by a number of scholars. In particular, Gabriel NUCHELMANS, *Stanislaus of Znaim (d. 1414) on Truth and Falsity*, in: *Mediaeval Semantics and Metaphysics. Studies Dedicated to L. M. de Rijk, Ph.D., Professor of Ancient and Mediaeval Philosophy at the University of Leiden on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, ed. Egbert Peter Bos, Nijmegen 1985, pp. 313–338; Stanislav SOUSEDÍK, *Pojem „distinctio formalis“ u českých realistů v době Husově*, *Filosofický časopis* 18, 1970, pp. 1024–1029. The issue has been most recently treated by Stephen E. LAHEY, *Stanislaus of Znojmo and Prague Realism: First Principles of Theological Reasoning*, *Kosmas. Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 28/2, 2015, pp. 9–26, and IDEM, *Wyclif in Bohemia*, in: *A Companion to the Hussites*, edd. Michael Van Dussen – Pavel Soukup, Leiden – Boston 2020 (= Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 90), pp. 63–98, here pp. 67–71.

13) For more on Stanislaus of Znojmo's life and writings, see: Stanislav SOUSEDÍK, *Stanislaus von Znaim († 1414). Eine Lebensskizze*, *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 17, 1973, pp. 37–56; IDEM, *Stanislav ze Znojma*, CSc. (Ph.D.) thesis finished at the Kabinet pro studia řecká, římská a latinská Československé akademie věd (Centre for Greek, Rome and Latin Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences), Praha 1972 (for political reasons not defended until 1990); IDEM, *Stanislav ze Znojma, Husův*

In the last phase of Stanislaus's career, from 1412 until he left Prague for Jindřichův Hradec in 1413, his position against Prague reformers hardened and he became an active opponent of those masters who adopted the radical positions of Wyclif and Matěj of Janov.<sup>14</sup> The *Tractatus* was one of Stanislaus's final texts, presenting the culmination of his turn against the masters of Prague who had supposedly embraced the Wycliffite heresy.

There are two complete manuscripts of Stanislaus's *Tractatus* that are currently known: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 4749, fol. 112r–145v, and Cod. 4933, fol. 220r–245r. Both were produced in the mid-fifteenth century, and in each case Stanislaus's work was included amongst a selection of Hussite and anti-Hussite tracts. Significantly, in each manuscript Stanislaus's work is preceded by Jakoubek of Stříbro's *Posicio*. The codices seem to have been collated with a view to recording the debates of the early Hussite movement, including the opposing positions of the 1412 papal Antichrist quodlibet.<sup>15</sup> Stanislaus's partial work in the Třeboň manuscript, by contrast, appears without Jakoubek's tract, and Crux makes it clear from the outset that his aim in including the *Tractatus* is not to repeat the debates of 1412 but to condemn Jakoubek.<sup>16</sup> At the top of the page in which the work begins, Crux explains:

*Ista sunt excerpta ex quodam tractatu de Antichristo contra Jacobellum, qui dicebat papam esse Antichristum. Mendax, iniquus et hereticus, qui inchoavit communionem sub utraque specie.*<sup>17</sup>

'These are extracts from a certain treatise of the Antichrist against Jakoubek, who declared the Pope to be the Antichrist. He was the lying, unjust and heretical man who introduced communion under both kinds.'

---

*univerzitní učitel*, in: Idem, *Učení o eucharistii v díle M. Jana Husa*, Praha 1998 (= Studium 6), pp. 11–36; Josef TRÍŠKA, *Literární činnost předhusitské university*, Praha 1967 (= Sběrka pramenů a příruček k dějinám University Karlovy 5), pp. 96–101; S. E. LAHEY, *Wyclif in Bohemia*, pp. 65–71.

14) The influence of Wyclif and Matěj of Janov have been explored extensively, see: Vlastimil KYBAL, *M. Matěj z Janova. Jeho život, spisy a učení*, Praha 1905; Howard KAMINSKY, *Nicholas of Pelhřimov's Tábor: an Adventure into the Eschaton*, in: *Eschatologie und Hussitismus. Internationales Kolloquium*, Prag 1.–4. September 1993, edd. Alexander Patschovsky – František Šmahel, Prag 1996 (= Historica – Series nova, Supplementum 1), pp. 139–167, here pp. 146–154; Jan SEDLÁK, *Počátkové kalicha*, *Časopis katolického duchovenstva* 52, 1911, pp. 97–105, 244–250, 397–401, 496–501, 583–587, 703–708, 786–791; 54, 1913, pp. 226–232, 275–278, 404–410, 465–470, 708–713; 55, 1914, pp. 75–84, 113–120, 315–322, especially p. 788; V. KYBAL, *M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Stříbra*; Bernhard TÖPFER, *Chiliasische Elemente in der Eschatologie des Matthias von Janov*, in: *Ost und West in der Geschichte des Denkens und der kulturellen Beziehungen. Festschrift für E. Winter zum 70. Geburtstag*, edd. Wolfgang Steinitz et al., Berlin 1966 (= Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas 15), pp. 59–79; Jana NECHUTOVÁ, *Filosofické zdroje díla M. Matěje z Janova*, *Filosofický časopis* 18, 1970, pp. 1010–1018; EADEM, *Eschatologie in Böhmen vor Hus*, in: *Eschatologie und Hussitismus*, pp. 61–72; P. CERMANOVÁ, *Čechy na konci věků*, pp. 55–67; EADEM, *The Apocalyptic Background of Hussite Radicalism*, in: *A Companion to the Hussites*, pp. 187–218, here pp. 189–193.

15) In Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (hereinafter referred to as ÖNB), Cod. 4749, Jakoubek's treatise is contained in fol. 96r–111v, and in Cod. 4933, fol. 205v–219v.

16) For more on the manuscript, see Jaroslav WEBER – Josef TRÍŠKA – Pavel SPUNAR, *Soupis rukopisů v Třeboni a v Českém Krumlově*, Praha 1958, pp. 115–160, no. 17.

17) SOA Třeboň, ms. A 16, fol. 425r.

As Stephen Lahey has recently suggested, the portion of the manuscript that records Stanislaus's tract was likely of interest to Catholic opponents of the Utraquists, and Crux tarred Jakoubek and the Taborites with the same brush.<sup>18</sup> Of course, the Taborites had lost control of Tábor long before the Třeboň manuscript was produced. Still, Crux still seemed to be interested in making the connection with Jakoubek because of the ongoing controversies over the practice of utraquism.<sup>19</sup>

Considering that Crux studied at the University of Prague (documents state he was there in 1459) and copied various tracts of Jakoubek and works about the Taborites, it is uncontroversial to assume that he knew that Jakoubek and the Taborites maintained different positions on scriptural interpretation. Indeed, his comment in the margin of Třeboň A 16 does not align Jakoubek with the Taborites, but rather Crux seeks to show that the claims about the Antichrist are part of a long tradition of heresy that stemmed from Jakoubek and was developed by the Taborites. Nevertheless, there was undoubtedly a polemical reason for including the comment.<sup>20</sup> The section of Třeboň A 16 that contained Stanislaus's tract was produced a year after Crux was ordained as a priest and became a vicar at St. Vitus Cathedral in Prague – a time in which he likely wanted to steer people away from utraquism as an alternative to communion in conventional Catholic churches.<sup>21</sup> The

18) From Lahey's work in progress on Stanislaus of Znojmo and his relation to Wyclif and Jakoubek.

19) It is significant that in the margin of fol. 425r the gloss does not implicate the Wycliffites, Hussites and followers of Jan Rokycana, as a similar gloss does on fol. 368r: *Contra Wiclefistas, Thaboritas, Husitas, Rokyczanistas et alios*. This seems to suggest some discrimination in the thought of Crux of Telč when it came to Stanislaus of Znojmo's *Tractatus*, as Crux does not implicate all shades of heretics in the manner of his previous gloss.

20) See Lucie Doležalová's details about Crux's marginalia in relation to *De sancto Iohanne Hus* (Třeboň A 16, fol. 43r–v) for more examples of his polemical copying, in *Kříž z Telče (1434–1504)*, pp. 47–56. Crux's polemical rhetoric is best exemplified in a couple of letters from 1477 contained in NKP, ms. XI C 8, fol. 226r–227v, and edited in *Kříž z Telče (1434–1504)*, pp. 187–214. This correspondence was supposedly written to a certain Tobias, headmaster of the school in Tábor. Crux asks Tobias whether Hus was executed for practising communion in both kinds, and whether there was a miraculous eclipse at the moment that he was burned or whether the eclipse occurred when Hus was still imprisoned. Lucie Doležalová and Jan Ctibor have questioned whether the correspondence was genuine, or part of the medieval rhetorical tradition of writing open letters intended for larger circulation. *List – Oldřich Kříž z Telče Tobiášovi do Tábora*, edd. Lucie DOLEŽALOVÁ – Jan CTIBOR, in: *Čítanka latinských textů z pozdně středověkých Čech*, edd. Lucie Doležalová – Michal Dragoun – Jan Ctibor, Praha 2017, pp. 183–194, here pp. 184–185. Their argument is strengthened by the fact that the only copy of the correspondence survives in a codex featuring texts that addressed communion in both kinds. In his reply to Tobias, Crux in a highly polemicized manner, erroneously asserts that Hus was in fact executed for supporting communion in both kinds, and proceeds to summarise several arguments against the practice. He goes on to claim that those who followed the tenets of utraquism drank too much alcohol and disrespected the Church by replacing communion wine with ale: *Et si veritate legis Christi fides est regulanda tamen oportet quod aliqui sint qui intelligant legem et secundum eam diiudicent sobrie et mature. Non quemadmodum vestri faciunt inebriantes se cantant: 'Tot su wieczy poswatne' etc., ymmo digito apporrigeret cervisiam in ore eius, vel alium liquorem inebriativum.* (Although faith must be established according to the truth of Christ's law, it is still necessary that there be some who interpret the law and judge it soberly and maturely. Not, as yours do, getting drunk and singing: "These are sacred things", etc. Indeed, his [the Utraquist priest] fingers will pour beer or other intoxicating liquids into his mouth [i.e. that of the communicant].). Latin text from Lucie Doležalová's critical edition in *Kříž z Telče (1434–1504)*, pp. 190–191.

