

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLMOUCI
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
KATEDRA HISTORIE

**Reactions to the Establishment of Mendicant Orders
in Central Europe During the 13th Century**

Magisterská diplomová práce

Elizabeth Allyn Woock

Studijní obor: Historie – Klasické Filologie

Vedoucí práce: doc. Mgr. Jan Stejskal, M.A., PhD.

Olomouc 2013

Prohlašuji, že jsem předloženou magisterskou diplomovou práci zpracovala samostatně a uvedla v ní veškeré použité prameny a literaturu.

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and expressed in my own words. Any use made within it of works of other authors in any form (e.g. ideas, figures, texts, tables, etc.) are properly acknowledged in the text as well as in the List of References.

Olomouc, 26. 4. 2013

.....
Elizabeth A. Woock

Firstly, I would like to thank doc. Mgr. Jan Stejskal, M.A., PhD, for sharing his wisdom and patience, as well as giving direction and invaluable advice as advisor of this thesis project. I am also very grateful for the assistance that so many professors of the department were kind to provide. Last but not least, I have infinite gratitude for my family for their support, love, and frequent phone calls.

Table of contents

Methods and sources	1
1.0 Introduction – Reactions to mendicants in Western Europe	4
1.1 Western Europe at the turn of the 13th century	4
<i>1.1.1 Social and physical environment</i>	4
<i>1.1.2 New professions, new people, new spiritual needs</i>	7
<i>1.1.3 Popular movements leading towards mendicancy</i>	9
<i>1.1.4 The right environment for Franciscans</i>	13
1.2 Positive reactions to mendicants	14
<i>1.2.1 Acceptance of mendicants vs. antifraternalism</i>	15
1.3 Defining Antifraternalism	16
1.4 Antifraternal trends in selected regions	16
<i>1.4.1 French</i>	17
<i>1.4.2 English</i>	19
<i>1.4.3 German</i>	20
1.5 Primary issues around mendicancy	22
<i>1.5.1 Diverging from monastic norms</i>	22
<i>1.5.2 Privileges</i>	24
<i>1.5.3 Apostolic life</i>	25
<i>1.5.4 Poverty</i>	26
<i>1.5.5 Handling money</i>	27
<i>1.5.6 Preaching the cross</i>	29
<i>1.5.7 Encroaching on the roles of parish priests</i>	31
<i>1.5.8 The Friars and Jews</i>	32
<i>1.5.9 Women and the third order</i>	33
<i>1.5.10 Mendicants and education</i>	34
<i>1.5.11 Violence against the Friars</i>	36
2.0 Reactions to Mendicants in Central Europe	37
2.1 Antifraternalism in Eastern Central Europe	37
<i>2.1.1 Defining antifraternalism in Eastern Central Europe</i>	39
<i>2.1.2 When and where to use German language sources</i>	40
2.2 Two periods of antifraternalism in Eastern Central Europe	41

2.3 Monastic orders and heresies predating mendicants	42
2.4 The arrival of mendicants	43
2.5 Elements affecting the arrival of mendicants	44
3.0 St. Agnes (Sv. Anežka) and mendicants in Prague	46
3.1 <i>Support for involvement with mendicants</i>	49
3.2 <i>Clare of Assisi and the path to female Franciscan houses</i>	52
4.0 Bishop Robert of Olomouc and mendicants in Moravia	54
4.1 <i>Rethinking Bishop Robert in foreign secondary sources</i>	54
4.2 <i>A Cistercian argument</i>	56
4.3 <i>Compilatio super Canica canticorum</i>	57
5.0 Reactions to mendicants in domestic source material	62
5.1 <i>Dalimil Chronicle vs. The Ointment Seller</i>	63
5.2 <i>Discovering antifraternalism in Old Czech lyric poetry</i>	64
Conclusion	69
Resumé	71
Primary Sources	72
Secondary Materials	76
List of Appendix Items	82
Appendix	84

Methods and sources

In order to approach the problems of the arrival of mendicants to Central Europe, I first tried to define the environment in which the mendicant orders were formed. I focused on elements that I thought were crucial to the formation of mendicant orders, as well as their success in gaining validation. Several key elements that helped the mendicants grow in Europe include: the new demographic distributions of the 'second feudal age', urbanization, the adoption of a profit economy, the rise of skilled tradesmen in urban labor forces and communities, lay spiritual movements, failed or heretical religious movements, and the appearance of both nobility and Church leaders who support the principles adopted by the mendicants, and personally supported the development of the mendicant orders. To get a general sense of the environment of the early 13th century, the works of BARBER, Malcom (2004); DE VRIES, Jan (1984); KLANICZAY, Gábor (2004); and POSTAN, M.M. (1973) were consulted. In regards to the general spiritual climate, I used the research of: BARRACLOUGH, Geoffrey (1968); HALVERSON, James L. (2008); ROSENWEIN, B. and LITTLE, L. K. (1974); SCHROEDER, H. J. (1937); SWANSON, R.N. (1995); and WALLWORK, Ernest (1984). Research on lay movements and heresies predating the mendicants is published by: LAMBERT, Malcom (1994); LEFF, Gordon (1999); GRUNDMANN, Herbert, who focuses on the women's religious movement and the historical foundations of German mysticism (1995); MCDONNELL, Ernest W., whose work is dedicated to the Beguines and Beghards (1969); and ZEMAN, J.K., who focuses on heretics and proto-reform movements in Central Europe (1969). In regards to mendicants in general, the works of LITTLE, Lester K. are indispensable, especially in respect of the economic issues faced by mendicants (1943). Also, BAILEY, Michael D (2003) contributes some perspective to the mendicants as a reform movement.

The positive reactions to mendicants are more common and varied than the negative reactions; thus the mendicant orders have survived to evolve into their present form. The negative reactions to mendicants made during their formative years in the first half of the 13th century have been well studied and divided into several conjoined themes. The theme which have been developed when discussion negative reactions to mendicants focus around roughly the following issues: divergence of monastic norms, privileges granted to the mendicants, the larger debate on the *vita apostolica*, the issue of voluntary poverty, the handling of money, the mendicant's role as preachers, the overlap of mendicant duties with those of parish priests, relations with Jews, the role of women and tertiaries in the mendicant orders, the role mendicants played in the field of education, and issues of violence against

the friars. These themes do not include perspectives of antifraternality from art history, which is a separate field of study.

In an attempt to create a framework from which to draw a meaningful comparison to the reactions to mendicants in Central Europe, three regions were focused on: France, England and Germany. Primary characteristics of the antimendicant trends of each region were outlined, although each region shares each of the themes mentioned above to some degree. The goal of identifying the dominant trends in each region was to provide a foil for the trends appearing in Central Europe. In a general introduction to these issues in Europe, with attention to France and England, I have consulted the following sources: GELTNER, G., who is considered one of the eminent scholars on antifraternality (2012), and another dominant scholar in the field, SZITTYA, Penn (2009). In regards to specific issues with mendicants, there are a wide range of sources available. Specifically examining the problems of poverty and property laws affecting mendicants there are COLEMAN, Janet (2009), and FRANK, Thomas (2008). Regarding women in the mendicant orders and lay movements, COAKLEY, John (1991) writes about power issues and gender. In respect to the role mendicants played in education, the most recent research has been published by COURTENAY, William (2009); in the Dominican sphere by MULHAHEY, M.M.(1998), and regarding the Franciscans by ROEST, Bert (1996, 2000). In the study of famous opponents and apologists of the mendicants, BOYLE, Leonard E. (1956) write on William of Pagula, DUFEIL, Michel-Marie researched William of St. Amour and the Paris University conflicts of the 13th century (1974), as well as extensive research done by GELTNER, Guy on the occurrences of antimendicancy in literary sources. (2004, 2008). Recent studies regarding the conflicts between mendicants and Jews were published by COHEN, Jeremy (1984) and McMICHAEL, Steven J. – MYER, Susan E. (2004).

Although mendicants in Central Europe share characteristics with their brothers in the rest of the continent, research has been done on the region to clarify the unique attributes affecting the ability of mendicants to settle. For this purpose, I have consulted BEREND, Ivan T (1986); GÓRECKI, Piotr S. and DEUSEN, Nancy van (2009); HALECKI, and Oscar (1952). German holds a special position separate from what can be called “Eastern”, or Slavic, Central Europe, and in regards to mendicants specifically in Germanic lands, research has been done by MAIER, Christoph T (1998, 2000) in regards to crusade activities in the region; the work of CLEVE, T.C. Van on Emperor Fredrick II (1972); DIPPLE, Geoffrey researches occurrences of antifraternality (2009); and FREED, John B. researched the arrival and settlement of mendicants in the area (1969,1977).

I focused my efforts on finding resources specifically framing the situation in Eastern Central

Europe in the 13th century, and consulted the work of HOFFMANN, František (1992, 2009); BOROVSÝ, Tomáš (2005); KLÁPŠTĚ, Jan (2006); and FIALA, Jiří in regards to the city of Olomouc (1995). In regards to the religious environment and mendicants in Eastern Central Europe, THOMSON, S. Harrison writes about pre-Hussite Bohemia (1933); the settling of Franciscans in Plzeň was researched by BUDILOVÁ, Pavla (2011); ČERNUŠAK, Tomáš – PROKOP, Augustin – NĚMEC, Damián published a history of the Dominican order in the region (2007); HLAVÁČEK, Petr researched the history of Franciscans (2005), KLOCZOWSKI, Jerzy contributed a history of Polish Christianity (2000), MORÉE, Peter C. A. researched preaching and some antimendicant figures in 14th century Bohemia (1999); and KLANICZAY, Gábor examines the role of royalty in the support of mendicant orders in both Eastern and wider Central Europe (2000). Finally, ŠANTORA, Jan attempted to write an account of the arrival of mendicants to Moravia in his bachelor's thesis (2007).

Since her canonization, countless publications have appeared on St. Agnes of Bohemia, an important figure in the establishment of mendicants in Eastern Central Europe, however, the most recent research has been done by KYBAL, Vlastimil (2001); POLC, Jaroslav (1989), POPÍŠILOVÁ, S.M. Ludmila OSF (2010); MUELLER, Joan (2010) who published a work about her connections with St. Clare of Assisi; and research about St. Agnes' heretical sister Blažena, by NEWMAN, Barbora (2005). An edition of the Legend of St. Agnes was published by VYSKOČIL, J.K. (1932).

Another important figure in the settlement of mendicants to Eastern Central Europe, specifically to Moravia, was Bishop Robert of Olomouc. The most current research on Bishop Robert was published by HLINKA, Vít (2006), also in the context of the Cistercian order in Moravia, in a collection by POJSL, Miroslav (2006). The literary works of Bishop Robert were summarized by KOPECKÝ, Milan (2002); while PUMPROVÁ, Anna published an edition of his Commentary on the Song of Songs (2010); and his work as a notary was researched by ŠEBÁNEK, J. (1947, 1959). Bishop Robert's role as a bishop has been recently researched by SVOBODOVÁ, Eva, in her master's thesis (2010).

Finally, in order to find samples of pro- or anti-mendicant arguments in regional literature, I consulted the collections of medieval Czech lyric poetry, edited by LEHÁR, Jan (1990); ČERNÝ, Václav (1948); and a collection of plays by VELTRUSKY, Jarmila F (2006). An additional 'literary' resource used in this work was the Dalimil Chronicle, as edited by BLÁHOVÁ, Marie (1995).

