

CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE USE OF POWER AND VIOLENCE
AS METHODS OF CONDUCTING
A RELIGIOUS DISPUTE:
THE CASE OF THE HUSSITE POLEMICS

PAWEŁ F. NOWAKOWSKI

The Hussite revolution is widely recognised as a highly violent period in Czech medieval history. Violence was a part of the Hussite movement from its very beginning. The death of John Huss was undoubtedly a violent occurrence, no matter if one agrees with the decisions that were made at the Council of Constance or not. The outbreak of the revolution, as a consequence of a violent procession ending with the first Prague defenestration, was a sequence of violent incidents, with the ruin of cloisters as the best-known, but not only, example. The later years saw regular wars, both domestic and with the consecutive crusades.¹ If one has to think about the Hussite movement it therefore seems inevitable to link it with a great deal of aggression and direct violence on all sides of the conflict.

But the most well-known and obvious forms of violent behaviour were not the only ones that occurred. The use of violence in different forms was also present during the disputes and other events of organising religious life. They presented differently, sometimes in a softer form or as a topic for discussion, but also as indirect and direct uses of legal power to

¹ The military aspect of the Hussite period has been a field of study for a long time, and still brings interesting results. Among them are those which show a wider perspective of the Hussite wars as a series of crusade and anti-crusade campaigns, such as: Norman Housley, *Religious Warfare in Europe 1400–1536* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 33–61; Jerzy Grygiel, “‘Contra Bohemos’ – wokół problemu krucjat antyhusyckich w XV-wiecznej Europie,” *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 126 (1999): 59–75.

undermine the efforts of the opponents. Repeated attempts to achieve supremacy could be seen in a field of discussion, as well as in the use of the secular arm of the Church to destroy or weaken the adversary. Let us then look at the problem of violence and the use of power during the Hussite religious disputes, as shown in examples from the epoch beginning with the outburst of revolution and ending with the death of John Rokycana and King George of Poděbrady.

The Roles of Power and Violence during Theological Discussions

To start a reflection on the use of power and traces of violence, it is best to look first at the less conspicuous elements which bolstered up the clearer forms. The use of power in theological discussions was already visible at the beginning of the process of formation of the different branches of the movement and their ideology. The most significant early meeting of radical and moderate reformers took place in December 1420. After unsuccessful attempts to organise and conduct a fruitful discussion, both sides undertook another one.² This time they put special emphasis on the venue and method of the discussion. To avoid giving an advantage to the academic, moderate side, the disputants decided to give up the idea of using *Karolinum*—the core of Prague University—as the place of the discussion. The best solution seemed to be the house of the royal moneyer and friend of the late John Huss, Petr Zmrzlik of Svojšín.³ Both sides recognised his authority and believed in his honesty.⁴ However, his close relationship with Oldřich Vavak, who conducted the discussion, as well as Prokop of Pilsen, the rector of the university, who changed the course of the debate, resulted in damaging the balance of power in this discussion.

² There was such an attempt, concluding in an unsuccessful meeting in St Ambrose's church, on December 8th, 1420. This event is described in Vavřinec of Březova, *Kronika husitská*, ed. Jaroslav Goll, *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, 8 vols. (Praha: Nákladem Nadání Františka Palackého, 1873–1932), 5:451–2.

³ August Sedláček, "Zmrzlik ze Svojšína," in *Ottův Slovník Naučný*, ed. Jan Otto, 28 vols. (Praha: Nakladatelství J. Otto v Praze, 1908), 27:653.

⁴ The choice to believe in Zmrzlik's good will resulted also from the conviction that it was the only way to reduce the influence of a Taborite Mikuláš of Hus. Regarding his political views and position, see Josef Macek, *Tábor v husitském revolučním hnutí*, 2 vols. (Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd, 1955), 2:281–3. Also about Mikuláš a detailed study in a wider context: Miloslav Polívka, *Mikuláš z Husi a nižší šlechta v počátcích husitské revoluce* (Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd, 1982).