21) For Crux's career see Lucie Doležalová's biography *Ibidem*, pp. 13–32.

selection of passages that Crux chose to transcribe of Stanislaus work is indicative of what Lucie Doležalová has termed Crux's 'creative copying': namely, of transcribing passages and adding comments to reflect the scribe's interests and tastes above those of the original author.<sup>22</sup> Relatively little attention is paid to interpretation in Stanislaus's full *Tractatus*, which was almost entirely devoted to establishing the structure of the Church and countering claims of a papal Antichrist.<sup>23</sup> By copying only the sections of Stanislaus's *Tractatus* that explicitly addressed interpretation, the revised text served Crux's interest in apocalyptic interpretation and the nature of glossing.

Nevertheless, Crux's interest in Stanislaus's work went only so far, as he reproduces a small portion of the text. Stanislaus's treatise has previously been identified between fol. 423v and 427v in Třeboň A 16,<sup>24</sup> but the actual summary of the *Tractatus* is much shorter, taking up just one and a half pages, fol. 425r–v. Crux copies a list of three grave errors of which Stanislaus accuses Jakoubek, followed by twelve short summary points quoted from the concluding section of the *Tractatus*.<sup>25</sup> After Stanislaus's text there is a list of quotations from traditional sources of authority on the Antichrist and scriptural interpretation, beginning with Jerome before moving on to Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, etc. These authorities cover fol. 425v–427v and are longer than the summary of Stanislaus's text itself. Furthermore, an extract from Adso of Montier-en-Der's *De Antichristo* is copied from fol. 423v to the first seventeen lines of fol. 425r, crowding out Stanislaus's text even further. This gives us some indication of Crux's priority in this section of the codex: he is more concerned with the types of authorities that are referenced in the completed version of Stanislaus's *Tractatus* and what they had to say about the Antichrist, than with fully recounting Stanislaus's claims.<sup>26</sup>

The list of grave errors that Jakoubek allegedly committed in his *Posicio* gives us another clue as to Crux's focus. Each item in the list is taken from book four of Stanislaus's treatise, which addresses scriptural interpretation and the use of authorities.<sup>27</sup> Where Stanislaus's full treatise begins with a lengthy discussion of

22) Lucie DOLEŽALOVÁ, *Personal Multiple-Text Manuscripts in Late Medieval Central Europe: The 'Library' of Crux of Telč (1434–1504)*, in: *The Emergence of Multiple-Text Manuscripts*, edd. Alessandro Bausi – Michael Friedrich – Marilena Maniaci, Berlin – Boston 2019 (= *Studies in Manuscript Cultures* 17), pp. 145–170, here pp. 165–167.

23) Stanislaus provides a relatively faithful rendering of Wyclif's conception of the structure of the Church and the Church, or Synagoge, of the Antichrist. For Stanislaus, Wyclif's portrayal was quite conventional and orthodox, especially in comparison to Jakoubek's model that was based on Matěj and Milič. See Lahey's forthcoming book project on Stanislaus and Wyclif.

24) J. WEBER – J. TŘÍŠKA – P. SPUNAR, *Soupis rukopisů v Třeboni a v Českém Krumlově*, p. 159; Pavel SPUNAR, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provecum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem conditam illustrans* I, Wrocław etc. 1985 (= *Studia Copernicana* 25), p. 289, no. 786.

25) SOA Třeboň, ms. A 16, fol. 425r–v. Corresponding to ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 144v–145v, and Cod. 4933, fol. 244v–245r. See appendix.

26) It is unlikely that Crux would have assumed his readers to have familiarity with or access to the full version of Stanislaus's text, as the number of surviving manuscripts of the *Tractatus* suggests that the text was not widely available or especially popular.

27) Almost all of the major Prague masters active in the early Hussite movement attempted to discredit the Taborites by suggesting that they stuck too closely to their physical enactments in chiliastic

what form the Antichrist would take – arguing that the Antichrist could never truly be the contrary of Christ because he lacks the divine power ordained by God that Christ possessed<sup>28</sup> – the summary version begins with the dangers of jumping to the mystical senses of Scripture without first considering the literal:

*Primo, quia illos textus [simul] privant fundamentali sententia textuali, reali et propria, cum asserant solum mysticum et similitudinarium sensum continere, et non sensum textualem, cum omnis textus scripture, sive aperte et manifeste loquatur; sive sensum tropicum et enigmaticum, [debeat] habere primum suum sensum textualem realiter et proprium, cui sensus mystici et similitudinarii [possunt] circumpo- ni vel supponi.*<sup>29</sup>

‘First, because those texts are at once deprived of the fundamental sentence of textual truth and particularities when they [Jakoubek and his followers] assert that it contains only the mystical sense and its images, and not the textual [i.e. literal] sense. With all Scripture, whether it is open and plainly spoken, or it is tropological and enigmatic, it first holds its own true textual sense and characteristics, to which the mystical sense is able to be placed around or on top.’

Stanislaus claims that the foundation of Scripture is the literal sense – that which was defined by Augustine as the historical context and intention of the author (*intentio auctoris*), either figuratively or plainly – and upon this literal foundation all other interpretation is to be based.<sup>30</sup> In the archetypal four-fold structure of scriptural interpretation that was held to be the ideal model for exegetes to follow, the literal sense should always come before one moved to the allegorical, anagogical or tropological. Although the four senses of Scripture were rarely represented equally in commentaries of the period, the four-fold structure still provided the basic framework for all exegesis.<sup>31</sup> One need not employ all four modes, in other words, because invoking any one of them should necessarily imply the others. Stanislaus accuses Jakoubek of purposely excluding the foundational literal sense and distorting the meaning by considering only the mystical connotations that were essential to his claims about the Antichrist. He explains that the very understanding of the Antichrist as a composite body of numerous members controlled by

prophecies. František ŠMAHEL, *Die Hussitische Revolution II*, Hannover 2002 (= Schriften der MGH 43/II), p. 1049; IDEM, *Husitské Čechy. Struktury, procesy, ideje*, Praha 2001, p. 285; H. KAMINSKY, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, p. 315; Petr ČORNEJ, *Velké dějiny země Koruny české V. 1402–1437*, Praha – Litomyšl 2000, p. 224; Amedeo MOLNÁR, *K otázce reformační iniciativy lidu. Svědectví husitského kázání*, in: *Acta reformationem Bohemicam illustrantia I. Příspěvky k dějinám utrakvismu*, ed. Idem, Praha 1978, pp. 5–44, here p. 21; Robert KALIVODA, *Husitské myšlení*, Praha 1997, p. 185, note 39.

28) For more on these aspects of the *Tractatus*, see: J. SEDLÁK, *Spis Stanislava ze Znojma „de Antichristo“*; S. SOUSEDÍK, *Stanislaus von Znaim († 1414)*, pp. 52–56.

29) SOA Třeboň, ms. A 16, fol. 425r; ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 129r, and Cod. 4933, fol. 233v.

30) Stanislaus followed this standard concept of the literal as defined by Augustine and refined by those such as Aquinas. Alastair J. MINNIS, *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, Philadelphia 2010, pp. 73–74; Marie-Dominique CHENU, *Towards Understanding Saint Thomas*, trans. Albert M. Landry – Dominic Hughes, Chicago 1964, pp. 167–168.

31) A. J. MINNIS, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 5.

a head, as Jakoubek describes him, was an allegory and not part of the foundational meaning of the parts of Scripture from which Jakoubek drew.<sup>32</sup>

Stanislaus would have been familiar with the trend in the late medieval period to treat some parts of the mystical senses of Scripture as components of the literal reading.<sup>33</sup> The Hussites were particularly influenced by the likes of Nicholas Lyra, Richard FitzRalph and John Wyclif, who developed the idea of the *duplex sensus litteralis*, in which allegory could in fact be regarded as the literal sense. These authors argued that the allegorical sense of Scripture was a part of the intended meaning of the Holy Spirit as author. Thus to understand what the author fundamentally intended to say, one had to take into account what the metaphors of their writing signified. John Wyclif further broadened the literal sense so that it included all the four classical modes of scriptural interpretation. For Wyclif, and indeed several other theologians of the period, Scripture was not so much a text that was mediated by human ('proximate') authors, but a single Divine Truth that existed outside of the textual form and the historical context in which the human authors were writing. If every Bible were destroyed, the Divine Truth of Scripture would still exist in a platonic sense without the text. Stripped from its physical form and the historical context in which it was written, there were definitive truths that God sought to pass to His faithful followers. In order to comprehend what this Truth was, the traditional literal or historical sense sometimes had to give way to one or more of the allegorical registers.<sup>34</sup>

Nevertheless, even if Jakoubek drew on the *duplex sensus litteralis*, it did not give him carte blanche to take Scripture out of context from the intention of the author, forming a patchwork of different passages that together verified his claims about the End Times. Stanislaus invokes Richard FitzRalph's *Summa in quaestionibus Armenorum*, who in turn extrapolates from Augustine, to explain that where biblical authors used allegory, it had a literal truth elsewhere in the Bible and thus was not detached from a foundational meaning. Stanislaus and FitzRalph both refer to Galatians 4:22–33, where Paul interprets Abraham's children allegorically to show that while the passage would seem to suggest that the allegorical interpretation is the Apostle's *intentio auctoris*, the meaning is actually based on the earlier literal description of the sons in the Old Testament. FitzRalph explains: *Sed*

32) Stanislaus points to the understanding of the Antichrist that Jakoubek derives from Daniel and the New Testament as evidence of his preference for the allegorical over the literal. ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 128r; and Cod. 4933, fol. 232v.