1.0 Reactions to mendicants in Western Europe

1.1.0 Western Europe at the turn of the 13th century

In light of the events and reforms taking place immediately after the turn of the 14th century, this work will focus on the reaction to mendicant orders in regards to their arrival and settlement between 1200 until the close of the 13th century. Throughout the 13th and 14th centuries, the mendicant orders had gone through so much change and evolution that by the end of the 14th century, the original state of the orders seemed to have been lost enough to merit reform: “Founded in the early thirteenth century, the Dominican order had by the early fourteenth lost much of its initial discipline in terms of poverty and other aspects of religious life. . . . Shaken by the horrors of the plague and papal schism, and objecting to the increasingly lax adherence to the rule and initial constitutions of the order maintained in most convents, many Dominicans wanted a reform founded in a strict observance of the early principles, and a strict interpretation of the early documents, of their order.”¹ In addition to the evolution of the orders themselves, a conscious decision was made to focus events before 1300, due to the significant changes in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, the Holy Roman Empire, and dramatic shifts in official church policy towards the mendicant orders. However, in order to augment the limited primary source material originating before the turn of the 14th century some sources, such as literary evidence, is applied providing sensitivity to their context within tradition and within the contemporary culture in which they were recorded.

1.1.1 Social and physical environment

By the year 1200 Christendom had expanded to encompass and connect Europe in a way that the Roman Empire had never achieved. The initiation and evolution of the Crusades, what Bloch defined as a “second feudal age”² ushering in new economic realities, the demographic shift and steady urbanization, even the gradual climatic adjustment of the Medieval Warm Period to the Little Ice Age³. A plethora of factors converged to create a suitable atmosphere for the founding of the Franciscan and Dominican orders. Although they represent a stark break from earlier monastic practices, which for hundreds of years revolved around the Augustine or Benedictine tradition, the mendicant orders are comprised of elements established well before their arrival. Although these elements – holding strict

1 BAILEY, Michael D.: *Religious Poverty, Mendicancy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*, in: *Church History*, 72:3 (September 2003, The American Society of Church History) pp 457-483., p 469.

2 The concept is explored in: BLOCH, Marc. *Feudal Society: Vol 1: The Growth of Ties of Dependence* (1989); *Feudal Society: Vol 2: Social Classes and Political Organisation*, 1989.

3 HUGHES, Malcolm K., – DIAZ, Henry F.: *Was there a 'medieval warm period', and if so, where and when?* In: *Climatic Change*. March 1994, Volume 26, Issue 2-3, pp 109-142.

poverty in the perceived manner of the apostles, public preaching, itinerant, participation of the laity – were active to various degrees in the practice other monastic communities, they had not been condoned and consolidated into a single order. St. Francis (1181/2-1226) and St. Dominic (1117-1221) were blessed to find themselves in the right place at the right time, both as a product of their era as well as innovators of the age.

There were several macro shifts from the 11th to 12th centuries that directly enabled mendicant orders to enter mainstream Christendom. These factors were interconnected, fundamental changes in demographics and culture, and key to understanding why the mendicant orders seemed to stray so shockingly from their previous brethren. One significant trigger was simple population growth, estimated to be about 300 percent.⁴ Because of the growth and relative stability, the increased populations began to concentrate and blossom around urban centers.⁵ Although the newly urbanized population made up no more than an estimated five percent of the overall population, “it had a far greater impact on society at large than that small percentage would imply.”⁶

Although the urban environment was pivotal in their activities, the friars also appeared in more rural areas on missions and in transit between cities, yet the harshest reactions against the friars originated in the most developed cities. Guy Geltner claims that “notwithstanding cities’ generally superior documentation, is that legal jurisdiction in cities, which often gained their liberties from the church, was more carefully monitored, and its rejection, especially by clerics, was strongly contested . . . sensitivity to the friars’ material success, their maintenance of diverse privileges, and their claims of independent jurisdiction fed into a traditional suspicion of clerics among propertied urban elites.”⁷

Another formative element of the mendicant orders was the power and structure of urban centers leading to innovations in work and production. An urban population had begun to emerge, working in jobs that were neither fight, prayer or agriculturally based. Cities had become not just a density of population, but deeply socially, culturally and economically distinct from the rest of inhabited Europe. M. M. Postan describes this as “non-feudal islands in the feudal seas.”⁸ Arriving at a position of clout, the new urban nobility, made rich through business in the new economy, gradually

4 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978. p22.

5 Ibid.

6 ROSENWEIN, B. – LITTLE, L. K.: *Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities*, in: *Past and Present*, No. 63, (May, 1974) pp 4-32., p 16.

7 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance, and Rememberance*, Oxford University Press, 2012., p 136.

8 POSTAN, M.M.: *The Medieval Economy and Society: An Economic History of Britain, 1100-1500*, University of California Press; 1st edition, 1973. p. 212.

usurped the power of the older feudal nobility.⁹ Alongside the movements generated by these new conditions, the older monastic orders also had to adapt, the Cluniacs being among the most efficient in their transition from the gift economy to the urban, profit economy.¹⁰ Rural monastic communities often acted as a bridge to bring the new economic factors to the countryside.¹¹

Within the city, urban populations recently transplanted from rural areas were knitted together through their parish affiliation. Often a neighborhood was comprised of people from the same village or region, which sought to recreate the social structure of the village community in that of the parish. This extended even into the professional life of a worker, as individual guilds would link themselves to a specific parish church, further emphasizing the continuity of the community. Little emphasizes that in addition to their “protection of the collective economic interests of the members, guilds proved a sense of identity and a full range of social security measures for their members.”¹²

Religious life had to respond to the developments of secular needs. The shift of the religious focal points of monks – for example, praying for the fighting crusaders, or those of the nobility who acted as patrons – and the extreme armed violence around the time of the first crusades, gave way to urban concerns. A new type of poor began to emerge, caught at the bottom of the new economic system rather than victims of violence.¹³ They were victims of money, or the lack thereof, rather than the victims of a direct action by an identifiable person. The sense of victim-hood and the inability to place blame or seek retribution against a specific individual or act, became a philosophical and thus theological concern. The solutions, both physical and spiritual, of urban poverty were left wanting by the religious traditions of the previous century. These issues were further complicated by the growth and change initiated in city spaces: “even in strictly material terms, the sources of urban poverty differed from those of rural poverty, for the wage-earner in a city was vulnerable to the fluctuations of an uncontrolled market economy. Particularly on the lower levels of the urban economy, work was not only low-paid but irregular.”¹⁴ Textile workers were one of the demographics deeply affected by the starkly contrasting wealth and poverty of urban production. It is no mistake that communities of Humiliati were closely tied to the textile industry, so much so that Humiliati cloth was known by

9 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978, p 210.

10 Ibid., p 68.

11 Ibid., p 96.

12 Ibid., p 25.

13 ROSENWEIN, B. – LITTLE, L. K.: *Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities*, in: *Past and Present*, No. 63, (May, 1974) pp 4-32. p 17.

14 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978, p28.

name.¹⁵ Indeed, St. Francis himself was the son of a wealthy cloth merchant.¹⁶

1.1.2 New professions, new people, new spiritual needs

The growing populations in the developing urban areas supported themselves with new forms of labor, and new professions. The morality of these jobs and the theological issues surrounding the use of hard currency left lay folk of the city in a quandary. The urban sector was dominated by entrepreneurs: merchants, bankers, lawyers, notaries, school masters and land lords, who made money through tertiary occupations such as services rather than the creation of consumable goods.¹⁷ "This sector was dominant in urban life, not because it constituted a majority of the population in any one city, but because it was in command of the new market economy and eventually derived there from considerable wealth and commensurate political power. . . . The urban laity, also increasingly educated and connected, deeply desired to participate in their faith, and thus arose a movement to overcome and redefine the archaic practices."¹⁸ The Christian morality of the previous century no longer addressed the concerns of the new economic and social realities. Mendicant orders arose as a Church sanctioned answer to what Little calls the "acute problems involving impersonalism, money, and moral uncertainty"¹⁹ that defined the turn of the 13th century.

By the end of the 12th century the need for a new spirituality that addresses both the use of money, which was demonized both in the Bible as well as defamed during throughout the debates on usury, and the desire to participate in spirituality, which lead to movements of lay preaching, were clear. Various orders sought address these concerns, including the Cathars, Waldensians, the Humiliati and only later, the mendicant orders. Furthermore, the urban faithful desired to define and validate the practice of their faith within the limitations of their lifestyles, whether they are confined by work or marriage. The Cathars and Humiliati played a large role in the religious life of guilds, in which an entire guild would align as tertiaries, thus closely tying these new orders with the new labor force. The Humiliati were particularly close to the textile industry, for example, in central and northern Italy to the point where there were communities of Humiliati in almost every cloth producing city. Furthermore, the Cathars and Humiliati also functioned in lieu of a guild, for those workers who were unemployed or unconnected with a guild.²⁰ These movements also acted as a social and economic safety net for women who were left unsupported, or in cooperation with traditionally female guilds, creating tertiary

15 Ibid., p 119.

16 STACE, Christopher, trans.: *The first life of : St. Francis of Assisi*, Caledonian International, Glasgow, 2000

17 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 197.

18 Ibid., p 24 .

19 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 19.

20 Ibid., p 119.

communities such as the Order of Magdalenes.²¹

When the mendicants arrived and established themselves in the urban communities, sometimes entire guilds would transfer affiliation from one of the older lay movements to oversight by the Dominicans or Franciscans, evidence of this occurring in both southern and northern regions of Western Europe.²² This is due to the fact that mendicants and Dominicans in particular, had been actively developing moral codes for merchants and post-feudal urban inhabitants. Evidence of the advancements made by mendicants appear in wide circulation by the early half of the 14th century, for example *Regula mercatorum* (1315) written by Gui de Toulouse²³, a Dominican monk. Mendicant orders further clarified the role of morality in lay life, including married individuals who wished to participate in the movement.

Unwilling to leave their marriages and obligations to fully join an order, the new religious movements catered to these people by openly supporting their involvement as married tertiaries. Rather than encouraging would-be monastics to leave their marriages in favor of the cloister, the new orders take a different tone. Berthold of Regensburg (1220-1272)²⁴ wrote on the order of married people saying: "God has sanctified marriage more than any other order in the world, more than the bare-footed friars, the preaching friars, or the grey monks, who upon one point cannot match holy matrimony; namely, society could not do without the latter. God therefore commanded it, whereas the others he merely counseled."²⁵ Ironically, the huge success and monetary profit derived from close association with the rapidly developing urban population brought an awkward wealth to the mendicant orders, further complicating their stance on voluntary poverty.

The shifting concepts of participation in spiritual life were accompanied by a trend to follow what was perceived, and hotly debated, to be the true *vita apostolica*. Also continued crusades expanding the domain of the Roman Catholic Church made the support for the crusades and protection of Christendom a public affair. The mendicant orders answered both these needs with their public preaching and close connections with the laity. Lay spirituality in urban centers became the focus of monastic work after the turn of the 13th century, in stark contrast to the previous centuries of monastic isolation and introversion.²⁶

21 Ibid., p 209.

22 Ibid.

23 KAEPPPEL, Thomas: "Guido Tolosanus", *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, Rome, Sancta Sabina, t. 2, 1975, p. 74-75, no 1405. p 74-75.

24 MERTENS, Volker, *Berthold von Regensburg*, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Bd. 1, München, Zürich: Artemis 1980, Sp.2035, <http://www.berthold-von-regensburg.de/bibliographie.htm>, accessed 4.11.2013.