Using his influence on both Zmrzlik and Vavak, Prokop of Pilsen suggested preliminary questions that could explain basic controversies between the sides. In fact, the set of questions, prepared earlier, consisted of 72 allegations, and the real reason for using them was quite different.⁵ The moderate side included various problems that were also roots of disagreement among the radicals.⁶ That way the radical side could not answer unanimously, and lost the debate before it even began. The academic side used a trick that let them show the radicals as heretics and thus exclude them from further debate. In this case, not only did they not intend to discuss theological problems freely, but what is more, knowing of differences among their opponents, they used them to paralyse their potential to respond. This was clearly an act of non-physical violence, and was understood as such by the debaters on the radical side, who compared their behaviour at the debate to Huss' trial in Constance six years earlier.⁷

After the incident at the Zmrzlik's house, the discussion-conducive atmosphere was greatly diminished. The Hussites started to pay greater attention to with whom, where and how any dispute would be conducted. A clear example of that attitude may be seen during joint efforts to discuss religious matters with the Council of Basel. As a place for the preliminary discussion, the two sides chose Cheb, which was a kind of compromise. Cheb, a catholic city, was a place with both Czech and German history, so it seemed to be a good place for coming to a mutual agreement.⁸ By resigning from Prague, they avoided the influences, both academic and radical, from the New Town. This time the meeting appeared to be a successful one, but the experience of power being used to change the course of the debate were clearly visible in the effect it had.

⁵ Vavřinec of Březova, *Kronika husitská*, 454–62.

⁶ Among them was a group of chiliastic views. This particular group of allegations was lately carefully examined by Pavel Soukup, "The Masters and the End of the World: Exegesis in the Polemics with Chiliasm," trans. Zdeněk V. David, in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, ed. Zdeněk V. David and David. R. Holeton, 8 vols. (Praha: Akademie věd České republiky, 1996–), 7:91–114.

⁷ Vavřinec of Březova, *Kronika husitská*, 462.

⁸ The older literature emphasised situation of Cheb as a city on the border, exposed to the military actions of the Hussites: Jaromír Čelakovský, "Cheb," in *Ottův Slovník Naučný*, 12:107. However, recent research shows that the city was quite stable, and a good place for a discussion with Catholics outside of the troubled districts of Prague: František Kubů, "Cheb v době husitské," in *Soudce smluvený v Chebu. Sborník příspěvků přednesených na symposiu k 550. výročí*, ed. Josef Janáček (Cheb: Panorama, 1982), 108–9; Vladimír Bystrický, "Západní Čechy a husitství," in *Soudce smluvený v Chebu*, 54.

In the agreement signed in Cheb, the legations paid attention to the conditions of the Hussites' stay in Basel, as well as the procedure of the debate. The predicted channels that would allow the use of violence or power to oppress them were blocked by the agreement. Firstly, the legation was granted not only freedom of speech, but also the right to have their own services in a Hussite liturgical tradition. All that could not result from just the application of an interdict, nor of any other ecclesiastical or secular punishment.⁹ All these arrangements were supposed to prevent the abuse of power by the council and possible violent behaviour by both sides. Indeed, the solution worked to some extent, and possibly lowered the amount of aggression felt during the discussions in Basel.

As far as the discussion is concerned, in the relationship between the Church and the Hussites, one is accustomed to seeing the prevailing power. But there are examples of the opposite situation. A visit paid by John of Capistrano to Moravia and Bohemia in the beginning of the 1450s may be one of them.¹⁰ It is worth mentioning at this point that this time it was the Utraquist faction which controlled the place of the possible discussion. In the end there was no such meeting as had been desired by Capistrano, because the Utraquists tried to set the place for discussion in such a way as to prevent the friar from giving sermons to large crowds, which could possibly lead to mass conversions to Catholicism. Even agreeing with the Utraquist terms and to hold the debate in a smaller circle, Capistrano wanted to have the right that had so many times been raised by the Hussites—the right to give sermons freely. In the end his plans could not be fulfilled because of the strong opposition from the Utraquist clergy and the support given to them by notable officials, first and foremost George of Poděbrady.¹¹

⁹ The Latin text of the agreement may be found in John of Raguso, *Tractatus de reductione Bohemorum*, ed. František Palacký, in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, vols. 4 (Wien: CR Officina Typographica Aula et Status, 1857–1935), 1:219–20. The Czech translation and detailed analysis is provided by, among others, Amedeo Molnár, “Chebský soudce,” in *Soudce smluveny v Chebu*, 24–8.

¹⁰ Apart from general studies concerning Czech and Hussite history, Capistrano's mission had also been described in several studies concerning that episode from his active life, see Johannes Hofer, *Johannes Kapistran. Ein Leben im Kampf um die Reform der Kirche*, 2 vols. (Rome: F. H. Kerlag-Heidelberg, 1964–65), ch. 10 and 12; Agnieszka Lissowska, “Antyhusycka misja Jana Kapistrana na Śląsku,” in *Bernardyni na Śląsku w późnym średniowieczu*, ed. Jakub Kostowski (Wrocław: Atut, 2005), 51–63.