33) Beryl SMALLEY, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, Oxford 1952, pp. 281–308; Lesley SMITH, *The 'Glossa Ordinaria'. The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, Leiden – Boston 2009, pp. 63–66, 225–228.

34) Kantik GHOSH, *The Wycliffite Heresy. Authority and the Interpretation of Texts*, Cambridge – New York 2002 (= Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 45), pp. 11–14; Alastair J. MINNIS, 'Authorial Intention' and "Literal Sense" in the Exegetical Theories of Richard FitzRalph and John Wyclif: An Essay in the Medieval History of Biblical Hermeneutics, Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 75 C, 1975, pp. 1–31, here pp. 4–5; Pavel SOUKUP, *Metaphors of the Spiritual Struggle Early in the Bohemian Reformation: The Exegesis of 'Arma Spiritualia' in Hus, Jakoubek, and Chelčický*, The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice 6, 2007, pp. 87–109, here pp. 88–89; IDEM, *Reformní kazatelství a Jakoubek ze Strážnice*, Praha 2011, pp. 282–284.

*nunquam quia scriptura de Abraham filiis et uxoribus suis est per allegoriam dicta, ideo non est vera ad literam.*<sup>35</sup> ('But just because Scripture speaks of Abraham's sons and wives through allegory, it does not mean that they were not real in a literal sense.') In the passage, Paul's allegorical interpretation is the *intentio auctoris*, but it is also clear that Abraham's sons and wives were real people, hence Paul bases his interpretation in a literal sense from another point in the Bible. For Stanislaus, like FitzRalph, an allegorical reading was not part of the *duplex sensus litteralis* if it did not have a literal sense that preceded and anchored it: *Si enim tanta scriptura superius allegata non habet, nisi misticum et similitudinarium sensum, et non habet aliquam apertum proprium et realem sensum literalem et textualem...*<sup>36</sup> ('For if such [a passage of] Scripture does not have a prior account, it cannot have the mystical and imaginary sense because it does not have its own open and real sense, the literal and textual...') Stanislaus's point about precedent passages is vital for our understanding of the apocalyptic question because he argued that all of Jakoubek's assumptions about the Antichrist were based in an allegorical register that had no basis in an anchoring literal sense.

In the *Posicio de Antichristo*, a case can be made that Jakoubek is guilty of Stanislaus's accusation, namely of taking Scripture out of context and neglecting the literal sense. In a section on 2 Thessalonians 2, Jakoubek explains that Paul was prophesising the events of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Paul told the Thessalonians that the End Times had not arrived, despite what their own church had told them, because a number of signs must occur before one could be certain of the impending Apocalypse. One of these signs was a *discessio*, a departure or fall from faith. Jakoubek explains:

*Ex quo textu videtur, quod cum venerit discessio hec ab Apostolo intellecta, quod tunc in foribus venit Anticristus. Sibi talis discessio iam venit dudum, ergo verisimile est, quod iam venit Anticristus continue et successive per temporum intervalla revellandus.*<sup>37</sup>

'From this text it is seen that the coming fall was understood by the Apostle to be the time in which the Antichrist comes in the door. This fall has now been coming for a long time, therefore it appears to be true that now the Antichrist comes, continually and through successive intervals of time, to be revealed.'

If this *discessio* was a sure sign of the End Times, then proving specifically what the term referred to was imperative. Although Paul does not explain precisely what he means by a *discessio* in 2 Thessalonians 2, Jakoubek turns to various other passages to prove that the term referred to those who repeatedly and continually sinned and exploited the Church. For Jakoubek, the clergy and papacy were the

35) ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 129v, and Cod. 4933, fol. 233v. See also: Richard FITZRALPH, *Summa domini Armacani in questionibus Armenorum*, ed. Iohannes SUDORIS, [Parisiis 1512], fol. 146v (Lib. XVIII, cap. 5); A. J. MINNIS, "Authorial Intention" and "Literal Sense", p. 9.

36) ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 129r-v, and Cod. 4933, fol. 233v.

37) NKP, ms. X E 24, fol. 236v, and ms. XI D 5, fol. 173v; see also Jitka SEDLÁČKOVÁ, *Jakoubek ze Stříbra a jeho kvestie o Antikristu*, master's thesis defended at the Ústav pomocných věd historických a archivnictví Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy university (Department of Auxiliary Historical Sciences and Archive Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University), Brno 2001, p. 40.

ones who exploited the Church and so he concludes that it was them that Paul was prophesizing. To give a sense of how Jakoubek determined this, it is worth quoting him at length:

*Ecce quod Apostolus ad Thesalonica prophetans discessionem a fide in novissimis temporibus quod hoc se expones dictam esse discessionem a fide. Non autem intelligitur hic talis discessio a fide per manifestam abnegationem aliquorum articulo- rum, ut presint in hereticis et aliis manifestis apostatis, sed magis ad propositum Anticristi veritas intelligitur discessio a fide, que per dilectionem operatur, que sit per extinctionem amoris divini ad Iesum et ad proximos ceteros. Non quod iam sic communiter expresse negarent Christum et suam fidem, sicut olim peccatus quamvis hoc intridum contingat, sed est discessio adverso Ihesum per multiplicationem uni- versorum peccatorum et errorum et fictionum ac fabularum in populo christiano, et hinc finem manifeste alludit Veritas Mathei 24<sup>o</sup> [5] describens tempora novissima Anticristi dicens: ‘Multi enim venient in nomine meo dicentes: Ego sum Cristus et multos seducent.’ Et paulo post [Matthew 24:10–12]: ‘Et tunc scandalizabuntur multi, et invicem tradent, et odio habebunt invicem. Et multi pseudoprophete surgent, et seducent multos. Et quoniam habundavit iniquitas, et refrigescet caritas multorum.’ Ista autem dicta non notant abnegationem Dei manifestam, sicut olim prefuit. Sed corruptionem fidei et morum sanctorum atque errorum multorum fidei sancte in missorum intantum, ut in errorem inducantur, si fieri potest et electi. Et hoc inten- dens Apostolus cum dixisset: ‘Discedent quidam a fide.’ [1 Timothy 4:1]<sup>38</sup>*

‘Behold that the Apostle to the Thessalonians prophesised that the departure in the End Times, that he here exposed, is said to be a departure from faith. This is not to be understood as a departure from faith manifest through a denial of a particular article that is present in heresy or some other apostate, but rather a departure from faith is understood as practising the truth of the Antichrist, operating through dilection, and through the extinction of divine love to Jesus and to one’s neighbours. It is not because such a community expressly deny Christ and His faith through sins formerly or however frequently committed; it is a departure adverse to Jesus through multiplying [or spreading] universal sins, errors, fictions and fables to the Christian populace. It is clearly alluded to by the Truth of Mat- thew 24[:5], [where Jesus] describes the End Times of the Antichrist saying: “For many will come in my name saying, I am Christ: and they will seduce many.” And a little afterwards [Matthew 24:10–12]: “And then will many be scandalized and will betray and hate each other. And many false prophets will rise and seduce many. And because iniquity abounds, the charity of many will grow cold.” However, this is not to say that they observe a clear denial of God, as He is the head [of the Church], but rather a corruption of the faith and holy morals, and through multiple errors of holy faith disseminated often in order to induce error, if they are able and choose to. And this is what the Apostle intends when he says: “Some shall depart from the faith.” [1 Timothy 4:1]’

38) NKP, ms. X E 24, fol. 236v–237r, and ms. XI D 5, fol. 174r.

Crucially, Jakoubek claims that denying specific parts of Church law or doctrine, as he himself did, does not constitute a departure from the faith; the departure was rather a culmination of a moral corruption within the Church committed by its members. Moral decay was so dangerous for Christ's Church because certain priests, who were satellites of the Antichrist, were preaching multiple errors in order to advance the corruption. Their preaching is clear evidence of the End Times because, for Jakoubek, the priests placed themselves above Christ when they preached fictitious exempla and used contemporary glossae to interpret His words.<sup>39</sup> Cross-referencing 1 Timothy 4:1 and Matthew 24:5 was relatively common in discussions of heresy and the End Times, and Jakoubek was certainly not the first to draw the connection.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, according to Stanislaus one must not get carried away by the possible apocalyptic connotations of the passages, because they had a clear historical sense to Paul and Matthew: Paul explains to Timothy how the Church should be established and run, whereas Matthew records Christ's words directly about false prophets who would come to claim the authority of God with false miracles.<sup>41</sup> Both passages could be taken to refer to possible future conflict within the Church, but they do not explicitly refer to a specific time as the Apocalypse. Most exegetes took such passages to be applicable throughout Church history and not tied to a precise moment.<sup>42</sup>

Examples of this method of exegesis occur throughout Jakoubek's *Posicio*, as he arranges different verses of Scripture to make his case for the papacy as the seat of the Antichrist. This was not the method of allegorical interpretation that FitzRalph or Stanislaus practised, where allegories could be treated definitively as the intention of the author only if there was a preceding literal understanding from which they drew. Each passage that Jakoubek cites had apocalyptic connotations, of course, but he was required to do some rhetorical manoeuvring to make them

39) Much like Matěj of Janov before him, Jakoubek connected the advent of the Antichrist with the abandonment of communion to the laity. S. LAHEY, *Matěj of Janov*, pp. 12–17; Helena KRMÍČKOVÁ, *Vliv Matěje z Janova na utrakvismus Jakoubka ze Stříbra a Mikuláše z Drážďan*, in: *Mistr Matěj z Janova ve své a v naší době*. Sborník z vědeckého symposia, konaného na Teologické fakultě Jihočeské univerzity 29.–30. listopadu 2000, edd. Jan B. Lášek – Karel Skalický, Brno 2002 (= *Studie Teologické fakulty Jihočeské univerzity* 21), pp. 78–88, here pp. 78–81.