25 GÖBEL, F. ed.: *Bertholds Predigten*, Regensburg: 1905, p. 282.

26 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 209.

Spiritual innovation addressed the needs of the new, urban demographic, and in turn the innovators themselves rose from that demographic. Both Waldes, who was denounced as a heretic, and Francis of Assisi, declared a saint, emerged from this demographic and stepped into their roles as spiritual leaders from the position of semi-educated laymen with a desire to understand and preach the Gospel, as well as define new spiritual roles for the people outside the established norms of the previous century. The role of preaching as a testament to faith, and the philosophy of preaching the gospel as well as living it took central role in lay spirituality.

1.1.3 Popular movements leading towards mendicancy

Several lay movements aided the success of the mendicant orders, partially by taking root in previous movements such as the Cathars, Humiliati and Waldensians. The expansion of the third orders enabled more laymen to imitate the apostolic life by making allowances that accounted for the other obligations of a layman or laywomen's life. "The women among them preached as well as the men. The uneducated and the unintelligent among them preached. People of even the most lowly occupations, reported Stephen of Bourbon with a slight tone of scandal, went out to preach. These early Waldensians preached in towns and villages, in homes, in public squares, and even in churches."²⁷

These principles of inclusion and flexibility particularly benefited women, and a primarily, but not exclusively, female third order developed and spread throughout Europe. The Beguine movement was a natural extension of the the same trends that generated the Humiliati, but with more emphasis on structure and stability. The Beguines (and Beghards) did not take formal monastic vows, but lived in stable communities that resembled monastic houses headed by a mistress, the members of which were under the authority a local pastor and bishop. As they were not a stand-alone order, communities of beguines had to attach themselves to, and under the supervision of, a traditional representative of the church, be it a parish or a monastery. After the establishment of the Dominican and Franciscan orders, groups of Beguines often allied themselves with communities from those orders.²⁸ Although the Beguines did not promote a lifestyle of itinerant preaching for its members, they embodied several elements of the lay movements that had been brewing for decades, while smoothly integrating the norms of the new economic reality. Many Beguines earned wages performing some sort of labor, often in the textile industry, and participated in health and care services. Little claims that structure and function of a Beguine community was most similar to a Premonstratensian nunnery,²⁹ although they were a lay, rather than monastic, movement. This further demonstrates that the creation of the

²⁷ Ibid., p 123.

²⁸ LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978. p132; (citation: McDonnell, pp 200-201).

²⁹ Ibid., p 132.

mendicant orders was hardly an overnight miracle, but rather the culminating success of decades of attempted reform movements.

Despite their strength and popularity, the majority of these lay movements, precursors to the mendicant orders, were eventually denounced as heretical, despite, in some cases, the popular faith in their sanctity. In 1147 suppression of the Cathars was set into motion by Pope Eugene III (Pope from 1145-1153), initiating a cycle of resurgence and oppression of the movement throughout the following century. The Waldensians (although some reconciled groups were approved) were declared heretics in 1215, at the Fourth Lateran Council,³⁰ and at the conclusion of the crusade against the Cathars, despite becoming the new focus of persecution, endured in small communities. The Humiliati existed on the edge of heresy, its members often mixing with officially denounced heretical movements, but despite occasional altercations the Humiliati were mostly accepted by the Church, similarly to the Beguines. In their struggle, the Humiliati did win the approval of Pope Innocent III (1160/1-1216), and partially adopted the rule of St. Benedict³¹, although continued to live their secular lives. The approval of the Humiliati was a crucial step in paving the way for the Franciscan and Dominican orders.

Perhaps the largest hurdle for these movements was accepting the primacy of the pope, and in their rejection of the existent authority, they opened themselves for persecution. Since the bishopric of Rome began to claim heredity of St. Paul's legacy, the Catholic Church had defined and defended itself on the bonds of an unbroken chain of authority to St. Peter.³² Thus, all attempts up to the 12th century to challenge the authority of the seat in Rome or the chain of command leading to it -- be it antipopes, competing metropoli such as Constantinople or Antioch, or dissenting sects such as the Cathars -- are rejected. It is no wonder why such sects spring up in the regions of Christendom out of the immediate reach of Rome, where distant authority can be construed as weak or unjust by lay folk. Although some movements, such as the Beguines, accepted the authority and were tolerated, other movements “whether they tried to co-operate with the clerical hierarchy, to challenge it directly, or merely to avoid it, these groups all encountered official resistance and hostility,”³³ in addition to being persecuted for doctrinal errors.

But a heresy to the pope may be a liberating revolution for a layman, and indeed the heretical movements of the middle twelfth century were pivotal. In order to better understand the success of the

30 SCHROEDER H. J.ed.: *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary*, (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1937). pp. 236-296. <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/lateran4.asp>, Access: 23.4.2013.

31 FOSSAS, Ignasi M.[et al.]: *Regla per als monjos: text llatí/català*, Barcelona, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997 (Subsidia Monastica, 21), Latin transcription and Multilingual access to the Official Rule of St. Benedict at <http://www.osb.org/rb/> Access: 11.4.2013.

32 Concept outlined through first half of : BARRACLOUGH, Geoffrey. *The Medieval Papacy*. New York 1968.

33 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 99.

mendicant orders, it is necessary to review the failures of the movements rejected as heretical. Moreover, the arguments made against mendicant orders have a long tradition, originating in the arguments against the preceding, failed movements.

In addition to the rejection of papal authority, several other issues championed by lay movements were denounced. The other prominent issue related to the doctrines of these movements, which, although rooted in biblical evidence and successfully practiced by a few, were considered too extreme and inapplicable to the greater whole of monastics, much less the laymen the groups advocated. Although the Humiliati continually brought themselves back from the brink of heresy, the Cathars, in addition to their rejection of Church authority, complicated their position with irregular doctrine: the emphasis on two primary forces in the universe and the rejection of material possessions, sex and the food of animals born of coition, and among other offenses, the Waldensians were denounced for holding their meetings in secret. The Dominicans and Franciscans avoided adopting any particularly radical practices, and rather build their orders on a compilation of practices that had precedence in other orders or clerical functions.

Furthermore, the heretical Cathars and Waldensians allowed both uneducated men and women preach. The strong stance Pope Innocent III took against heretical movements was in part initiated in reaction to this preaching. As John Clare Moore described his reaction:

“Interpreting scripture was therefore a matter for specialists. There were in Europe at the time lay people who were barely literate, but who nevertheless read the bible, explained it to one another, and preached the gospel in city streets. For Lothario and his highly-trained peers, that would be roughly the equivalent of a modern person’s practicing surgery or dentistry without any formal education - laughable if it were not so dangerous.”³⁴

Slowly, theological justification and clarifications were developed to allow lay preaching, most importantly the establishment of different types of preaching. The Humiliati won approval for their practice of allowing a brother “strong in faith, knowledgeable in religion, gifted in speech, and consistent in behavior and speech” preach for their Sunday congregation. Pope Innocent III's acceptance of this movement indicated several theological innovations, specifically regarding the details of preaching, which now separated the formal preaching of doctrine from the act of “giving witness to faith and morals”, the latter being approved for laymen, thus confirming the authority of an educated preacher. Another lay movement soon after approved by Pope Innocent III, in 1208, were the

34 MOORE, John Clare: *Pope Innocent III: To Root Up and to Plant*, Brill: Leiden, Boston, 2003., p 10.

Poor Catholics, (*Pauperes Catholici*). Although the Poor Catholics had modeled their manner of living after the Waldensians, they also required approval of local clerical authorities before preaching. The Dominicans incorporated this into their order by placing a monumental emphasis on education as a prerequisite for preaching, while the Franciscans took full advantage of the rights to 'give witness'. Both orders recognized the authority, at least in theory, of the local bishop and clergy in the ministry

Although the previous section focus on the qualities that drove popular lay movements of the late 12th century, there were also several monastic orders whose practices were echoed in the mendicant orders. Similarities can also be drawn between mendicants and houses of canons. These were primarily orders involved in crusade missions – the Cistercians, the Premonstratians and the Teutonic Knights. These three orders are particularly important in Central Europe, as will be further explored in the second half of this work. The Cistercians had already begun to diverge from the Benedictine rule, and included lay brothers, *conversi*, to buttress their monastic communities. These monastic orders also experienced criticism from older orders throughout their development, even the Cistercians being seen as radicals in their own time.

In many ways, the Premonstrates were laid the most groundwork for the mendicant orders. They experienced an evolution of their own – though the founder, Norbert of Xanten (c. 1080-1134), engaged in several practices that would be later found in the mendicant orders, such as simple dress, public preaching and itinerancy.³⁵ However, he first sought the approval of Pope Gelasius II (Pope from 1118-1119), which proved key in his acceptance. The Premonstratensians predate the mendicants in their rejection of personal property, humble dress and although the rule does not officially address preaching or ministry, by the end of the century the order had received special permission from Pope Clement III (1187–1191) to engage in parish work, hostels, hospitals and schools.³⁶ These are similar to the allowances made to the Teutonic Knights, though the Knights had a greater function within the Crusades. While being houses of regular canons, the Premonstratensians maintained traditionally characteristics in their practices, in their social hierarchy and by establishing stationary communities outside of urban centers.

For the Dominicans and Franciscans, the Humiliati were the lay movement closest to their own practices which was sponsored by the Church, and could provide historic precedence for their otherwise nontraditional practices. Thanks to Francis' close ties to Cardinal Ugolino (1170-1241, Pope Gregory IX from 1227-1241) and Innocent III “the revolutionary programme of mendicant preaching, a deadly threat to so many established interests, was turned into a form of orderly internal church reform

³⁵ Ibid., p 8.8

³⁶ LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978. p 89; footnote 73.

by the skill of these astute administrators.”³⁷ St. Francis began his work as a religious man in a manner closely tied with the existing episcopal authority, being transferred directly from the oversight of his parents to the protection of the local bishop, Guido of Assisi, who had connections to Pope Innocent III. Francis continued to work closely with the bishop and the papacy throughout the development of his order.

1.1.4 The right environment for Franciscans

In addition to previous lay movements preparing the path for the likes of the Franciscans and Dominicans to enter mainstream Christendom, a unprecedented source of support was found in Pope Innocent III and Cardinal Ugolino, whose approach to the waves of lay movement had changed significantly since their predecessors rejected the Cathar and Waldensians, who presented similar proposals as that of St. Francis. As Little frankly puts it: “Innocent III was not Alexander III”³⁸

The success of the mendicant orders did not stop after the approval of their rule. Pope Gregory IX (formerly Cardinal Ugolino) followed the lead of Innocent III and promoted the mendicant orders, indeed even expediting the canonization of St. Francis and confirmation of his stigmata, despite countless rejections of claims of stigmata throughout the previous centuries. Pope Gregory IX was not unmoved by politics, and by his time the mendicant orders had become established, thanks to their formative cooperation with the Church, as a tool of the Holy See in their continuous crusading missions. As Christoph Maier concisely describes the situation:

“The decision to proceed with the canonization of Francis of Assisi was taken at a time when Gregory IX’s authority was at a critically low point in his conflict with the emperor. . . . To make matters worse for Gregory, the citizens of Rome supported Frederick and forced the pope to flee the town. In the face of the emperor’s successful defiance of papal authority Gregory was hard pressed to restore the papacy’s credibility and authority.³⁹ Francis’ canonization was one way of doing so. The canonization procedure was hurriedly planned and was finished within a few days in an unprecedented hurry.”⁴⁰

As Innocent III's favor of the Poor Catholics, Humiliati and eventually the Franciscans was a concession to growing public sentiment, Gregory IX also sought to appease the lay folk though

37 Ibid., p 169.

38 Ibid., p 150.

39 CLEVE, T.C. Van: *Emperor Fredrick II of Hohenstaufen*, Oxford, 1972.

40 MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, 1998., p 27.

favoring the mendicants. The mendicant orders were an amalgamation of previously established practices and the influence of lay movements, while most importantly being the benefactors of circumstances grown ripe for their arrival.