¹¹ George's response letter to John was quite short and harsh. He argued that Bohemia had its own preachers and did not need another one, whose visit could

Excluding Certain People from the Cities

The silent battle for domination in the location of a debate was just one particular part of the overall battle for domination which included other areas. One of the most visible was that connected with the capital city, which had several openings. After introducing the decisions of the compacts, the situation in Prague started changing. A complex group of moderate reformers got involved in the tactical games of the council's legate, Bishop Philibert of Montjeu.¹² The bishop wanted to widen the area of freedom in Prague for Catholics and rebuild as much of their earlier power and influence as possible. To achieve that, he had to support the most conservative priests among the reformers and thus strengthen the conciliatory faction among Utraquists. Another faction, led by John Rokycana, rightly called the Consistent Utraquists, was more interested in sustaining the role of the Utraquist church than in merging again with the Catholics. Both factions were supported by slightly different groups of noblemen, which made the struggle a political one, too. The action that Philibert took was simple and effective—he filled the main churches in Prague with the members of the conciliatory faction. Among them were Prokop of Pilsen and John Přibram, who were granted the parishes of notable churches in Prague's Old and New Town.¹³ At the same time, in the spring of 1437, the Utraquists had to make a decision about their representative in the legation to Basel. Once more, the problems of giving communion of both kinds to the laity and the communion of children had to be discussed. In the latter case, the firm attitude of Rokycana was a key issue, and the Utraquist had to face Philibert and King Sigismund to answer the charges. In the end it was not Rokycana who was chosen as a

bring unrest to the capital city, see the letter from George of Poděbrady to John Capistrano dated to December 22nd, 1453), published in *Annales Minorum seu trium ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum*, ed. Luke Wadding, 2nd ed., 25 vols. (Rome: Typis Rochi Bernabo, 1731–1886), 12:166–7 (no. 10).

¹² Philibert, Bishop of Coutances, was a legate who promoted the council's policy in Bohemia until his death in 1439. His position, however, was slightly weaker at the time of his mission in Bohemia because of the increasing conflict between the pope and the council, see Blanka Zilynská, "Biskup Filibert a české země," in *Jihlava a basilejská kompaktata. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodního symposia k 555. výročí přijetí Basilejských kompaktát*, ed. Dana Nováková, Karel Křesadlo and Eva Nedbalová, (Jihlava: Okresní Archiv Jihlava, 1992), 61.

¹³ On Bishop Philibert's policy in the matter (connected also with the division of holy relics to the churches), see Kateřina Horníčková, "Memory, Politics and Holy Relics: Catholic Tactics amidst the Bohemian Reformation," trans. Zdeněk V. David, in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, 8:137–42.

member of the legation to Basel, but Přibram and Prokop. However, King Sigismund formally opted for his presence in the legation,¹⁴ but his role was to be significantly decreased. Rokycana made a final decision when the king promoted another member of the conciliatory group, the elderly reformer Kristan of Prachatice, an Utraquist administrator of the church in Prague. Rokycana, who was supposed to be a Hussite archbishop, was no longer in the formal position of leader of the reformed Church in the capital city. He left Prague, and recovered his position 11 years later, when George of Podebrady took the city.¹⁵

But it was not only Rokycana who felt pushed out of the city. After the change of course connected with the increasing role of the consistent faction and the noblemen who supported them among Hussites, Catholics also felt this way. The Catholic administrator of the church, Hilary of Litoměřice, had to leave Prague in a similar way as Rokycana had earlier done.¹⁶ The uses of power by both sides did not differ much. Attempts to win city space for each faction were also visible in the manner of conducting liturgical ceremonies. The most significant one, which was recorded in the sources, was the procession on the Feast of Corpus Christi which took place on May 30th, 1437. There were two processions that day, one led by Bishop Philibert, the other by the priests from the Rokycana's faction. The Utraquist procession ostentatiously held up a chalice. The processions met, and the report clearly shows a tug-of-war between the factions.¹⁷

Each of the above mentioned examples shows that the religious struggle was not limited to theological arguments or ecclesiastical correction. It was also a game of power and domination, with silent violence leading to the suppression of some people and ideas and the promotion of others.

The Role of Utraquist Ecclesiastical Power in Sustaining Orthodoxy

To become the leader in the religious life of the country, the struggling faction had to sustain orthodoxy within the reform movement. This was

¹⁴ Jean de Tours, *Regestrum actorum in legationibus a sacro concilio in Boemiam*, ed. Ernestus Birk, *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, 1:857.