40) See: Irene BUENO, *False Prophets and Ravening Wolves: Biblical Exegesis as a Tool against Heretics in Jacques Fournier's 'Postilla' on Matthew*, *Speculum* 89, 2014, pp. 35–65, especially pp. 60–62. See also Penn R. SZITTYA's discussion of William St Amour in *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature*, Princeton 1986, p. 61, and the passages from Timothy and Paul used against the Cathars in *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe. Documents in Translation*, ed. Edward PETERS, Philadelphia 1980, pp. 111–112.

41) False miracles that contrast the life of Christ were commonly attributed to the Antichrist. For instance, Adso of Montier-en-Der's popular *De ortu et tempore Antichristi* explains that the Antichrist fakes his death only to remerge three days later as if miraculously resurrected. Curtis V. BOSTICK, *The Antichrist and the Lollards. Apocalypticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England*, Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998 (= *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought* 70), p. 96. The Antichrist is sometimes also associated with Simon Magus, who offered to trick people with illusions that seemed like miracles in order to increase devotion to Christ.

42) Bernard MCGINN, *Antichrist. Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*, San Francisco 1994, pp. 41–68.

align with his position that they prophesied his present time. It is straightforward, therefore, to see why Stanislaus objected. There is little concern for the context in which Paul and Matthew were writing, or the literal, historical sense of their text. The passages are spliced together as if they were written in tandem to prophesize the same events.

Distinguishing the literal sense in one's exegesis was particularly significant because Stanislaus invokes Augustine's argument in his letter against Vincent the Donatist that one cannot provide proof for a scriptural argument from the mystical senses of Scripture alone, one must firmly base one's position in the literal register.<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, Stanislaus concedes:

*Sic nulli fidelium licet discredere scripturas illas simul de Daniele, et postea allegatas de novo testamento, quando ille partim manifeste et proprie, partim tropice et enigmaticae, venturam in novissimis temporibus circa finem seculi personam unam humanam non ex pluribus personis aggregatam per tres annos cum dimidio tyrannice divinaturam, etc. significant et ostendant.*<sup>44</sup>

'Thus, although no one of faith discredits those Scriptures – both from Daniel and afterwards that having been laid forth from the New Testament, since they are partly manifestly clear and partly hidden in tropological and enigmatic senses – they signify and expose the coming in the End Times, around the end of the world, of one human person that will be endured, not of multiple persons aggregated during three years with divided tyrannical power, etc.'

Still, the hidden senses of Daniel and the New Testament do not identify the Antichrist as Jakoubek's definition of the conglomerate papal Antichrist with his evil members splitting their power for three years (at Stanislaus's time of writing, 1413, there had been three popes for four years, since 1409). In the same vein, Stanislaus argues that Scripture does not anywhere suggest when the End Times will occur. Wyclif also held that one could never know when the Apocalypse would occur or the identity of the followers of the Antichrist.<sup>45</sup> Jakoubek in his *Posicio* aligned himself with Matěj of Janov, who saw the Papal Schism as an obvious sign that the Antichrist would be exposed imminently; this was, in fact, so obvious that

43) Mary DOVE, *The First English Bible. The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions*, Cambridge – New York 2007 (= Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 66), p. 134; Alastair J. MINNIS, *Material Swords and Literal Lights. The Status of Allegory in William of Ockham's 'Breviloquium' on Papal Power*, in: *With Reverence for the Word. Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edd. Jane Dammen McAuliffe – Barry D. Walfish – Joseph W. Goering, Oxford – New York 2010, pp. 292–308, here p. 295.

44) ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 128r; and Cod. 4933, fol. 232v.

45) Stephen E. LAHEY, *John Wyclif*, Oxford – New York 2009 (= Great Medieval Thinkers), p. 193. Wyclif declared that Christ hid three things from humans: the hour of one's death, whether one is destined for salvation or damnation and the exact time of the Apocalypse. Jakoubek draws the same conclusion in an Ash Wednesday sermon of 1416 delivered at Bethlehem Chapel. Jakoubek ZE STRÍBRA, *Betlemská kázání z roku 1416*, ed. Karel ŠITA, Praha 1951, p. 23. See also Amedeo MOLNÁR, *Die eschatologische Hoffnung der böhmischen Reformation*, in: *Von der Reformation zum Morgen*, ed. Josef L. Hromádka, Leipzig 1959, pp. 59–187, here p. 77; P. SOUKUP, *The Masters and the End of the World*, p. 95.

he declared that 'it must be clear to everyone who is not asleep'.<sup>46</sup> Jakoubek took Matěj's claims about Scripture and the End Times to the next logical step, stating that the reign of the papal Antichrist was already underway. It was this claim to which Stanislaus objected. The third error listed in Třeboň A 16 claims:

[...] *volunt papam haberi nunc ut summum Antichristum, et post eum cardinales, archiepiscopos, episcopos et usque ad infimum curatum ut satellites illius Antichristi, et [sic!] papam cum illis sicut precipuum nunc Antichristum, cum suo corpore mistico Antichristi fidelibus detestandum, persequendum, in iudicio et mandatis suis contempnendum, in foro suo legislatorio et iudicatorio horrendum, et ita de aliis.*<sup>47</sup>

'[...] they desire today's pope to be held as the highest Antichrist, and after him the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, down to the lowest curates are held as the satellites of the Antichrist. And thus the pope with those [satellites] is especially today just like the Antichrist. With his mystical body of the Antichrist he is to be detestably pursued in court by the faithful, and his orders are to be condemned in justice courts, [along with] his horrendous legislation and judgements, and so forth.'

Not only did Jakoubek's claim defame the head of the Church but it signalled the beginning of the sixth age, meaning that the End was rapidly approaching.<sup>48</sup> The Taborites claimed much the same in their own writings, that the End Times were happening in their present. However, they claimed that events had progressed further and that they were living in seventh age, which would see the Second Coming of Christ. The early Taborites prophesised that Christ would return in February 1420, but when the date came and went and Christ had not made Himself known, they maintained that He had come secretly among them like a 'thief in the night' (Revelation 3:3).<sup>49</sup> The Prague masters, including Jakoubek, argued against the immediacy of the Taborite claims; Jakoubek was cautious never to suggest that the End Times had moved on to such an extent as one could expect the Second Coming imminently. As Pavel Soukup explains, what started as a rapid sprint towards the End Times turned 'into a rather leisurely process', as the Prague masters maintained that the papal Antichrist would have a long reign and things had still to get worse before the seventh age began.<sup>50</sup>

46) *Matthiae de Janov dicti Magister Parisiensis Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti* III, ed. Vlastimil KYBAL, Oeniponte 1911, p. 30 (Lib. III, tr. 5, dist. 5, cap. 8): *Quis vero est ille in hoc tempore, qui est mendax et venit per mendacium in papatum, notum potest esse illi, qui non dormit.*

47) SOA Třeboň, ms. A 16, fol. 425r. This is unchanged from ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 130r; and Cod. 4933, fol. 234r-v.

48) Pavlína CERMANOVÁ, *The Apocalyptic Background of Hussite Radicalism*; EADEM, *Constructing the Apocalypse: Connections between English and Bohemian Apocalyptic Thinking*, in: *Europe After Wyclif*, edd. J. Patrick Hornbeck II – Michael Van Dussen, New York 2017, pp. 66–88.

49) See *Articuli et errores Taboritarum* in AČ III, ed. František PALACKÝ, Praha 1844, pp. 218–225, no. 21, here p. 220: *It[em] již nyní tento čas skonání věku, jenž den pomsty slove, přišel jest tajně Kristus jako zloděj...* ('Already at this time at the end of the age, which is the day of vengeance, Christ has come secretly like a thief...')

50) P. SOUKUP, *The Masters and the End of the World*, pp. 107–108; see also Pavlína CERMANOVÁ, *Waiting for Paradise – Waiting for Damnation. Concepts of Apocalyptic Time in Prophecies of the Hussite Period*, in: *Mittelalterliche Zukunftsgestaltung im Angesicht des Weltendes / Forming the Future Facing the End of the World in the Middle Ages*, ed. Felicitas Schmieder, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2015 (= Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 77), pp. 141–164.