1.2.0 Positive reactions to mendicants

Despite the failure of movements before them and the criticism against them, the mendicant orders have enjoyed substantial popularity from the time of their origin to the present day. St. Francis and St. Dominic build their orders differently, appealing to slightly different demographics, but both essentially satisfying the contemporary demand for reform. Both orders went about their development differently:

“Whereas the Franciscans seemed to scatter their shots widely and then look to see what they hit, the Dominicans by contrast were forced to choose narrow and specific targets, and then take care not to miss them. With no set plan Francis preached to elderly people, soldiers, birds, merchants, and princes; but Dominic, and his successor Jordan of Saxony, adhered to carefully arranged schedules that kept them constantly engaged in the business of the order.”⁴¹

As the rest of this work will focus mainly on negative reactions to the arrival of mendicant orders in Europe, and especially Central Europe, it is important to first emphasize the support that these orders were met with. Although there was criticism of the mendicants' practices,⁴² politics, their role in the crusades and as inquisitors, they were indeed warmly received by some groups and fulfilled the spiritual demands of a new century. Guy Geltner adds that counter to the perception of conflict, “indeed, it is one of the ironies of mendicant history that the brethren’s initial arrival to certain areas actually curbed anticlericalism by furnishing laymen with a living example of evangelical life that they found lacking among the secular clergy and traditional monasticism.”⁴³

1.2.1 Acceptance of mendicants vs. antifraternality

Material and political support for the mendicant was provided by the Pope himself and the cardinal protectorates assigned to the orders, but a significant amount of support was given by secular individuals and groups. Although the patrons' social position and manner of support varied regionally, there are some identifiable trends. In the south, for example around urban Italy lists of third order

41 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978., p 160.

42 MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades*, 1998. p 159; “The business of crusading vow redemption certainly remained alive and popular during the later half of the thirteenth century, so that there is no reason to believe that the criticism levelled against it damaged it in any serious way.”

43 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternality*, 2012., p 136.

membership “show a heavy predominance of tradesmen and lesser professionals. . . the real strength of the movement came from the better-off inhabitants of cities, whether bourgeois or noble.”⁴⁴ Nobles such as the wife of King Louis IX (1214-1270) founded convents that they themselves retired to later in life. But, nobles did not monopolize the support of friars; Little cites a case study of the friars in Macon, and the trends of support begin with the local nobles, but gradually shift to support from the bourgeoisie by the end of the thirteenth century.⁴⁵ The friar would often be invited by a town, and then provided for by the locals.

In the much less urbanized north, complicated by the relationship between the Holy Roman Emperor and the Holy See in Rome, “no one social order had an exclusive hold on membership in or support of the friars. The leaders of the German friars came from the lesser nobility and the urban patriarchate, while the rank and file emerged from ordinary burgher families.”⁴⁶ The dynamic of noble families supporting the recently arrived mendicants occurred throughout Northern and indeed Central Europe, although its manifestation in Germany had quite a different tone than in other parts of the region. While the French and Italian nobles embraced the mendicants, Emperor Fredrick II (1194-1250) had a different reaction, as the mendicants were acting as agent of his enemy, the Pope.

St. Francis himself warned against relying too much on the support of wealthy patrons, which Little understands to indicate a propensity to do so.⁴⁷ Little continues to note that:

“the patronage of religious establishments by princes and nobles was not new in the thirteenth century. The friars seem merely to have stepped in as new beneficiaries to an ancient, solidly established tradition. . . But as we have seen, the new element in patronage, not without its twelfth-century antecedents to be sure, lay in the participation of the prospering and influential people of urban society.”⁴⁸

Although the most obvious patronage of mendicant came from the nobility to fund building and large projects, the bulk of support for mendicants came from the average laymen, who made up their membership.

1.3 Defining Antifraternalism

“As the acclaimed Franciscanist A.G. Little once admitted: “If you want to know what happened, the Dominicans will be the safest guides; if you want to know how it struck a

44 FREED, J.B.: *The mendicant orders in Germany 1219-73*, Princeton University PhD thesis 1969.

45 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.. p 205

46 ROSENWEIN, B. – LITTLE, L. K.: *Social Meaning* ,1974, pp 4-32.; p 28.

47 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978., p 205-6.

48 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978., p 206.

contemporaryconsult the Franciscans."⁴⁹ The mendicants themselves were the original historiographers of their own persecution; ROEST Bert notes their eagerness to document their victimization and the martyrhood they experienced during their daring missions to the edges of Christian Europe and beyond.⁵⁰ The more recent, formalized study of antifraternism can be said to have matured through the work of SZITTYA, Penn, who framed his career as a medievalist by examining antifraternist themes in literature. LITTLE, Lester K., although not focused on antifraternism per se, researched occurrences of it within the periphery of his study of mendicants and their interactions with economics. GELTNER, Guy has built greatly on this, extending the body of research to include violence and greater interest in Central Europe, particularly the German areas. Geltner defines antifraternism as: "opposition to the friars in their early phase (c. 1220-c.1400), [which] is usually understood as a phenomenon driven by competition over material and political resources as well as by envy, a feeling aroused especially among monks and clergymen . . ."⁵¹ Many scholars in the last decade have published research focusing on certain aspects or regions where antifraternism (or 'antimendicantism') is manifested. Antifraternism has occurred in all areas of Europe, and in many forms; from direct violence, to discrimination, to satirical stereotypes.

1.4 Antifraternist trends in selected regions

Before turning the attention to reactions against mendicants in Central Europe, specifically in Moravia, it is necessary to examine the established patterns of reactions noted in other areas of Europe. The antifraternist traditions I would like to examine first are those originating in France, England and Germany – specifically, categorized linguistically into French, English and German regions, rather than modern political borders – as they have an extensive amount of research published, and they share more characteristics with Eastern Central Europe (identified as the Slavic language region of Central Europe, with overlap of German language) than coeval Italy, Spain, etc.

These three foils were selected because of their relevance to the context of Central Europe: they have hosted the same heretical movements, they are under the extended reach of the Catholic Church rather than its direct and immediate influence as Italian cities were, and yet held very strong local governments and cultures of their own. Also, they were fairly stable and distinctly Christianized regions of the Roman Church, unlike Spain, the far northern and eastern edges of Europe or North

49 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternism*, 2012. p 86. GELTNER cites: cite A.G. Little "Chronicles of the mendicant friars, in *Franciscan Papers, Lists, and Documents*, 284; Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, 81 (Manchester; Manchester University Press, 1943), 41)

50 ROEST Bert: *Reading the Book of History: Intellectual Contexts and Educational Functions of Franciscan Historiography 1226 -ca.1350*, Groningen, 1996

51 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternism*, 2012, p 5.

Africa. Germany in particular constitutes an outlier among the three, which will be examined further later, but stands in contrast as well as compliment to Eastern Central Europe, considering the deep and inseparable German involvement in the region.

By examining the reactions to mendicant orders in these three regional arenas, it will become clear why the Northern and Eastern Central regions require special attention within the study of mendicants in Central Europe, considered apart from reactions clearly speaking to specifically Germanic interests of the Western Central region. There are very interesting reactions to be considered outside of the German arena, although they have not often been considered separately; a domestic, German perspective often dominates discussion of Central Europe, especially in English, French, and German language academic literature.⁵²

1.4.1 French

Perhaps the most well know opponent of the mendicants was William of St. Amour (c. 1200-1272), (Guilelmus or Wilhelmus de Sancto Amore), called the Hammer of the Friars, a university master in Paris. His most famous anti-mendicant work is *De periculis novissimorum temporum*⁵³, a treatise that he composed in 1256. His subsequent excommunication and exile, imposed by pope Alexander IV (c.1185-1261), came as a result of his history of vocal opposition to the friars and reflected the ongoing conflicts at the university in Paris, which involved both Dominican and Franciscan monks. Although *De periculis* is his best known work, perhaps because of its timing immediately before his excommunication, he had a history of antifraternality writings and ongoing conflicts with both secular powers and the papacy.

The antifraternality of William of St. Amour is conventionally considered the vanguard against the mendicant orders in France and the British Isles. Themes characteristic to his sermons and treatises are later echoed in the works of Archbishop Richard FitzRalph (c.1300-1360) and other vocal antimendicants of the mid-14th century. As in other cases of antifraternality, the vehemence against the friars extends to their supporters, in this particular occurrence the king of France, Louis IX. This posture of rejecting the mendicant orders as a way of also creating a thinly veiled attack against the secular leaders who support them, as well as the higher members of the church who act as their protectors was repeated throughout Europe, including Central Europe, as will be shown.

The main points made against the mendicants are: their hypocritical involvement in the

52 For more introduction to this area: FREED, John B.: *The Friars and German Society*, 1977. And DIPPLE, Geoffrey "Si sind all glichsner: Antifraternality in Medieval and Renaissance German Literature" in *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV: 2009

53 Edition: GELTNER, Guy trans. *William of Saint-Amour*, 2008.

universities, their false poverty, their unorthodox preaching, and their unclioistered lifestyle. William of St. Amour concludes that the arrival of the mendicant orders is a harbinger of the apocalypse, that these qualities identify the friars as the 'false brothers' foretold in "An ordinary gloss to Apoc. 6.5, which explains that 'the Devil sends forth false brothers who might subvert'⁵⁴ the faith sub habitu sanctitatis, allows William to make the allusion to the friars that much more obvious."⁵⁴ Although some critics of mendicants argued for the orders to reform, William wrote with an aim not to bring them closer to the traditional monastic structure, but rather to eradicate the movement entirely.

Although he does not mention the conflicts in the university specifically⁵⁵, his actions – such as going to the pope to refute the *Introductorium in Evangelium Aeternum*, written by Gerard of Bergo San Donnino (Fra Gherardo of Borgo San Donnino, the text was preserved only in extracts made by the commission that examined it in 1255⁵⁶) -- were with an aim to discredit the mendicants completely, and ultimately remove them from their positions in the university. He was successful in influencing Pope Innocent IV to be more strict with the mendicants, but the naming of Pope Alexander IV very quickly reversed any progress made to restrict the mendicants. In his first years as pope, Alexander IV rather returned mendicants to their seats in the Paris university and brought Louis IX to crack down on antimendicants such as William. The story of William of St. Amour conveniently displays the key elements of antifraternality as it appears throughout the British Isles, France, Italy and Germany: the use of religious arguments and the apocalyptic motif to resolve political conflict and the hard policy of the papacy to severely silence critics of the mendicants.