¹⁵ Frederick G. Heymann, "John Rokycana: Church Reformer between Hus and Luther," *Church History* 28, no. 3 (1959): 250.

¹⁶ *Ottův Slovník Naučný*, 11:283, s.v. Hilarius Litoměřický.

¹⁷ Jean de Tours, *Regestrum actorum*, 865.

not an easy task, as opposing the hierarchical Church led to the unleashing of a wide range of ideas that had previously been kept in hiding. There were several attempts to control the developing branches and ideas of the Hussite movement, one of which was definitely the described debate at Zmrzlik's house. But even after the revolution, when the Utraquist faction came to an agreement with the Council of Basel, the task still remained unfinished. The Taborite faction, which had taken part in the discussions as part of the Czech legation in Basel a few years earlier, now stood outside of that agreement.¹⁸

The Taborites were devoid of their former military power, but still presented a significant force, mainly on the ideological and theological fields. To both moderate and conciliatory Utraquists, the Taborites seemed to be a hindrance to their discussion with the council, but were also a competing force in the religious life of the Czech Kingdom. Knowing that, John Příbram and John Rokycana came closer to each other in the beginning of the 1440s. The result of their joint efforts was a declaration concerning the main Eucharistic views, which was imposed on the Taborites after an uneven "debate."¹⁹ The final result of the debate was announced by the secular branch, as it was a decision of the Prague Synod in 1444.²⁰ The whole case was the first step toward the liquidation of the Taborite branch, but the Utraquists had to wait for eight years more to make the final move.

However, the Taborites were not the only faction among the reformers who suffered from the dominating role of the Utraquists. Another example was the Unity of the Brethren, in Czech *Jednota*, which became a separate ecclesiastical organisation and denomination in 1467 after some years of formation.²¹ The members of the new group sent several letters to Rokycana shortly after they ordained their ministers. They tried to explain the reasons for their decision and suggested a meeting to explain their

¹⁸ See Petr Čornej and Milena Bartlová in vol. 6 of *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny České*, 6 vols. (Praha: Paseka, 1999–), 86.

¹⁹ The documents concerning the debate, especially the letters and treatises which appeared in the second half of 1443, show the division of power and the defensive situation of the radicals, see *Prameny k synodám strany pražské a táboreské v letech 1441–1444*, ed. Zdeněk Nejedlý (Praha: Královská Česká Společnost Náuk, 1900).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 107.

²¹ Ludvík Fuček, "Vznik Jednoty – počátek uskutečňování reformačních požadavků," *Křesťanská revue. Theologická příloha* 33 (1966): 81; Jindřich Halama, *Sociální učení českých bratří 1464–1618* (Brno: Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury, 2003), 23–4; Martin Nodl, "Utraktivismus a Jednota bratrská na rozcestí. Dobový kontext náboženské konverze Jana Augusty," *Marginalia Historica* 4 (2001): 139.

understanding of certain theological issues.²² The answer from Rokycana was an official one. The leader of the Utraquists wrote a pastoral letter to be read in churches, in which he condemned the new group and warned believers not to meet with or listen to the followers of *Jednota*.²³

This event, which happened during the final years of Rokycana's life, shows how the thinker—once eager for discussion and confident in the power of rational explaining—put away some of his ideas and decided to use his official power against weaker opponents who could endanger the unity of his community.

The Use of the Secular Arm

In order to do this, the factions used also the secular arm and its force. The first situation in which this occurred after the debate in Zmrzlik's house. The following months saw disintegration among the radicals, which led to open hostility and finally to the burning of the most radical reformers in Klatovy and near Nežarka in 1421 by John Žižka.²⁴ The disagreement was definitely increased by the dispute, which can be observed in a letter that Nicholas of Pelhřimov wrote to the Utraquists.²⁵ He strongly opposed all ideas that approached Eucharistic heresy, which was one of the main divisions among reformers. The burning of the chiliasts, however, happened during the most turbulent years of the revolution, when violence was a common thing, and fighting against anti-Hussite crusaders was interlaced with domestic struggles.