Despite disagreements as to the timeline of the Apocalypse, the Taborites found the mode of exegesis employed in Jakoubek's *Posicio de Antichristo* to be particularly appealing. In Taborite theology, all prophets and authors of the Bible, from the Old and New Testaments, had a glimpse into the future through the Holy Spirit, and therefore passages that are seemingly unconnected can be shown to prophesise the same events. This approach was not unique to Taborite exegesis, but rather was part of a tradition of *recapitulatio* that could be traced back to exegesis from late antiquity.<sup>51</sup> Jakoubek may not, therefore, have influenced this approach, but he certainly engaged in the same tradition. In a chiliastic Taborite *questio* recorded by the Hussite chronicler Vavřinec of Březová († 1437), the anonymous author explains this method of *recapitulatio* most succinctly: *quia secretum suum Deus revelavit ad servos suos prophetas dans eis intelligere, signa hiis ampliora ne queramus* ('since God revealed His secrets to his servants, his prophets, giving them understanding, we must not seek greater signs').<sup>52</sup> For this author, then, everything that was needed to uncover the Apocalypse was already present in Scripture, and so there was no need to seek other signs or authorities about the End Times in glosses written by earthly authors. Since the Taborite author believed that all the prophets and writers of Scripture were led to write about the same future, the historical context in which they were writing became less important because the primary intention was to be prophetic. The *questio* argues further that the signs present in Scripture were left for the true followers of Christ, and so if followers of the Antichrist, those of the adulterous generation (*generacione adultera*), tried to decode the passages, they would lack the wisdom to comprehend them.<sup>53</sup>

When considering Jakoubek's apocalyptic exegesis in his *Posicio de Antichristo*, it becomes apparent why Crux paired Jakoubek and the Taborites in his condemnation. However, as mentioned earlier, Jakoubek quickly moved away from this type of exegesis. In his *Výklad na Zjevení sv. Jana* ('Exposition of the Revelation of St John'), Jakoubek takes various apocalyptic passages and gives a moral interpretation that entails rejecting worldly temptations by trusting in God to cure the hearts of the sinful. Jakoubek held that the End Times could occur at any time and so one must remain contrite and pure in order to be ready. This contrasted with the Taborite interpretation, which led them to the mountains to form communities away from what they considered to be the Babylonian city of Prague. Jakoubek

51) For more, see: Kenneth B. STEINHAUSER, 'Recapitulatio' in *Tyconius and Augustine*, Augustinian Studies 15, 1984, pp. 1-5; Alastair J. MINNIS, *Discussions of "Authorial Role" and "Literary Form" in Late-Medieval Scriptural Exegesis*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 99, 1977, pp. 37-65.

52) František Michálek BARTOŠ, *Do čtyř pražských artykulů. Z myšlenkových i ústavních zápasů let 1415-1420*, Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hlavního města Prahy 5, 1932, pp. 481-591, here p. 584; also quoted in P. SOUKUP, *Reformní kazatelství a Jakoubek ze Stříbra*, p. 339.

53) F. M. BARTOŠ, *Do čtyř pražských artykulů*, p. 584: *Sed res est stupendo miraculo Digna, quod sapientes huius mundi faciem terre certe sciunt per signa cognoscere et tempus hoc non possunt diiudicare. Quid aliud de eis sciendum est, nisi quod sunt de generacione adultera, qui indigni sunt, ut detur eis signorum intelligencia!*

argues that Matthew's suggestion of fleeing to the mountains was a metaphor and not an invitation to physically escape the city:

*'Tehdy kteří sau v Židovstvu, utiekajte k horám'* [Matthew 24:17], *totiž varujte se od zlosti šatanovy, uzavierajte se od bluduov a navyklostí zlých. 'A modlte se, aby utiekanie vaše nebylo v zimě.'* [Matthew 24:20] *Srdce studené, od lásky božie uhašené, nemuož utiekati; ale kdež zahřívá Kristus, slunce spravedlnosti, a osvěcuje skrze vieru, ten ť utieká od přátel a časných věcí, ano i od vlastního těla, jedině aby toliko zuostati mohlo vnitř to, což se Bohu líbí.*<sup>54</sup>

"Then those in Judea must flee to the mountains" [Matthew 24:17]: that is, avoid the angers of Satan, shield yourselves from errors and bad habits. "Pray that your flight may not be in winter." [Matthew 24:20]: Cold hearts, with the love of God doused, cannot flee; but he who is warmed by Christ, the sun of righteousness, and is illumined by faith, runs away from friends and worldly things, yes, also from his own body, so that inside him there would remain only that which is pleasing to God.'

These passages are to be taken allegorically, interpreted to mean that the faithful must avoid the worldly possessions of Satan and embrace only that which is pleasing to God. God is the only one who can purge the heart of the cold, and it is by holding the soul higher than the body that one can be cured of the coldness of sin. Retreating to the mountains and literally battling one's enemy was, therefore, ill-advised and naïve because it took the forewarnings from Matthew out of their allegorical and anagogical context.<sup>55</sup> Still, as Soukup maintains, the Taborites did employ an allegorical interpretation of the passages in Matthew's Little Apocalypse: after all, a literal interpretation would have forced them to seek out mountains in Egypt, not Bohemia. Both the Utraquists and the Taborites, in fact, took the notion of fleeing to the mountains to be a call to flee from the sinners in Prague, but the resulting actions diverged drastically.<sup>56</sup>

The concept that the End Times will lead to a spiritual rather than physical struggle is evident even in Jakoubek's earlier writings. In his *Posicio*, Jakoubek argues that the tribulation brought about by the impending Apocalypse was spiritual, affecting the soul rather than the body. He explains:

[...] *quod tribulatio maxima, in tempore Anticristi prophetata a Christo Mathei 24<sup>o</sup> [21], non est in rebus temporalibus, sed in animabus, non quibuscunque, sed animabus electorum et discipulorum Cristi. Unde cum dixisset Christus quod 'erit tribulatio magna qualis non fuit ab initio mundi usque modo noc fiet'*.<sup>57</sup>

['...] that the greatest suffering in the time of the Antichrist prophesied by Christ in Matthew 24[:21] is not in temporal things, but in the spiritual, and not of everyone, but of the souls of the elect and disciples of Christ. Since Christ had said

54) Jakoubek ZE STŘÍBRA, *Výklad na Zjevení sv. Jana I*, ed. František ŠIMEK, Praha 1932 (= Sbíрка pramenů českého hnutí náboženského ve století XIV. a XV. 18), p. 490 (chapt XII).

55) V. KYBAL, *M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Střibra*; P. SOUKUP, *Reformní kazatelství a Jakoubek ze Střibra*, pp. 241–242.

56) P. SOUKUP, *The Masters and the End of the World*, p. 101.

57) NKP, ms. X E 24, fol. 240v, and ms. XI D 5, fol. 178v.

“for there will be then great tribulation, such as has not been felt from the beginning of the world until now, and never will it be equaled again”.’

The great tribulation that will be felt in the End Times is to be inflicted upon the congregation of the elect not in a physical or bodily sense but in spiritual torment, which is far more threatening and painful than any bodily pain. This is not to say that Christ’s true preachers would not experience bodily harm, but rather that it should not be their primary concern because the spiritual suffering will be worse. Even in 1413 Jakoubek consistently used the signs of the End Times as a warning to rectify the spiritual corruption of the Church and make one’s soul ready to face Judgement at any time.<sup>58</sup> His interpretation was, then, markedly different from that of the Taborites, who saw the rapidly approaching Apocalypse to be a signal to physically escape Babylonian Prague and put distance between themselves and the corrupt Church. While the mode of exegesis in Jakoubek’s *Posicio* and Taborite works were both based on extrapolations from intertextual concordances, the actions that resulted were starkly different. Both relied on Scripture and rejected the standard glosses and readings of the period to form an interpretation that conservative theologians such as Stanislaus found to be particularly distasteful.

### Glossing and Authorities

One of Stanislaus’s main critiques of Jakoubek’s *Posicio de Antichristo* was the paucity of authorities he cited. Stanislaus argues that it was easy to avoid drifting into error when one took into account the long tradition of exegesis and commentary on the Bible, and that Jakoubek was led into error precisely because he avoided the glosses of undeniably holy men:

*Ideo tales nimis infatuati peccant, qui audent hoc negare, quin et extra communitatem sanctorum doctorum, quin et post communitatem sapientum tractatorum et explanatorum huius scripture,<sup>59</sup> que communitas usque hodie plus quam a mille annis perdurat. Et si communitati illorum sanctorum doctorum et communitati illorum sapientum non est hic circa hanc scripturam standum, nulli erit standum, neque circa hanc, neque circa aliam aliquam scripturam sacram, quod omnem fidem catholicam interimeret et omnem heresim induceret. Et percurrat fidelis quicumque si non inueniat communitatem sanctorum doctorum Ieronymi, Augustini, Crisostomi, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Bernhardi, Remigii etc.<sup>60</sup>*

58) Jakoubek would later go on to explain in greater depth the ways in which the End Times should serve as a constant reminder to remain pure and free of sin. J. ZE STRÍBRA, *Betlemská kázání*, p. 23: *A proto ty věci jsú před námi skryty, abychom tiem snažněji hřiechův se vystřiehali, dobré skutky činili, a tím jistějšé byli milostí Boží, a tiem bezpečnějšé čekali smrti své i dne súdného.* (‘And therefore are those things concealed so that we might more ardently avoid sins, perform good works, and thereby become surer of God’s grace, and less fearful of our death and of Judgment Day.’) Translation from P. SOUKUP, *The Masters and the End of the World*, p. 108, note 79.

59) ÖNB, Cod. 4933, fol. 234r, leaves out a portion of this passage, stating: *Ideo tales nimis infatuati peccant, qui audent hoc negare, quando et extra communitatem sapientum tractatorum et explanatorum huius scripture...*

60) Ibidem, Cod. 4749, fol. 129v–130r, and Cod. 4933, fol. 234r.

‘They are foolish enough to dare to deny the common tradition of interpreting Scripture that has persisted for more than a thousand years up to today without interruption, even though they are not just outside of the community of sacred doctors but also subordinate to the community of wise authors and exegetes of Scripture. Without the guidance of this community of sacred doctors and wise men, one is not able to traverse Scripture, nor is one able to traverse other sacred writings that all faith is based upon, rather one destroys Catholicism and is lead to all sorts of heresy. And one skims over faith if one does not examine the community of sacred doctors, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Gregory, Bernard, Remigius, etc.’