The arguments against mendicants originating in William's work as a preacher and man of the cloth eventually do spread to secular writings. Geltner identifies *De periculis* as the ancestor of all subsequent antifraternality tracts.⁵⁷ His specific arguments are repeated, as well as the apocalyptic motif, but in the hands of the laity the character of the fat, lecherous friar is developed. This characterization speaks to the contact the laity had with the friars, as local preachers and figures in the fabric of urban society, rather than using the theological objects presented by member of the clergy. Evidence of antifraternality spreading from the clergy to the laity can be found in the *Roman de la rose* (c. 1230:

54 Ibid.

55 Because the university conflicts have been very well described in other literature, I will not go into detail about them here, see: CONGAR 1961; DOUIE 1954 and 1974; DUFEIL 1976; TRAVER 1997-99 and 1999.

56 GARDNER, Edmund. *Joachim of Flora*. In: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 8. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910. 11 Apr. 2013<<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08406c.htm>>. Accessed: 22.4.2013.

57 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternality*, 2012. p 16.

Guillaume de Loris, addition c. 1275: Jean de Meun)⁵⁸, Rutebeuf's *Oeuvres complètes* (1260s)⁵⁹, and the tradition carried on later in Jean d'Anneux's *Filios enutrivi* (1328)⁶⁰, and much later in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (mid 14th century)⁶¹, among many lesser literary manifestations of antifraternalism.

Antifraternal chansons of the 13th century revolve around themes of hypocrisy and corruption of the friars, specifically concerning monetary issues rather than theological objections: the sale of indulgences, the perceived sale of the Word by accepting excessive donations in exchange for preaching and spiritual services, detracting the (financial) support of parish clergy and the redemption of crusade vows.⁶² The tensions between the university master, King Louis IX and the papacy are also referenced.

1.4.2 English

Antifraternalism in England was heavily represented by the Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, who composed many sermons against the friars, on the themes presented in *De periculis*, before he was exiled. In many ways, the opponents of mendicants applied the same arguments as in the French arena, but also there was attention paid to property and legal issues as well. One example of criticism leveled against the friars on a legal perspective is seen in James le Palmer's (c.1327 - 1375) 14th century work *Omne bonum, fratres mendicantes*⁶³.

Markedly English expressions are composed later, often as a negative portrayal of a friar in a secular literary work, employing the English literary love of estate satire. Excellent examples of this stereotype can be seen in Langland's *Piers Plowman* and in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*⁶⁴. It should be noted, however, that works like the *Canterbury Tales* carry overall anticlerical themes, attacking all levels of the clergy, not just mendicants. Later issues with mendicants in England include discontent with inquisitional activities and, during the Protestant movement, antifraternal art and literature

58 GELTNER, Guy. "Faux Semblants : Antifraternalism Reconsidered in Jean de Meun and Chaucer" in *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 101, No. 4, Fall 2004, University of North Carolina Press, 2004. pp 357-380.

Primary source information available at the Digital Library Project "Roman de la Rose", at romandelarose.org, access 11.4.2013.

59 RUTEBEUF, "Le dit des Cordeliers," in: *Œuvres complètes de Rutebeuf*, 2 vols., ed. Edmond Faral and Julia Bastin (Paris: Picard, 1959-60), 1: p 231-7., GELTNER, G.: "William of St. Amour's *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, pp 134-135.

60 GELTNER, G.: *William of St. Amour's De periculis novissimorum temporum*, 2009., pp 137.

61 SZITTYA, Penn R. "The Friar as False Apostle: Antifraternal Exegesis and the Summoner's Tale" In: *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 71, Np. 1, Jan 1974, University of North Carolina Press 1974, pp 19-46

A guide to Chaucer and his work can be found at <http://www.courses.fas.harvard.edu/~chaucer/index.html> Accessed: 11.4.2013

62 MAIER, Christoph: *Preaching the crusades*, 1994, p 158

63 JAMES LE PALMER *omne bonum, fratres mendicantes* (folio 154r-161v and again fol. 162r-v) SANDLER, Lucy Freeman, *Omne Bonum: A Fourteenth-Century Encyclopedia of Universal Knowledge: British Library MSS Royal 6 E VI-6 E VII*, 2 vols, London: Harvey Miller, 1996

64 GELTNER, G.: *William of St. Amour's De periculis novissimorum temporum*, 2009, pp 135-136.

abounds, often further developing the apocalyptic theme.

Although apocalyptic themes corresponding with the larger eschatological trends in the second half of the 13th century appear in Central Europe by the turn of the 14th century, the antifraternistic-eschatological themes championed by William of St. Amour appear in Czech language sources only in the mid to late 14th century, specifically in the works of proto-reformers, such as in the sermons of Jan Milíč of Kroměříž. Williamst antifraternal themes, although without the apocalyptic framing, appear in several examples of 14th century lyric poetry, which will be examined in Section 5.2, giving further evidence to the late arrival of Western antifraternal rhetoric to Eastern Central Europe. One possible explanation for the timing of the arrival of Williamist themes to Eastern Central Europe appearing in the works of proto-reformers could be the connection and communication between the Czech and British courts at the mid 14th century, with the themes being transferred from France by way of the English tradition's adaption of those themes and subsequent application of them by Wyclif and the reform movements.

1.4.3 German

The negative reactions against mendicants in the Germanic region is both unique among its neighbors and essential for establishing a clearer perspective of antifraternalism in Central Europe, specifically in the western Slavic lands. It is essential to note that the “urban” areas of what could be identified as “Germany” by modern definitions were a far cry from the cities of Italy or France. Cologne was the largest urban center, with 50,000 inhabitants by the 13th century, in addition to only about 50 towns with populations over 2,000.⁶⁵ Emperor Fredrick II had been carrying on a long conflict with the papacy, incurring excommunication in 1227 and again in 1239, political maneuvering against the Hohenstaufen dynasty and was thus formally denounced by the mendicant orders, although in practice this was perhaps not acted upon. Mathew Paris (Matthaeus Parisiensis, c. 1200-1259) reported of mendicants being attacked by imperial agents in 1229⁶⁶ Many of the friars had arrived to Germany as participants in the Hohenstaufen crusade in the 1240s and 50s. Their preaching was lost on the locals, who would have certainly disliked the content if they could have at least understood the languages that the mendicants haplessly employed in substitution of German.

Geltner provides two other examples; the minorite Giano, who portrays Germany as a destination for martyrs, and Heinrich von Regensburg, the regional Protector of Dominicans, who

65 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978., p 23.

66 Mathew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, In: LUARD, Henry Richards: *Matthæi Parisiensis: Monachi Santi Albani, Chronica Majora*, Longman & Co: 1872.

warned the Strasbourg Dominicans of lethal danger.⁶⁷ As Geltner refers to the *Chronica Fratris Jordani*⁶⁸, the situation seems dire:

*And according to the Franciscan chronicler Jordan of Giano, when a similar mission landed in Germany, the friars were accosted by the locals and 'asked if they were heretics, and if they had come to Germany in order to infect it just as they had perverted Lombardy.' Unfortunately, the friars replied with the only word they knew in the local dialect, namely, Ja. Whereupon, some of them were beaten, others imprisoned, and still others stripped naked, taken to a public place, and made a spectacle for men to mock at.*⁶⁹

The brothers of Strasbourg were indeed evicted in the 1260s⁷⁰, but Geltner warns that the claims of violent persecution might be exaggerated. While some communities of friars were expelled, others seem to have integrated. According to Freed, friars possibly ignored both the first and second excommunication of the Emperor, as evidenced by the continued patronage of pro-Hohenstaufen bishops.⁷¹

Though physical violence may not have been always applied against the friars, a plethora of written compositions remain as evidence of strong antifraternal tendencies in the Germanic region. Themes range from those propagated by William de St. Amour, seen in the writing of Johann Eberlin von Gunzburg and Konrad von Waldhüsen, to anti-papal overtones of Konrad of Megenberg and Walther von der Vogelweide.⁷² However, many antifraternal works originate after the 1300, supposedly referencing long established themes which were employed by contemporaries of the protestant reformation. There is unfortunately a lack of written records from this area, so additional writings or antimendicant sermons have not been preserved, if they ever existed.

An important component in expressing antifraternalism in German culture was the courtly minnesinger. Early lyrical poets who wrote against the mendicants were Reinmar von Zweter (c. 1200-1260)⁷³, at the court of Vaclav I, Der Marner (c. 1230-1265)⁷⁴ and Frauenlob (pseudonym of Heinrich

67 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012. p 119.

68 AUWEILER, Edwin J. *The Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano: A Dissertation*, Kessinger Publishing: 2010

69 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 56; Cites: *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, ed. H. Boehmer (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1908), 5 (pp. 5-6) "*Unde accidit, ut interrogati si essent heretici et si ad hoc venissent ut Teutonium inficerent sicut et Lombardiam pervertissent, et respondissent 'ia', quidam ex ipsis plegati, quidam incarcerati et quidam denudati nudi ad choream sunt ducti et spectaculum ludecre hominibus sunt effecti.*"

70 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 119.

71 DIPPLE, Geoffrey: *Si sind all glichsner*, 2009, p 183.

72 GELTNER, G.: *William of St. Amour's De periculis novissimorum temporum*, 2009, 105-118. pp 139-140

73 ROETHE, Gustav, ed.: *Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter*. Leipzig, 1887. Repr. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1967

74 DER MARNER: *Lieder und Sangsprüche aus dem 13. Jahrhundert und ihr Weiterleben im Meistersang*. hg., eingel., erl. und übers. von Eva Willms, de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 2008.

von Meissen, d. 1318)⁷⁵, at court of Vaclav II, and Friedrich von Sonnenburg at the court of Přemysl Otakar II. There is some evidence that these poets, or at least their work, was circulated throughout the Czech lands, and served to inspire authors in the Czech language.⁷⁶ Although reactions against mendicants differed greatly between Czech and German sources in the 13th century, by the protestant movements of the 14th century they have both come to adopt the trans-European themes first expressed by William de St. Amour, which will be discussed more in Section 5. The arrival and leaning of these themes differ between Western and Eastern Central Europe, and are eventually produced in Eastern Central Europe thanks to the increased presence of education, ironically developed through the support of mendicant schools. In order to identify the point where both Czech and German language authors shifted to favor the generalized Western European antifraternial discourse, and thus identify their unique reactions to the arrival of the mendicant orders, it is necessary to first outline the common features of antimendicant objects that circulated outside of Central Europe.

1.5 Primary issues around mendicancy

The next section will aim to only briefly introduce the most common issues revolving around the mendicants in the early 13th century. Special attention will be given to issues that play a prominent role in the reaction to mendicants in Central Europe.

1.5.1 Diverging from monastic norms

Upon the rise of their popularity and notoriety, objections were made against the mendicant orders over a wide scope of issues from the practical, to the material, to the theological and doctrinal. For the mendicants, these issues were deeply intertwined and related, stemming from the basic principles of the movement – the apostolic life as demonstrated in voluntary poverty, involvement of the laity and active, itinerant preaching – and the tension those principles caused when applied to the realities of a wider population, both secular and clerical:

Though religious like monks and governed by a Rule, they differed in key respects: they were not cloistered, they wandered; they were religious, yet their mission resembled the apostolic mission of the clergy in preaching, conversion, confessional and unlike any other order in the 1200 years of the Church, they did not earn a living either by the work of their hands or by ecclesiastical endowment, they begged. Most of all they were

75 STACKMANN, Karl – BERTAU, Karl (Hrsg.): *Frauenlob (Heinrich von Meissen): Leichs, Sangsprüche, Lieder*. 2 Bände, (= Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl. III, 119–120) Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1981.