After the revolution, when the kingdom seemed to be recovering, the need for stability caused the use of secular power against one of the factions once more. As it is recorded, the struggle with the Taborites had two stages. After the definition of the Utraquist Eucharistic views as orthodox and the confirmation of this by the Prague Synod of 1444, the Taborites became an isolated, unorthodox group in the view of the state. In his preparations for being a Governor of the Czech Kingdom, one of George of Poděbrady's political actions was to eradicate the Taborite

²² All letters were edited by Jaroslav Bidlo, *Akty Jednoty Bratrské*, 2 vols. (Brno: Historická Komise Při Matici Moravské, 1915–23), 1:1–79.

²³ John Rokycana, *List proti pikartóm*, ed. Karl Jaromír Erben, *Výbor z literatury české*, 2 vols. (Praha: České Museum, 1845–68), 2:733–8.

²⁴ Stanisław Bylina, *Na skraju lewicy husyckiej* (Warszawa: Instytut Historii PAN, 2005), 80–1 and 86–8.

²⁵ Nicholas' letter was unfortunately not preserved. We know about it, however, thanks to the Hussite chronicler, Vavřinec of Březova, *Kronika husitská*, 474; see also Bylina, *Na skraju*, 68.

movement by destroying the source of the ideas and the core of the community—Tabor. The conquest of Tabor was quick as there was almost nothing left of its previous military grandness.²⁶ The main living radical reformers—Nicholas of Pelhřimov and Wenceslaus Koranda of Pilsen—were transported to different castles under the supervision of George's men, where they stayed until their deaths several years later.²⁷ But from the religious point of view, we can see once more the use of power in a violent way. Immediately after taking Tabor, Utraquist control over services was established to avoid any possibility of recovering the Taborite tradition. The aforementioned reformers were also given "a chance" to accept the Utraquist teaching, but they refused.

The secular arm was also used against the new radicals who emerged in the late 1450s and early 1460s. The first persecution, as it was later called in the writings of the *Jednota*, was an initiative that came rather from King George's circle than the ecclesiastical one, but it was a religious reason that underlay the action. Several academics were put on trial, and faced the fear of imprisonment or even death, however, their lives were saved thanks to the intervention of John Rokycana.²⁸ King George most probably wanted to prove in this way that he was fulfilling his secret coronation oath, as a part of which he had promised to fight against the heresies in his realm.²⁹ During his conflict with the papacy, the king needed proof with which he could confront the papal point of view, which saw unorthodoxy in the ideas of Utraquism.

The Legal Cases

Apart from the use of secular power and attempts to control an area or the method of conducting discussions, there were other means of exerting

²⁶ Ecclesiastically, Tabor was also much weaker than years earlier. See Amedeo Molnár, "Réformation et Révolution. Le cas du senior taborite Nicolas Biskupec de Pelhřimov," *Communio Viatorum* 13 (1970): 147.

²⁷ Cf. remarks by Rudolf Urbánek given in *České dějiny*, 4 vols. (Praha: Jan Laichter na Královských Vinohradech, 1915–62), 3.2:677; František M. Bartoš, "Konec kněží tábořských," *Křesťanská revue. Theologická příloha*, 21 (1954): 136.

²⁸ Čornej and Bartlová, *Velké dějiny*, 192.

²⁹ *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, ed. August Theiner, 2 vols. (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1860), 2:405 (no. 580). On King George's coronation and his need for the Church's approval, see Zdeněk V. Tobolka, *O volbě a korunování Jiřího z Poděbrad* (Praha: Klub historický, 1896), 25f.

pressure used during the religious disputes. One of them was appealing to the law and making legal cases against certain people. This was a delicate matter, as all of the participants in the Czech religious discussions remembered the legal case that had led to the death of John Huss. It must have recalled the worst associations when, during the disputes with the Hussites in 1433 in Basel, the English delegation demanded a similar intervention against Peter Payne.³⁰ The latter was an English Wycliffite, who travelled to Bohemia and became one of the most influential reformers, respected by both radicals and Utraquists.³¹ In Basel, the English members of council reminded that there were some charges against Payne still valid in England, and wanted the council legate, Cesarini, to allow legal action against him. The case appeared to be similar to that of John Huss nearly two decades earlier. The quarrel about the status of Payne and his fate lasted for some time, and finally ended in releasing him to the Czech legation. Any other action would have been a breach of the Cheb agreement and lead to a total collapse of the ongoing negotiations with the Czechs. But the discussion over the case of Payne visibly weakened his own position as a disputant and a member of the Hussite legation.