Using glosses and commentaries helped to situate oneself in the community of exegetes that helped form a collective understanding of Scripture. Although these extra-biblical authors were not necessarily led by the Holy Spirit, they still contributed to the sapiential knowledge of Scripture that was essential to its interpretation. Relying on these authorities was particularly important, Stanislaus claims, when dealing with such a contentious issue as the Antichrist, as any error in interpretation could lead one into heresy and erroneous accusations. Jakoubek largely ignored such commentators in his *Posicio*, instead basing his readings on three authors: Augustine, Matěj of Janov and Milíč of Kroměříž.<sup>61</sup> The problem, for Stanislaus, was that Matěj and Milíč were clearly not considered to be part of the established canon of Church Fathers, and did not qualify for his community of wise authors and exegetes. Nonetheless, Jakoubek regularly used all of the holy doctors that Stanislaus lists in his later writings. Indeed, the complaint of Stanislaus in this text again speaks to the distinctiveness of the *Posicio* among Jakoubek’s oeuvre.

Jakoubek diverges from Stanislaus by asserting in his *Posicio* that the advent of the Antichrist could be known from three sources: *ex solida scriptura canonica et rerum experientia et ex interna spiritus illuminatione* (‘from solid canonical Scripture, experience of things and from the inner spirit of illumination’).<sup>62</sup> This meant that he could perhaps ignore the standard glosses, sentences and commentaries because they were not required to comprehend the apocalyptic passages of Scripture. Whilst Stanislaus argued that there were parts of Scripture that were enigmatic and could not be decoded unless one drew on the long tradition of exegetical literature, Jakoubek claimed that unction – as it is defined in 1 John 2:20: *vos unctionem habetis a Sancto, et nostis omnia* (‘you have the unction from the Holy One, and know all things’) – ensured that all aspects of faith could be learnt from the Bible. It was precisely through a combination of Scripture, experience of things and internal illumination that one could come to understand the true meaning of Scripture. However, the precise definition of internal illumination in the *Posicio*

61) As Helena Krmíčková notes, the work is almost entirely quotations from these authors. Helena KRMÍČKOVÁ, *Cupio a te, o pater, edoceri (M. Matthias de Janov et M. Iacobellus de Misa)*, in: Eadem, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, Brno 1997 (= Spisy Masarykovy univerzity v Brně, Filozofická fakulta 310), pp. 86–119; see also Lucie MAZALOVÁ, *Eschatologie v díle Jana Husa*, Brno 2015 (= Spisy Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity 432), pp. 256–260.

62) NKP, ms. X E 24, fol. 240r; and ms. XI D 5, fol. 178v.

is unclear. As Ferdinand Seibt has demonstrated in relation to Jakoubek's works written after 1413, internal illumination seemed to relate to a revelatory experience when one carefully read and ruminated on Scripture and the works of holy doctors. Illumination was for Jakoubek a scholastic endeavour rather than a revelation granted without the input of earthly authors.<sup>63</sup> After all, Jakoubek did use some authorities in his *Posicio*. Despite Jakoubek's ideas on internal illumination and the use of authorities in his later works, the *Posicio* has a different criterion for establishing the worthiness of authorities. For example, Jakoubek considered the apocalyptic insights and apostolic lifestyle of Milíč to have been so holy and saint-like that they verified his teachings and revelations about the advent of the Antichrist.<sup>64</sup> The internal illumination that Milíč of Kroměříž felt was thus enough to establish him as a credible author on the End Times. After all, a scholastic gloss may be based in a long tradition of exegesis leading back to holy doctors, but the actual author of the glosses lacked the direct illumination of the Holy Spirit that Jakoubek believed his authorities possessed.

In his *Posicio*, Jakoubek is preoccupied with the notion of directness in authority. When he is not explicitly citing Scripture, he uses authors, such as Milíč, who he believed had been directly influenced by the Holy Spirit. Stanislaus objected to Jakoubek's rejection of extra biblical material because Stanislaus held that not all aspects of faith were explicitly contained in the Bible. One had to unpack all the enigmatic parts of Scripture with the writings of the Church Fathers in order to fully understand it. Without using the received wisdom available in texts such as the *Glossa ordinaria* and Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, one could not possibly comprehend all of the hidden meanings of a scriptural passage. By neglecting the community of sapiential authors who helped to develop an understanding of the Antichrist and the End Times, Stanislaus argued that Jakoubek impaired his own ability to properly comprehend faith. The proof, for Stanislaus, that Jakoubek failed to engage with the long tradition of exegesis, was that he and his followers claimed that no one would deny that the passages he cites are principally about the Antichrist. This assertion is, in fact, the second grave error mentioned in Třeboň A 16:

*Secundo peccant illi, quia manifestum testimonium est et preclara probacio, quod scriptura [illa] sit de persona humana Antichristi, quia per sanctos doctores, ut patebit per communitatem sapientum tractatorum et expositorum illorum textuum, usque hodie scriptura illa intelligitur de Antichristo, de tempore Antichristi, de condicionibus et factis Antichristi hominis sepe dicti. Et usque hodie non est inventus aliquis, precipue notorius sanctus, vel aliquis approbatus famosus scripture sacre*

63) Ferdinand SEIBT, *Die 'revelatio' des Jacobellus von Mies über die Kelchkommunion*, Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters 22, 1966, pp. 618–624, here pp. 621–624.

64) NKP, ms. X E 24, fol. 237v, and ms. XI D 5, fol. 175v: *Et per ista conclusionem est ille famosus et venerabilis predicator Mylicius, qui dicit sibi esse revelatum aspectu Antichristum advenisse, cuius vite sanctitas ad hoc eum autenticat dicendum.* (And that is the conclusion of the famous and venerable preacher Milíč, who was said to have revelatory observations about the advent of the Antichrist, and his life was so holy as to verify his teachings.)

*tractator et explanator; qui expresse negaret scripturam illam esse principaliter de illo Antichristo.*<sup>65</sup>

‘The second sin they commit is that [they believe] there is clear testimony and clear proof that those scriptures are about the person of the Antichrist, because through sacred doctors that explain through a community of sapiential authors and exegetes that those texts all the way up to today understand those scriptures to be about the Antichrist, the time of the Antichrist, the conditions [of his arrival], and the Antichrist made in man as is often said. And up until today there have not been discovered any especially famous holy authors or anyone approved by a famous commentator or exegete of sacred Scripture who expressly denies those scriptures to be principally about the Antichrist.’

Jakoubek may not have trusted certain scholastic commentaries and glossae of his day, but those commentators that he did consider to be part of the long tradition of exegesis that ultimately led back to the authority of Scripture and Church Fathers, all concurred with assertions about the Antichrist. Stanislaus, by contrast, claims that if Jakoubek truly understood the long tradition of glosses and commentaries the nature of the Antichrist would become clear. In any case, it is not as if these glosses denied that the Antichrist would come to earth to bring about the Apocalypse, but they did not mention the conglomerate Antichrist that Jakoubek believed had taken over the papacy. By casting a wider net and engaging with more authorities and glosses, Stanislaus claims that Jakoubek would have reached the same conclusion as him, namely that the Antichrist would not be incarnated as a pope.

After Jakoubek’s strong claims about the nature of scriptural interpretation and unction in his *Posicio*, he quickly changed his opinion to something approaching Stanislaus’s. Instead of relying on Scripture with only a few references to Augustine, Matěj of Janov and Milíč of Kroměříž, Jakoubek endorsed a more rigorous engagement with the long tradition of exegesis to which Stanislaus alluded. While Jakoubek stuck to his conglomerate model of the papal Antichrist, he used a wider range of authorities to make his claims. In Jakoubek’s response to the polemic of Ondřej of Brod (*Andreas de Broda*), he produces a passage that bears a striking resemblance to the excerpt from Stanislaus of Znojmo cited at the beginning of this section:

*Hic doctori dicitur, quod generaliter vocando ‘revelationem’ modum cognoscendi venientem ex scrutinio legis Domini et ex solidis expositionibus et auctoritatibus antiquorum sanctorum, ut Augustini, Cypriani, Bernhardi, Chrysostomi et aliorum eos in eodem sensu sequentium, concedere possum, quod habeo revelationem. Quia habeo cognitionem ex lege et scriptis authenticis. Haec ‘cognitio’ [...] generaliter vocari potest revelatio. Quia per eam quodammodo velamen ignorantiae intus deponitur; juxta illud Psalmi [118:18]: ‘Revela oculos meos, considerabo mirabilia de lege tua.’ Et*

65) SOA Třeboň, ms. A 16, fol. 425r. Unchanged from ÖNB, Cod. 4749, fol. 129v, and Cod. 4933, fol. 233v–234r.

*hanc cognitionem veram sive revelationem probavi rationibus et scripturis, [...] quas doctor in suo scripto suis persuasionibus nullo modo potuit improbare.*<sup>66</sup>

‘This is said to the doctor [Ondřej] that the general type of cognition designated as a “revelation” derives from the study of God’s Law and from certain interpretation and authorities of the ancient saints, such as Augustine, Cyprian, Bernard, Chrysostom and others who follow them. From them I can claim a revelation, because I derive an understanding from the Law and from authentic writings. This type of understanding [...] is generally called a revelation, because in this way the veil of ignorance is discarded. According to Psalm [118:18]: “You open my eyes: and I will consider the wondrous things of your law.” And this true understanding or revelation is proved through reason and Scripture [...] and no doctor in his writings is in any way able to disprove it.’