76 The circulation and use of German language lyric poetry in the Czech region is discussed at length in: ČERNÝ, Václav: *Staročeská Milostná lyrika*, Vydavatelstvo Družstevní práce: Praha: 1948, pp 93-105.

*a structural novelty, and therefore deeply troubling.*⁷⁷

They seemed to James de Vitry (c. 1160-1240) like a group of Augustinian monks functioning as a house of canons, thus outside of both definitions.⁷⁸ There is no specific place one may start exploring the contentious elements of the mendicancy, so irrelevant to the order of their presentation, the connections will become obvious.

Perhaps the most vague, overarching objection to the mendicant orders was to their omission of traditional monastic structures. The Rule of St. Benedict speaks particularly negatively of wandering monks, “*semper vagi et numquam stabiles*”,⁷⁹ and emphasizes the value of geographic and communal stability. Secondly, monks were traditionally contained in self-sufficient communities, living off of their own labor (although it's been oft noted that several orders, including the Cistercians who were so critical of the lay movements of the late 12th century, circumvented this obligation by the applying lay brethren to the manual work). The structured hierarchy of mother-daughter houses so intently developed in the previous century was dismissed by the mendicants in favor of a more improvised expansion by the Franciscans, while the Dominicans planned their new communities more carefully, while all communities answered directly and independently to the Pope. Finally, while previous orders had preserved secular social hierarchy within the walls of their monasteries, the mendicants advocated a degree of equality among all the members regardless of their status in secular life, although the order respected the general ecclesiastical authority.

To further emphasize the impossibility of incorporating mendicants into the existent structure of church hierarchy:

*. . . William argues that God instituted two and only two orders, with their respective subdivisions, for the direction of the church. The first or 'perfect' order (bishops, presbyters, and deacons) was prefigured in the twelve apostles, while the second and inferior order 'of those to be perfected' (monks, laymen, catechumens) follows the path set by the seventy-two disciples (Luke 10:1).*⁸⁰

The real issue of the mendicants' rejection of established monastic hierarchy was that, unlike the Cistercians, whose centralized administration allowed for control and oversight at all levels while ably incorporating themselves into the local secular hierarchy wherever they settled daughter houses, the

77 SZITTYA, Penn: *Kicking the habit*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner, Leiden: Koninklijk Brill NV: 2009, pp 105-118. p 170

78 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 166.

79 Chapter 1, lines 10-11, *Rule of St. Benedict*, Saint-Gall manuscript,

<http://www.lluisvives.com/servlet/ServeObras/jlv/02580516454693584321157/index.htm>, Access: 4.4.2013

80 MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades*, 1998, p 21.

mendicants were at first allowed to act above local supervision. Adjustments were made to reign in the Preachers and the Friars Minor and seek the approval of local authorities before acting in an area, but their other liberties made advocates of the old structure understandably uncomfortable.

The mission to wander and preach wherever needed, as the apostles, flew in the face of the geographic stability maintained by most other orders. While their itinerancy was functional in the context of the crusades – as Cardinal Simon of St. Cecilia said in December 1267 “that the secular clergy had many other things to attend to and did not have sufficient time to broadcast the crusade themselves”⁸¹ – most critics of the mendicants perceived the wandering habits of their apostolic mission to indicate instability and insincere intents. Moreover, the friars were outsiders, disrupting the local order and overlapping the work of parish priests. The Benedictine distaste for vagrant monks mixed with a distrust of strangers, particularly in the north, where friars appeared to be agents of the papacy, at odds with the emperor and speaking little German.

Furthermore, both the Dominican and Franciscan orders rejected the established Augustinian and Benedictine rules that most orders were based on, and instead chose to write their own rules. The rule St. Francis had composed was rather a collection of evangelical excerpts, and he insisted that the Gospel was the only “real rule.”⁸² Both orders did, however, accept and maintain the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

1.5.2 Privileges

Perhaps making matters worse for the friars was their protected status, perceived as 'pets' of the papacy. Jonathan Robinson describe this phenomenon as „ general opposition to the friars’ ministry grew amongst the secular clergy approximately in proportion to the number of papal bulls issued in the friars’ favor.”⁸³ Their privileges frustrated both local clergy for the appearance of favoritism and the disruption of their work, and local clerks for the implied legal awkwardness of making exceptions for all the friars' activities. These rights included permission to perform sacred functions usually reserved for canons, such as baptism, confession and burial rights, but also included advantages for using property and other resources.

The English clerk James le Palmer criticized the friars on the basis of their *privileges*, which were viewed as “illegitimate rights made especially for them in violation of ancient ecclesiological principles, giving them the papally endowed power to usurp some of the functions originally ordained

81 Ibid, p 61 MIAER cites: LAYETTE DU TESOR DE CHARTES, Paris 1863-1909, iv. no. 5339)

82 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 165.

83 ROBINSON, Jonathan: *Qui praedicat periculum in illo peribit*, 2000, p 2.

for parish priests: especially preaching, but also confession, baptism, burial and so forth.“⁸⁴ In reaction to ecclesiastical legislation after 1250, designed to smooth and control the issues between the mendicants and their competitors through canon law, William of Pagula (1290-1332) writes in his *Summa summarum*⁸⁵ complaining of the mendicants luxurious rights.

1.5.3 Apostolic life

Although the apostolic poverty advocated by the Waldensians had been rejected with the movement, the approval of the Humiliati had made way for the Franciscan order to win the support of the Holy See in their practice of extreme voluntary poverty, in the perceived manner of the apostles. To have the friars perform their ecclesiastical functions, as well as manage their activities as preachers of the crusades, the mendicants eventually began handling a lot of money. When begging was rewarded with richer fair, or charitable donations exceeded modesty, the friars became the target for criticism, as had all orders before them which found themselves the focus of wealth. As the heretical organizations before them, the Dominicans and especially the Franciscans had difficulty balancing their position with money, especially in light of their immense popularity. The scholarship around the concept of *vita apostolica* in the 13th century is extensive, ranging from economic to theological debate.⁸⁶

1.5.4 Poverty

The process to clarify the issues surrounding poverty and the use of private property by monastics and clergy began in the mid 12th century and the debate continued throughout the 13th and beyond. This is further evidence of the intense disruption caused by the economic shift of the second feudal age, and the need to redefine moral norms to function in the new system. An apostolic life of poverty had already been acknowledged by the Rule of Aix at the synod of 1059, but did not condemn “those who still adhered to the old rule.”⁸⁷

The definition and spiritual clarifications of poverty were further expanded on by the mendicants themselves. St Bonaventure (1221-1274) was the most prominent defender of poverty, expressed in 1269 in the *Apologia pauperum*, and sanctioned in *Exiit quia seminat*⁸⁸ by Pope Nicholas

84 SZITTYA, Penn: *Kicking the habit*, 2009, p 169.

85 In: BOYLE, Leonard E. *A Study of the Works Attributed to William of Pagula: With Special Reference to the Oculus Sacerdotis and Summa Summarum*, Volume 1 University of Oxford, 1956.

86 For introductory reading on the issues surrounding the *vita apostolica* and its relation to antifraternalism, see: McDONNELL, Ernest: *The Vita Apostolica: Diversity or Dissent and Culture*, in: Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture / Volume 24, Issue 01, March 1955, pp 15-31.

87 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p101-102.

88 LEFF, Gordon, *Heresy in the later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, C. 1250-1450*, Manchester University Press, 1999 pp83-100

III (c. 1210/20-1280) in 1279.⁸⁹ Thomas Frank opens an interesting discussion on the tricky position St. Francis found himself in concerning poverty in “Exploring the Boundaries of Law in the Middle Ages: Franciscan Debates on Poverty, Property, and Inheritance.”⁹⁰ The issue was eventually solved on the basis of everything the friars owned or used was not their private property, but the actual property of the church or God which the friars accessed on the principle of *usus*.⁹¹

The fundamentals for supporting monks dedicated to poverty had been established a century before to accommodate the Cistercian order, who had held in their own time revolutionary ideals of poverty. Arguments had been established to ensure the support of the monks, in a way that would relieve them from the burden of maintaining private property. St. Bernard himself “drew a distinction between types of charity in such a way as to make a higher order out of gifts given to his monks than to the involuntarily poor. ‘It is one thing,’ he reassured the archbishop, ‘to fill the belly of the hungry, and another to have a zeal for poverty. The one is the service of nature the other the service of grace.”⁹²

The Franciscans and Dominicans approached their dedication to poverty differently; “The Dominicans were always able to open their own priories, a point that gave them greater institutional stability at the start of their expansion than the Franciscans had in theirs. Such a prudent programme would not have satisfied Francis’ commitment to poverty.” Moreover, “On the question of work, the Dominicans always preferred that the preacher spend his time either preaching or preparing to do so, and hence that he be supported from some source other than his own labor. . . . The Franciscans, though, maintained the ideal at least that a friar should either work or beg for his food.”⁹³ A common objection to the practice of apostolic poverty was voiced by notoriously antifraternal Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, who claimed in his *De defensio curatorum*⁹⁴ that the preaching of absolute poverty was counter to John XXII’s (1244-1334) condemnation of the “mendicant thesis”⁹⁵

89 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 101-102.

90 FRANK, Thomas: *Exploring the Boundaries of Law in the Middle Ages: Franciscan Debates on Poverty, Property, and Inheritance*, in: *Law and Literature*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer 2008), pp 243-260, University of California Press: 2008. pp 243-260

91 See: COLEMAN, Janet “Using not Owning – Duties, not rights: The consequences of Some Franciscan Perspectives on Politics”, and CLOPPER, Lawrence M. “Langland and the Franciscans on Dominion.” in *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, M. Cusato and G. Geltner, eds. Brill: Leiden, 2009

92 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978. pg 94-95, footnote 74.

93 Ibid. p 164

94 FITZRALPH, Richard “Defensio curatorum” in *Issue 167 of Dialogus inter militem et clericum, Richard FitzRalph’s sermon: ‘Defensio curatorum’ and Methodius: ‘þe byggnnyng of þe world and þe ende of worldes’* with Saint Methodius (of Olympus), Aaron Jenkins Perry, ed. John Trevisa, trans. H. Milford: Oxford University Press, 1925

95 CLOPPER, Lawrence M.: *Langland and the Franciscans on Dominion*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life* ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijk Brill NV, 2009. p 86. “Cum inter nonnullos: Quum inter nonnullos viros scholasticos saepe contingat in dubium revocari, utrum pertinaciter affirmare, Redemptorem nostrum ac Dominum Iesum Christum eiusque Apostolos in speciali non habuisse aliqua, nec in comuni etiam, haereticum sit censendum. In *Corpus iuris canonici*.” CLOPPER cites: FREIDBERG, Emil Albert eds. (Leipzig, ex officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1879-81), 2: 1225-1229)

1.5.5 Handling money

A moral disgust for money had been developing alongside the growing acceptance of its use. The arguments against usury had developed over the 12th century, yet money lenders were important to the functioning of a growing city. St. Francis protested his revulsion of money, and his followers were encouraged to do the same, although for the practical functioning of the order, this was not possible.

Carefully constructed arguments had to be made to defend the friars' rights to handle money in the name of the church, for both selling indulgences and crusading purposes. Because of the mendicant orders' success in secular courts and as preachers of the crusades, they were perceived as hypocrites for their contact with so much wealth. "This was just the time when the accelerating needs of business and government for a credit system were coming into conflict with the rigid anti-commercial morality."⁹⁶ Matthew Paris (c. 1200-1259), along with other critics of the mendicants expressed their shock at the hypocrisy of the friars building homes and churches for their orders.