Another example of the use of legal arguments in religious discussions was the case of John Rokycana himself. As it was mentioned earlier, the elected but not confirmed Utraquist Archbishop of Prague had to leave the city and spend some years away from the main course of the political and religious life of the capital city. It was most probably during that period that his opponents prepared a set of arguments against him. The document in which these were recorded included several categories, among which were doubts about the validity of his priesthood and charges of tolerating and encouraging behaviour against canon law. The argument about

³⁰ The case must have been considered an important one, because it is mentioned in several sources from both sides of the discussion in Basel. See *Deník tábořského kněze o jednání Čechů na koncilu basilejském z roku 1433*, ed. Ivan Hlaváček, trans. František Heřmanský, *Ze zpráv a kronik doby husitské* (Praha: Svoboda, 1981), 400–2; *Tagebuchaufzeichnungen 1431–1435 und 1438*, ed. Gustav Beckmann, Rudolf Wackernagel and Giulio Coggiola, *Concilium Basiliense: Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel*, 7 vols. (Basel: R. Reich, 1896–1927) 5:48–9; *Die Protokolle des Concils 1431–1433*, ed. Johannes Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, 2:381. See also: Alois Krchňák, *Čechové na basilejském sněmu* (Svitavy: Trinitas, 1997), 151–4.

³¹ About Payne's life and career in the Hussite period, see more František Šmahel, "Curriculum vitae Magistri Petri Payne," in *In memoriam Josefa Macka (1922–1991)*, ed. Miloslav Polívka and František Šmahel (Praha: Historický ústav, 1996), 141–60.

Rokycana's priesthood touched on the conversion to Utraquism of former Archbishop Konrad of Vechta, who was relieved of office and later excommunicated. Konrad of Vechta was the one who had ordained Rokycana. The Utraquist leader was then called *acephalus*, which was a tricky word that could mean both a man who is irresponsible and somebody outside of his proper hierarchical system.³² These accusations against Rokycana were widely known, and the repeated in different situations, and they also became known to important diplomats on the side of the Holy See. They were probably heard by Juan Carvajal, who visited Bohemia in 1448, and later by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, who used some of them in his discussion with George of Podebrady in 1451. Piccolomini tried to persuade George that the candidature of Rokycana was out of question for legal reasons,³³ but among others, he decided not to openly use the problem of Rokycana's priesthood. Taking all the accusations into account, and based mainly on its content and analysis of the visit of Carvajal, some scholars, among them the editor of the document, Zdeněk Nejedlý, as well as Rudolf Urbánek and Janusz Smołucha, have connected the accusations to the community of Czech Catholics and dated it to before 1448.³⁴ But when we look at the source, which is kept in the Třeboň Archives, we may see that it was described by a copyist as the work of John Příbram from 1445.³⁵ It is quite probable that Příbram collected the arguments and arranged the document, but in my opinion it must have been earlier, most likely before 1441, when Příbram and Rokycana were divided by open hostility. Later they started to cooperate, preparing to face the Taborites ideologically, which finally took place, as mentioned above, in 1443. So this case once more shows that the use of power, this time in the form of legal attacks, was also a part of the religious struggle among the reformers, and was similar to that which happened on the Catholic side.

³² Zdeněk Nejedlý, "Mládi M. Jana z Rokycan," *Časopis Musea království českého* 73 (1899): 532–3.

³³ *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, vol. 3, ed. Rudolf Wolkan, *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*, 97 vols. (Wien: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1855–), 68:32–5.

³⁴ Nejedlý, "Mládi M. Jana z Rokycan," 532–3; Urbánek, *České dějiny*, 3.3:43–5; Janusz Smołucha, *Polityka kurii rzymskiej za pontyfikatu Piusa II (1458–1464) wobec Czech i krajów sąsiednich. Z dziejów dyplomacji papieskiej w XV wieku* (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2008), 68.

³⁵ Státní oblastní archiv v Třeboni, 16A, 84v–86r. However, the title was written on the inner side of the cover of the manuscript and not repeated on the first page of the actual text.

Conclusion

The aforementioned examples show that the use of power was an immanent part of the religious struggle in Hussite Bohemia. It was visible in different forms, such as the open military actions taken by the secular branch, but also in the game of dominating the streets, the churches and places of discussion. Violence was not always clear and visible, but sometimes covered by the guise of legal action, the need to determine the truth or a mutual base for discussion. But there were incidences in which the opponents tried to avoid the problems caused by unexpected outbursts of violence. One of these was definitely the Cheb agreement. There was, however, no clear tendency over the whole Hussite period, from the beginning of the revolution till the death of King George and Rokycana, for one faction to hold back from using their power or avoid any kind of violence or pressure. It was merely a matter of which side was currently dominating the political and religious scene.