In this work, revelation is not produced from a direct connection to God through unction and reading Scripture, nor is revelation considered to be verified by the events of one’s saintly life. A revelation was simply a lifting of the veil of ignorance by studying ‘authentic writings’ of God’s Law and familiarising oneself with the community of sapiential authors, as Stanislaus would say.<sup>67</sup> If an interpretation is based on this type of reason, then no one may disprove it because it has the backing of Scripture placed within a long tradition of interpretation. The point of contention between Utraquist university masters such as Jakoubek and more orthodox or conservative theologians, then, became about which exegetes would be included as ‘authentic’ commentators of Scripture and which were not worthy to be read.<sup>68</sup>

While Jakoubek in the late 1410s and 1420s came to hold a position very similar to Stanislaus, the matter of authorities was far from resolved within the Hussite movement itself. From the inception of the Taborites to their negotiations with the moderate Utraquists in the lead up to the Cheb Judge and the Council of Basel, certain Taborites continued to rely upon Scripture alone in their sermons and commentaries. According to tracts written to condemn the Taborites, many of their theologians rejected scholastic glosses of all stripes, maintaining that with the passage of time humanity was losing a sense of direct divine inspiration, which university masters sought to replace by studying hermeneutic tradition.<sup>69</sup> The glosses of the doctors, even those of the Primitive Church, were hence not necessary for salvation, but served only to dilute the purity of Scripture. As the Taborite and later Pikart leader Martin Hůska explains in *Vyznání o chlebu živém a věčném* (‘Confession about the Living and Eternal Bread’):

66) *Jacobellus contra Brodam De Communionem sub utraque*, in: *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense concilium III*, ed. Hermann von der Hardt, Francofurti – Lipsiae 1698, cols. 416–585, here col. 566 (pars II, cap. 22).

67) F. SEIBT, *Die ‘revelatio’ des Jacobellus von Mies*, pp. 621–624.

68) For more on the selection of authorities and Hussite engagement with the Christian exegetical tradition, see: A. MOLNÁR, *K otázce reformační iniciativy lidu*, p. 13.

69) Franco MORENZONI, *Parole du prédicateur et inspiration divine d’après les ‘Artes praedicandi’*, in: *La parole du prédicateur (V<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, edd. Rosa Maria Dessì – Michel Lauwers, Nice 1997 (= *Collection d’études médiévales de Nice 1*), pp. 271–290.

*Dále vyznává[m] že dosti jest k spasení každému věrnému, když bude živ samým životem Pána Jezu Krista, kterýžto řadně jest popsán v evanjelium a v epištolách, ale ne v doktorských, kteréžto vymyslili mistři a nazývají to glosou; a přijali jsou je lidé na mnohých místech proti svatému evanjelium.*<sup>70</sup>

‘Furthermore, I confess that it is enough for salvation, for all those who are faithful, to live by the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is accurately reported in the Gospel and the Epistles, but not in the doctors’ writings, which were invented by the masters and are called glosses – and they are received by the people in many places against the holy gospel.’

For Húska, *imitatio Christi* was perhaps the most significant factor in leading the faithful to salvation, hence the most important text is the one with the most authority in reporting Christ’s life, the Gospels themselves. Consequently, glosses and extra-biblical tracts served only to divert glory away from the supreme authority of Christ and His Apostles. Nevertheless, Húska breaks his own rule in his *Vyznání*, and, much like in Jakoubek’s *Posicio*, cites Augustine.<sup>71</sup> Jan Příbram explained this type of inconsistency by suggesting in his list of Taborite errors that the Priests of Tabor used the works of the Church Fathers only when they suited their purposes.<sup>72</sup> Above all, radicals like Húska believed that interpretative glosses of university masters corrupted the purity of Scripture because they not only diverted glory away from the writings of the Holy Spirit, but also led one away from the teachings of God’s Law. Certain Taborites went as far as to claim that in their renewed kingdom in the Final Days, there would be no need for physical Bibles because each person would be directly moved by the Holy Spirit and would have no need for the mediation of texts or authors to relate God’s Law.<sup>73</sup>

Positions such as Húska’s were met with wholesale disapproval from the clergy and university Utraquists. As early as the 1419 St. Wenceslas Synod, conducted before the Taborite movement had fully developed, those who rejected

70) *Vyznání o chlebu živém a věčném* (Martina Húska), ed. Antonín FRINTA, Jihočeský sborník historický 1, 1928, pp. 8–12, here p. 8. See also Vavřinec of Březová’s articles from the dispute at Zmrzlík’s house in 1420: *Item quod decreta universalis ecclesie et sanctorum patrum a spiritu sancto constitutiones, quomodocunque legitime, non sunt observande, quia in observacionibus evangelii expressis est contentandum.* (‘The decisions of the universal Church and holy Fathers by the constitution of the sacred spirit, no matter how legitimate, are not observed, because observance of the Gospel is to be expressly satisfied.’) *Vavřince z Březové Kronika husitská*, ed. Jaroslav GOLL, in: FRB V, ed. Josef Emler, Praha 1893, pp. 327–534, here p. 460, no. 56.

71) *Vyznání o chlebu živém a věčném*, p. 10; P. SOUKUP, *The Masters and the End of the World*, pp. 112–113, note 102.

72) Jan z PŘÍBRAMĚ, *Život kněží tábořských*, ed. Jaroslav BOUBÍN, Příbram 2000, pp. 93–99, no. 52; see also Stanisław BYLINA, *Jana z Příbramia ‘Contra articulos picardorum’*, in: Idem, *Hussitica. Studia*, Warszawa 2007, pp. 112–129, here pp. 119–120; Pavlína CERMANOVÁ, *V zajetí pojmu: Definice husitského chiliasmu*, in: *Heresis seminaria. Pojmy a koncepty v bádání o husitství*, edd. Pavlína Rychterová – Pavel Soukup, Praha 2013, pp. 139–169, here p. 159.

73) *Vavřince z Březové Kronika husitská*, p. 458, no. 27: *Item quod lex dei scripta in regno reparato ecclesie militantis cessabit et bible scripture destruentur, quia lex Christi omnibus superscribetur in cordibus eorum, et non opus erit doctore.* (‘That the writings of the Law of God will be set aside in the renewed kingdom of the Church militant, and even the written Bible will be destroyed, because all the Laws of Christ will be written in their hearts, and not in the works of doctors.’)

conventional sources in interpretation were condemned. The Synod also defended the ecclesiastical rules and tenets of the Primitive Church provided that they did not contradict the Law of God. Those at the Synod agreed that not all of the components of faith were explicitly contained in Scripture, and that many of the extra-biblical works of the doctors of the Primitive Church were based in the truths of the Bible, albeit in an indirect manner, and thus were useful tools in exposing all facets of the faith.<sup>74</sup> Jakoubek went further than this, suggesting that no one, no matter how skilled and learned they may be, could completely understand all the nuances and enigmatic parts of Scripture without the aid of certain holy glossators and exegetes. In his *Výklad na Zjevení sv. Jana*, Jakoubek attacks the Taborite mode of exegesis, explaining:

*Item přidává, ktož smysly nové nalézá nad rozum Písma a Ducha svatého. Petr v kanonice své die: 'Toto věděti máme, že všeliké Písmo a prorocství není duchem lidským přineseno, aniž vykládáno má býti z smysla porušeného' [2 Peter 1:20–21], ale s pilností máme nahlédati v knihy svatých, kteříž sau plní Ducha svatého, kterak vykládají, mravně, duchovně a svrchovaně neb bohobojně etc. Protož pád byvá v kacířstva v království tomto, kteříž na své zpoléhají duchy.'*<sup>75</sup>

'Also, one finding new meanings in the understanding of Scripture and the Holy Spirit is in error. "We must understand this, that Scripture and prophecies are not introduced by man, nor may it be interpreted with twisted meaning." [2 Peter 1:20–21] But rather we must diligently look into the books of saints, who are filled with the Holy Spirit, to see how they interpret morally, spiritually and competently, namely in a God-fearing fashion. Therefore, those tend to fall into heresy in this kingdom, who rely only on their own thoughts.'

By suggesting that the authors of interpretive works were directly filled with the Holy Spirit, Jakoubek justifies their necessity. He would not go as far as to claim that the influence of the Holy Spirit elevated commentary and exegesis to the same status as Scripture, but divine guidance certainly made the readings of these authors more credible than those that relied solely on their own intellect. Jakoubek, then, came to adopt the same position as Stanislaus of Znojmo, condemning those that did not take advantage of glosses when interpreting Scripture.

Jakoubek's *Výklad* presents a significant divergence from his approach to glosses in his *Posíció*. In just a few years, he turned from trusting Scripture and a few authorities, citing unction as a protection against poor interpretation and misreading, to arguing for the necessity of interpretive glosses. There is, in fact, nothing in Jakoubek's latter position to which Stanislaus would object. Indeed, the significance of the connection that is drawn between Jakoubek of Stříbro and the Taborites in Třeboň A 16 is that in relation to scriptural interpretation, Jakoubek comes to adopt the position of Stanislaus of Znojmo, whereas the Taborites align

74) H. KAMINSKY, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, pp. 259–264; Blanka ZILYNSKÁ, *Husitské synody v Čechách 1418–1440 (Příspěvek k úloze univerzitních mistrů v husitské církvi a revoluci)*, Praha 1985, pp. 31–39.

75) Jakoubek ZE STŘÍBRA, *Výklad na Zjevení sv. Jana II*, ed. František ŠIMEK, Praha 1933 (= Sbírká pramenů českého hnutí náboženského ve století XIV. a XV. 19), p. 634 (chapt XXII).

with Jakoubek's *Posicio*.<sup>76</sup> In effect, the disagreements between Jakoubek and Stanislaus were rehashed in relation to the Taborite split with the Utraquists. It would go too far to suggest that Crux of Telč intended this conclusion to be drawn from his annotation cited at the beginning of this article, as it seems clear that he merely intended to condemn Jakoubek alongside the Taborites as heretics. Still, by associating Jakoubek's claims about the Antichrist with the Taborites in relation to a text that preceded their formation, the Třeboň manuscript unintentionally prompts us to consider the intricacies of Jakoubek's changing methodology towards apocalyptic interpretation. Understanding the shifts in interpretation to which Třeboň A 16 alludes is, then, vital not only in decrypting the complexities of the Taborite split with the Utraquists, but also in demonstrating the continued relevance of Stanislaus of Znojmo's *Tractatus de Antichristo contra Jacobellum* deep into the fifteenth century.