It certainly didn't help that the mendicant orders were so deeply tied with the urban working population, and that their ranks were comprised of laymen from mercantile occupations. Ironically, "the Franciscans and Dominicans were correspondingly denounced for their avarice, their wealth, their merchandizing, their bargaining -- in short, for their similarity to merchants."⁹⁷ Moreover, prior to the rise of the mendicant orders, there was already a great sensitivity to monks and priests handling money, especially in the context of taking any sort of compensation for providing the sacraments. In the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, Canon 66 specifically mentions the issue:

It has frequently come to the ears of the Apostolic See that some clerics demand and extort money for burials, nuptial blessings, and similar things, and, if perchance their cupidity is not given satisfaction, they fraudulently interpose fictitious impediments. On the other hand, some laymen, under the pretext of piety but really on heretical grounds, strive to suppress a laudable custom introduced by the pious devotion of the faithful in behalf of the church (that is, of giving freely something for ecclesiastical services rendered). Wherefore, we forbid that such evil exactions be made in these matters, and on the other hand command that pious customs be observed, decreeing that the sacraments of the Church be administered freely and that those who endeavor maliciously to change a laudable custom be restrained by the bishops of the locality when once the truth is known.⁹⁸

96 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 175.

97 Ibid., p 201.

98 SCHROEDER H. J.ed.: *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary*, (St. Louis:

The combination of three elements made the mendicants especially susceptible to accusations of the abuses outlined in Canon 66. Mendicant privileges, allowed friars to perform exactly these duties – burial rites, confession, etc. Possible misinterpretation of services provided by mendicants was amplified by the visibility of their income flow, whether it be material or monetary; the directness of their begging and its proximity to the performance of their services. Finally, the prevalence of the laity in participation and membership of the mendicant orders, as well as issues of borderline heretical subjects, notably in the Franciscan order, made the mendicants easy targets for such accusations of selling sacraments.

Mendicants did not necessarily shy away from this characterization, as it did reflect a truth about their order. As has been mentioned before, the mendicant orders catered to the tertiary labor force and actively sought to define its moral elements, integrating spirituality into the actual reality of the lay person's life. This is evidenced in such works as *Sacrum Commercium*⁹⁹ (c. 1227), an allegory on poverty, and the sermons of Anthony of Padua¹⁰⁰ which “were laced with references to the types and places of work familiar to his hearers: pharmacists, shops in the square, usurers, mercenaries, metalworkers, and merchants.¹⁰¹ St. Bonaventure, too, occasionally used a commercial vocabulary, as when he argued for the usefulness of the friars, characterizing them as trusts for the Christian people, who are like debtors, and whose debt the friars try to pay off, or at least reduce.”¹⁰²

Provisions were made to skirt the issue in times when contact with money was unavoidable. In the custom of the Cathars, the Franciscan rule allowed that sick friars could use the services or care of a “faithful person” who was not a member of the order. This was later expanded to cover third person agents in monetary transactions, who could handle the money and provide for the friars.¹⁰³

The friars were also perceived as immodest in the use of their funds. Although they restrained themselves from constructing the sumptuous cathedrals of the Cluniacs, their building were still conspicuous. Like all orders before them, the friars made use of the latest innovations in architecture and engineering, specifically those that could enhance the building for preaching. The use of their financial means on such ostentatious building projects was merited, though the reason was perhaps out of the common periphery of contemporary critics. Little identifies two factors that could have caused

B. Herder, 1937). pp. 236-296. <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/latran4.asp>, Last access: 23.4.2013.

99 BRUFANI, Stefano, ed. *Sacrum commercium sancti Francisci cum Domina Paupertate*. (Testi, I.) Assisi: Edizioni Porziuncola, 1990. DRESSER, Robert M, ""*Sacrum commercium*," *an early Franciscan tract, as theological literature*" (January 1, 1990). ETD Collection for Fordham University.

100 ANTHONY OF PADUA *Sermones dominicales*, ed. A.M. Locatelli, 3 vols, Padua, 1895-190.

101 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 200.

102 Ibid., p 200, footnote 16.

103 Ibid., p 165.

the friars to build such expensive projects.¹⁰⁴ One reason is the simple price of prime urban property. Although the friars preferred to establish themselves on the outer edges of a town, preferably near the gates, they were still building on valued land. Moreover, in cases of smaller parcels, the buildings needed to be expanded vertically. The second point Little proposes, is that the risk of fire in urban areas was great, so building from cheaper materials was ill advised. Thus tall, stone churches were constructed within the restraints of apostolic poverty.

1.5.6 Preaching the cross

While in the southern countries the mendicants were heavily criticized for theological issues and their involvement in universities, in northern regions, where there was heavy recruitment and activities concerning the crusades, the mendicants came under fire for their practices collecting crusade funds in the name of the Church. Because this was a uniquely important element of antifraternalism connected with the anti-papal discrimination against the friars in the German and Czech lands, I would like to pay special attention to it here.

As martyrdom during the Fifth Crusade seemed a desirable end to St. Francis, participation in the crusades was a spiritually noble act for the secular population, in addition to providing certain financial benefits. Unfortunately, the actual act of traveling to the frontiers of Christendom, truly prepared to fight. Maier claims that the very poor experienced some frustration with their inability to contribute, or the lack of opportunity.¹⁰⁵ The preachers began to recruit all who wished to take the cross, including children, women, the elderly, and the disabled, perhaps hoping to redeem the vows monetarily rather than fulfilled by crusading in person. Maier reports that, according to the records of one chronicler, “the majority of these would-be crusaders, however, were reluctant to redeem their vows. Most of them, in fact, wanted to crusade in person. But the French nobility was dismayed and refused to be accompanied by a crowd of useless fighters.”¹⁰⁶ Maier claims that practice was further enabled by a lack of proper investigation before and after allowing a person take the cross: “this could result in a *crucesignatus* either attempting to redeem a vow for less than his financial situation allowed or to avoid fulfilling his vow in person or redeeming it altogether, while enjoying the legal and financial privileges of a crusader.”¹⁰⁷ Naturally this bred hostility against the preachers.

The friars also won themselves disfavor among the other monastic orders for their preaching. In addition to relieving local parish priests from the roles, some monastics took issue with the unfair

104 Ibid. p 206

105 MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades*, 1998, p 155.

106 Ibid. p 136

107 Ibid., p 140, (MAIER's citation: BRUNDAGE, *Canon Law*, 187-9).

distribution of benefits for crusaders. “Thomas found it difficult to accept that these *crucesignati* could gain a plenary indulgence with comparative ease whereas members of religious orders - he specifically mentioned the Cistercians, Franciscans, and his own order the Dominicans - did not receive a comparable spiritual reward for their harsh and austere everyday life¹⁰⁸

Perhaps in order to alleviate themselves from well-meaning, yet unfit crusaders, it was reported that some preachers would collect vow redemption (a monetary substitute for an unfulfilled crusading mission) on the spot. After being criticized for allowing unfit individuals to take the cross, crusade preachers now exposed themselves to criticism for inappropriately extracting redemptions, furthering their complicated relationship with money.

Matthew Paris reported in his *Maiora chronica*¹⁰⁹ that the crusade preachers were criticized openly for their practice of collecting vow redemptions on the spot, but Maier warns that this could be a misconception. Maier points out that this practice could have been popularized by people making their vows at their deathbed, which were obviously redeemed immediately.¹¹⁰ Such demonstrations of spirituality immediately before death were not uncommon, including baptism and of course a hasty confession and penance. In light of the crusade fervor, adding a vow while one is concluding their worldly affairs would be a practical solution. Also immediate collection of vow redemptions could lessen the numbers of individuals unfit for fighting from traditionally participating in a crusade.

Even if the practice of vow redemption were applied appropriately in some cases, the fact remained that the friars were handling a substantial amount of money. Although they were acting as agents of the pope, and the money technically belonged to the Roman Curia, thus avoiding violation of absolute poverty, the Fifth crusade was the first in which vow redemptions amounted to a larger portion of support for the crusade. Anger at the friars for the hypocrisy in handling so much money was often misdirected frustration at the Church. In the case of Matthew Paris, Maier claims that he was most bothered by “in connection with the friars’ preaching of the cross was that the papacy seemed to have found yet another way of successfully tapping the purses of the faithful. His attacks were first and foremost aimed at the Curia, which he accused of hypocrisy and false pretense in the way in which it tricked people into paying money to the Apostolic See.”¹¹¹

An complaint made against the mendicant orders was their clear, and privileged, position as

108MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades*, 1998, p 156. MAIER cites: THOMAS OF CANTIMPRE, *Bonum universale de apibus* (DOUAIS, 1627, pp 138-9).

109 MATTHEW PARIS *Chronica Maiora*, In: LUARD, Henry Richards: *Matthæi Parisiensis: Monachi Santi Albani, Chronica Majora*, Longman & Co: 1872. (MS 26, 16, 362 x 244/248 mm. Ff 141 + 281).

110MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades*, 1994, p 147.

111MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades*, 1994, p 149.

agents of the papacy. This special relationship was developed only after the mendicant orders had spread throughout Europe and established stable communities, at which point their usefulness as preachers of crusade propaganda and handlers of vows became apparent. Maier places this landmark shift at the late 1220s, when the friars demonstrated their loyalty to the papacy during the struggles between the pope and Frederick II.¹¹² Eventually the Curia came to rely on the mendicant orders entirely. It helped that crusade preachers were assigned to preach in places that they had originated or been established, for example; John of Waldh usen in Germany, Raymond of Panyafort in Catalonia and William of Cordelle in France.¹¹³

1.5.7 Encroaching on the roles of parish priests

In the same way that the mendicant preachers were encouraged to take the place of parish priests, the friars appropriated several other rights of ministry traditionally reserved for priests. This was probably the most contentious element of the mendicants' privileges, certainly the one that William of St. Amour focused on. The reasoning was that in providing certain spiritual services, the parish would be led astray, and not accidentally, so would their social and financial support. The novelty of the friars and their modern preaching indeed attracted crowds of the faithful, as evidenced by their rapid expansion and the favoritism they received from Rome.

George Dipple has shown that this criticism is also found in German antifraternality tradition, emphasizing the corruption of the friars through their sale of the Gospel and funneling parishioners and their money away from the priests.¹¹⁴ Little notes, however that, at least in the case of the Franciscans, as the order took on additional priestly duties, they also recruited and absorbed many men who were already ordained priests.¹¹⁵ As previously mentioned by Maier, often times preachers were assigned to regions where they had some personal connection. Already made sensitive by the threats such sects as the Cathars and Waldensians had made against both the clergy and monks, by demonstrating such spiritual purity and charity as laymen, tensions were heightened by friars adopting priestly roles, while not fitting squarely into traditionally monastic or clerical limitations. Purely spiritual intentions aside, the issue probably arose less who attended the parish, but rather the monastic or clerical affiliation of that person, which was a politically charged association.

It is fitting that Innocent III so cleanly sums up, in his first speech as pope, the reason critics distrusted the friars to lead a parish: "Peter had been charged by Christ to 'feed my sheep' . . . first the

112 Ibid., p 20

113 Ibid., pp 162-3

114 DIPPLE, Geoffrey: *Si sind all glichsner*, 2009. p 179.

115 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978. p 162.

food of examples, then the food of word, so that he would then be worthy to give the food of the sacrament. For if his actions do not conform to his words, then the preaching is in vain. If the preacher's life is despised, his preaching certainly will be, too."¹¹⁶ The friars – having come into mainstream Christendom with a range of practices associated with heretical sects, perceived doctrinal errors, discredited for the hypocrisy of their contact with money, moreover unjustly favored and protected by the papacy – hardly seemed like fit preachers to replace the traditional priesthood.