---

76) This is not to suggest that Jakoubek conforms to all points in Stanislaus's *Tractatus*, as his definition of the papal Antichrist remains relatively stable from 1413 onwards. Similarly, the Taborites do not adopt all of Jakoubek's positions from his *Posicio*. For more on the difference and intricacies of all of their positions, see: P. CERMANOVÁ, *Husitský radikalismus*.

**Appendix:****Crux of Telč's Summary of the *Tractatus de Antichristo contra Jacobellum***

This appendix presents Crux of Telč's transcription of the *Tractatus de Antichristo contra Jacobellum* written by Stanislaus of Znojmo. Třeboň, Státní oblastní archiv, ms. A 16, fol. 425r–v, is by no means the most authoritative or complete manuscript witness for Stanislaus's text, but, as this study has shown, Crux's copy shifts the emphasis of the original text in interesting ways. The other manuscript witnesses of Stanislaus's *Tractatus* are Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 4749, fol. 112r–145v, and Cod. 4933, fol. 220r–245r. Crux largely follows the original text in his summary version, adding a few comments in marginal notes at the beginning of the text (lines 1–7). The other sections of A 16 correspond to the following sections of 4749 and 4933:

lines 8–13: 4749, fol. 129r, and 4933, fol. 233v;

lines 14–21: 4749, fol. 129v, and 4933, fol. 233v–234r;

lines 22–28: 4749, fol. 130r, and 4933, fol. 234r–v;

lines 29–72: 4749, fol. 144v–145v, and 4933, fol. 244v–245r.

Lines 8–28, which present a list of three sins that Jakoubek and his followers allegedly committed, are taken from the fourth book of Stanislaus's *Tractatus*. This book focuses on interpretation of Scripture and the definitions of the Antichrist that can be gleaned from it. Stanislaus seeks to show that Jakoubek creates a false definition of the Antichrist as a conglomerate body made up of the three popes competing for control of the Church at Stanislaus's time of writing (1413). Lines 29–72 are taken from the concluding section of Stanislaus's text, in which he succinctly summaries each of his points. He does not number these points one to twelve as Crux does, but simply writes *Item* or *Aut* at the beginning of each new distinction. In the original text, Stanislaus may have meant for twelve to be a continuation of the previous point, but Crux divides eleven in two. Crux also omits the final line of Stanislaus's text.

In the edition below, contractions and abbreviations have been expanded silently. The sentence structure and grammar have been retained, though all punctuation is of course editorial. In the few instances where I have emended a word or inserted a reading from one of the other witnesses, it is indicated by square brackets. This has been done when Crux seems to have accidentally omitted a word or else the sense of the text would otherwise have been obscured. Cases where Crux is actively attempting to modify the meaning of the sentence, however slight, have been retained. Textual variations and emendations are noted below the text using the following sigla of witnesses:

A16 = Třeboň, Státní oblastní archiv, ms. A 16;

4749 = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 4749;

4933 = Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 4933.

*Třeboň, Státní oblastní archiv, ms. A 16, fol. 425r–v.*

425r *Ista sunt excerpta ex quodam tractatu de Antichristo contra Jacobellum, qui dicebat papam esse Antichristum. Mendax, iniquus et hereticus, qui inchoavit communionem sub utraque specie.*

Nota quidam in Bohemia heretici, Jacobellus unus fuit ex eis et Thaborite multi in revocacione habentur, dicta de Antichristo trahunt ad papam et cardinales et negant adventum Antichristi in carne, scilicet quod nunc multi sunt. Et qui hoc approbare conantur, graviter peccant tripliciter: 5

Primo, quia illos textus [simul] privant fundamentali sententia textuali, reali et propria, cum asserant solum mysticum et similitudinarium sensum continere, et non sensum textualem, cum omnis textus scripture, sive aperte et manifeste loquatur, sive sensum tropicum et enigmaticum, [debeat] habere primum suum sensum textualem realiter et proprium, cui sensus mystici et similitudinarii [posunt] circumponi vel supponi. 10

Secundo peccant illi, quia manifestum testimonium est et preclara probacio, quod scriptura [illa] sit de persona humana Antichristi, quia per sanctos doctores, ut patebit per communitatem sapientum tractatorum et expositorum illorum textuum, usque hodie scriptura illa intelligitur de Antichristo, de tempore Antichristi, de condicionibus et factis Antichristi hominis sepe dicti. Et usque hodie non est inventus aliquis, precipue notorius sanctus, vel aliquis approbatus famosus scripture sacre tractator et explanator, qui expresse negaret scripturam illam esse principaliter de illo Antichristo. 15 20

Tercio peccant tales, quia secundum sententiam eorum et quantum in eis esset volunt papam haberi nunc ut summum Antichristum, et post eum cardinales, archiepiscopos, episcopos et usque ad infimum curatum ut satellites illius Antichristi, et [sic] papam cum illis sicut precipuum nunc Antichristum cum suo corpore mystico Antichristi fidelibus detestandum, persequendum, in iudicio et mandatis suis contempnendum, in foro suo legislatorio et iudicatorio horrendum, et ita de aliis. 25

Et quod hoc cum predictis stare non possit, patet primo, quia tunc talis Antichristus non esset summe contrarius Ihesu Christo, cum eius fidem, legem et religionem, quas multi tyrannorum, et singulariter Saulus, usque ad integram extinctionem illarum, quantum in eis fuit, persecuti sunt, profiteretur. 30

Item secundo, quod non in toto contrariaretur glorie et honori Christi, cum se diceret fidelibus vicarium esse eius, iuxta illorum fantasiam.

4 Jacobellus...5 habentur ] *in marg. A16* 6 scilicet...sunt ] *in marg. A16* 8 quia ] quod *A16* 9 sensum ] *om. 4749* 10 sensum ] secundum *4749, 4933* 11 sive ] sicut *A16* | sensum ] secundum *4749, 4933* 13 supponi ] superponi *4749, 4933* 14 est ] *supra lin. A16* 22 quantum ] *corr: 4933* 23 volunt ] *vellent 4749, 4933* | nunc...Antichristum ] ut summum Antichristum nunc *4749*, ut summum nunc Antichristum *4933* 24 illius...25 Antichristi ] Antichristi illius *4749* 31 integram ] ultimam *4933* 32 profiteretur ] *corr: 4933* 34 vicarium esse ] esse vicarium *4749*

35 Item tercio, si met diceret se esse Christum, et Ihesum crucifixum non fuisse [Christum], sed deceptorem, quomodo eius religionem, legem et fidem eciam in verbis profiteretur?

Aut quarto, si diceret se ipsum Ihesum Christum, qui crucifixus erat, quomodo non est sibi ipsi summe contrarius, cum ipse Ihesus Christus prius ostendisset et  
40 predicasset humilitatem, castitatem et paupertatem in summo, et nunc directe oppositum?

Item quinto, tunc talis Antichristus non esset capitaliter malus et caput in malicia omnium perfidorum hereticorum et adversariorum fidei et religionis Christi, cum talem met profiteretur.

45 Item sexto, cum talis permetteret et concederet parvulos in fide Trinitatis baptisari, qui sic ante usum rationis mortui salvarentur, quando summe contrariaretur Christo? |

Item septimo, cum talis concederet [christianis] habere fidem Trinitatis et Christi cum dilectione Dei et proximi, que sufficiunt ad salutem, quomodo summe  
50 contrariabitur Christo?

Item octavo, cum non prohiberet christianis profiteri legem, religionem et fidem christianam, non fieret summe contrarius Christo. Et ubi enim aliquam religionem, legem vel fidem Christi Ihesu non prohiberet, sed admitteret et concederet, in hac parte non esset contrarius Christo, et sic non summe inter homi-  
55 nes, cum cuilibet parti religionis, legis et fidei Christi contingat per homines malos contrariari et aperte contradici.

Item nono, quomodo gens et communitas Iudeorum talem accipiet pro Messia, qui se Ihesu Christi [crucifixi] pretenderet in ecclesia eius in terris esse summum principem et diceret, cum tamen Ihesus Christus crucifixus illi genti sit scandalum?  
60

Item decimo, si potestates ecclesiasticas, sacramenta et res sacras in ecclesia Dei non detestabitur aperte, sed habebit eciam eas in verbo pro talibus, quomodo ad plenitudinem ordinationi Christi contrariabitur?

Item undecimo, quomodo talis pretenderet se habere claves ecclesie, universalem et totam potestatem ligandi et solvendi universa genera criminum et ex tali potestate [pretenderet] ligare et solvere, cum ipse esset capitalis auctor et fautor  
65 universi generis criminum?

Duodecimo, cum eciam talis ut caput erroris seductorum negaret infernum et vitam eternam post hanc vitam et purgatorium, alias talium sic malorum non esset caput. Et sic non omne genus malorum pertinet ad ipsum sicut ad caput  
70 inter homines. Planum est ergo, quod Antichristum illum summum esse huiusmodi papam est predictis contrarium.

---

35 Item ] Aut 4749, 4933 | esse Christum ] Christum esse 4749 36 eciam ] et 4749 39 est ] corr: 4749 | summe contrarius ] contrarius summe 4933 40 et! ] om. 4933 46 summe ] summo A16 52 contrarius Christo ] contra Christum 4749, 4933 53 religionem legem ] legem religionem 4749, 4933 | Christi Ihesu ] Ihesu Christi 4749 62 eciam eas ] eas eciam 4749, 4933 64 universalem ] corr: 4749 65 universa ] universa ergo 4749 | genera ] corr: 4749 68 ut ] sicut 4749 | caput erroris ] aput errores 4749 69 purgatorium ] purgatoriam etc. 4749, 4933 71 homines ] corr: 4933