1.5.8 The Friars and Jews

The conflict-ridden relationship between the mendicant orders and Jewish populations is a separate branch of study altogether, with its own academic context within Jewish Studies. Due to the complexities of this relationship and the limited length of this work, a very brief summary, apologetically outside of the area of study where these issues are usually couched, will have to suffice to introduce the issues relevant to antifraternalism in the 13th century. Firstly, due to the overlap in primitive banking services and money handling offered by both Jewish money-lenders and mendicants (although similar transactions were also administered by other orders, such as the militant orders in charge of organizing crusade activities, and additionally by private, secular members of the community) caused tension and received combined denouncement of money handling practices for all parties. Moreover, between the Jewish communities and mendicant groups relations were tense, with the mendicants deflecting antifraternalism into antisemitism, as well as re-harnessing the eschatological arguments against friars to reframe issues with Jews. Finally, in their position as inquisitors and crusade agents, mendicants were able to direct negative attention to Jewish communities, at the least indirectly influencing and perpetuating further prosecution.¹¹⁷

1.5.9 Women and the third order

Another innovation and target for disapproval was the involvement of women in the third order. As female members had supported the lay movements of the 12th century, such movements significantly aided women, especially in urban areas. There was a clear and serious need to create social support for women who were without connections, or members of the urban poor. Due to the particulars of the urban societal structure and the hard nature of available work left females at a disadvantage in cases where they found themselves unsupported by family or a husband. At times, as

116 MOORE, John Clare: *Pope Innocent III*, 2003, pg 29.

117 For further introductory reading on this subject, see: COHEN, Jeremy. *The Friars and the Jews*, Cornell University Press, 1984; and McMICHAEL, Steven J. and Susan E. Myer, eds.: *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Brill: Leiden, 2004.

the population in urban spaces has been roughly measure to contain more women than men,, thus in certain circumstances, as the women being dependent on either family or a husband, a disproportionate number were subjected to insecurity.¹¹⁸ The mendicant orders and Beguines were open to all members, regardless of worldly status.

Although the Franciscans and especially Dominicans resisted accepting female membership in their orders, the need was clear. The Franciscans solved this dilemma initially by cooperating with the Poor Clares (also Order of Saint Clare, Order of Poor Ladies, Clarisses, Ordo Sanctae Clarae), although female members who admired Francis, and wanted to imitate his charitable work and his preaching, were disappointed to be offered only the extreme cloistering and silence of the Poor Clare communities. For laywomen who wished to participate in the movement more actively, the Beguines offered communities similar to the mendicants and sometimes even overseen by a mendicant house.¹¹⁹ Coakly offers an impressive catalog of contemporary records of the close relationships maintained between mendicant and Beguine houses: the collection of letters sent by the Dominican Master General Jordan of Saxony (d. 1237) between 1222 and 1236 to the nun Diana of Andelo (d. 1236), assisted in founding the convent of St. Agnes in Bologna; the Vita of nun Lutgard of Aywieres (d. 1246) written by Dominican Thomas of Cantimpre (1200-1272); Thomas of Cantimpre also wrote a vita of Christine “the Marvelous” of St. Trond (1150-1224) and a supplement to the vita of Mary of Oignies (d. 1213) by Jaques de Vitry; the corpus of works compiled by Dominican Peter of Dacia about Christine of Stommeln (1242-1312) which includes his correspondence with her; Franciscan Vito of Cortona wrote the vita of the widow Humiliana dei Cerchi (d. 1246); the Vita of Margaret of Cortona (d. 1297) written by her confessor Guinta Bevignati; and finally, the book of revelations of the widow Angela of Foligno (d. 1309) written by her scribe friar Arnold.¹²⁰ Beguines and friars even shared critics: William of St. Amour even included Beguines in his attacks on the mendicant orders.¹²¹ By maintaining affiliation and guiding communities of Beguines and Poor Clares, the Franciscans and Dominicans could further delay accepting women into their orders, until the orders were required to take responsibility for their female members in the papal bulls of 1236 (affecting the Franciscans) and 1263 (for the Dominicans).

Several issues plagued the female tertiaries of mendicant orders. Already for centuries,

118 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 29.

119 BAILEY, Michael D.: *Religious Poverty, Mendicancy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*, 2003, p 466; (BAILEY cites: MCDONNELL, pp 200-201).

120 COAKLEY, John: *Gender and the Authority of Friars: The Significance of Holy Women for Thirteenth-Century Franciscans and Dominicans*, in: *Church History*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Dec. 1991), pp 445-460. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991, pp 447 – 449.

121 GRUNDMANN, *Religious movements*, 141; MCDONNELL, *Beguines and Beghards*, 456-58, BAILEY *Religious Poverty, Mendicancy, and Reform*, p 466.

nunneries had been a “repository for the excess daughters of the aristocracy and urban merchant demographic,” and were often places of wealth – although the mendicant orders could provide a place for female members, families were concerned about abandoning their daughters to absolute poverty, apostolic or not.¹²² In William of St. Amour's argument against the mendicants' interaction with females he claimed that “their main strategy is to target gullible women, and through them gain access to their husband’s homes, pockets and consciences. By offering personalized services, especially confession, these dangerous men are able to penetrate the homes of numerous people and sow heresy among them under the guise of a genuine apostolic life.”¹²³ Bailey claims that, as with the mendicants, “at the heart of most of the attacks directed against the beguines by ecclesiastical authorities (and often by secular authorities as well) lay concern over and objections to lay religious poverty and especially the practice of lay mendicancy, and at the root of these issues lay ultimately the more basic and longstanding conflict between the secular clergy and the mendicant orders of the church”¹²⁴

1.5.10 Mendicants and education

Education was another arena that drew the friars negative attention and criticism. As helpful as the friars were in developing urban schooling networks, they were perceived as a nuisance by both secular and clerical university masters. Several arguments were made against mendicant involvement in education, including from St. Francis himself. St. Dominic on the other hand required the members of his order to pursue education in preparation for their real work as preachers; as the Dominican Hugh of Saint-Cher (1200-1263) said: 'First the bow is bent in study, then the arrow is released in preaching.’

¹²⁵

Although the Franciscans de-emphasized the need for education, for Dominicans, education was the means to a very important end, expressed by Humbert of Romans in his writing *On the utility of studies in our order*,¹²⁵ ‘As the seed is planted in preaching, the fruit is harvested in confession.’ The enthusiasm for education was expressed also in a intense interest in universities. Dominicans visited universities, recruited there, initiated programs of study and sought teaching positions.¹²⁶ The need for better education grew alongside the need to defend the order from critics and the need to service a larger population, thanks to their success; moreover, quality preaching needed to be promoted while

¹²²BAILEY, Michael D.: *Religious Poverty, Mendicancy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*, 2003. p 470-1.

¹²³GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 19.

¹²⁴BAILEY, Michael D.: *Religious Poverty, Mendicancy, and Reform*, 2003 p 464.

¹²⁵MULHAHEY, M.M. *First the Bow is Bent in Study . . . Fominican Education before 1350*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies; 1998.

¹²⁶LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978. p 175-6.

preaching by the untrained discouraged.¹²⁷

The mendicants were not initially welcomed into the universities, and in Paris their position was made more contentious after the university strike, or Great Dispersion of 1229. “The apparent discrepancy between the friars’ theory and practice in the realm of letters, as well as the contrast between their professed humility and opportunism in the context of the strike, marked them in their opponents’ eyes as hypocrites.”¹²⁸ In the writing of Langland, the character of Conscience attributes “false teaching to friars who, out of envy, have gone to school to learn logic and law and to preach to men about Plato and to prove it by Seneca (B.20.273-79)”¹²⁹ The work of William of St. Amour was particularly influenced by the conflicts with mendicants at the university in Paris. The Franciscans refused to participate in the strike, yet gained a seat in theology.¹³⁰ Again in 1253, the Dominicans refused to participate and demanded a second theological chair in return for their support.¹³¹

Furthermore, mendicants had a reputation for recruiting among students, and taking them into the order against the wishes of their parents. Objections to this practice were an extension of cases where even children were recruited, which even resulted in assaults on mendicant houses.¹³² Although there is no theological argument against accepting younger members, the issue fell on the dissolution of the youth's poverty upon their acceptance of absolute poverty, property which may legally belong to their parents. Moreover, the order may be depriving the family of an heir or member of a business. These issues all related directly to the life of St. Francis, who as the son of a textile merchant, gave away his money and property, then abandoned his family's business. In the account provided by Thomas of Celano, the father of St. Francis express no pleasure in his decision to pursue an apostolic life.¹³³ Steps were taken to prevent this practice, such as the limit placed on mendicants by the local authorities in 1283, in Strasbourg, to require ablates under the age of 18 to acquire their parents' consent.¹³⁴

1.5.11 Violence against the Friars

Despite the shocking nature of such outbursts, violence against the friars was not particularly

127Ibid., p 185.

128GELTNER, G.: *A false start to medieval antifraternalism?*, 2009, p 107.

129CLOPPER, Lawrence M.: *Langland and the Franciscans on Dominum*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life* ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV, 2009, p 94.

130COURTENAY, William J.: *Franciscan Learning: University education and biblicaal exegesis*, in *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life* ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden, Koninklijkr Brill NV, 2009, p 56.

131GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 17.

132 Ibid. p 100

133THOMAS OF CELANO: “*The first life of : St. Francis of Assisi*” p 14, 16, trans. Christopher Stace, Caledonian International, Glasgow, 2000, pp 16-18.

134GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 60.

common nor remarkable within the context of the day to day violence of the age. A notable regional exception, however, is in the northern, specifically German lands. The aggression directed at mendicants arriving in the early half of the 13th century was in part spurred by loyalty to the emperor, as the friars were viewed as agents of the papacy.¹³⁵

Geltner identifies several peaks of violence and action against the mendicant orders, the first upon their arrival, the second in reaction to the plague, and then continued persecution by the protestant revolutionaries. Except for the first wave, which is directly focused on mendicants, the others follow general trends of unrest with increases of violence against several groups, not just mendicants. In the first half of the 13th century, after the start of Dominican involvement with inquisitional activities, there is a continuous flow of incidents, especially in northern Italy and southern France specifically in reaction to the inquisition.¹³⁶ It must be noted that violence against female mendicants was particularly rare. This could have to do with the scarcity of documentation, but Frances Andrews points out that the females of the order observed stricter cloistering and were barred from all activities outside the convent, in addition to being poorer than the male houses.¹³⁷ According to mendicant sources, Germany had the reputation of being the most inhospitable land for the friars. Indeed, missions sent to German cities were rejected, and communities of mendicants evicted, actual recorded acts of violence were less common.¹³⁸

As St. Francis himself aspired to go east, seeking his own martyrdom, we can conclude that perhaps Western Europe was too safe and civilized for the aspirations of the mendicants, who wished to observe an apostolic life to the bitter end. However, “it is the fact that the majority of cases encountered so far appear to expose the very quotidian nature of aggression against the friars. It is difficult to discern an ideology of Williamine antifraternalism among Cluniacs eager to maintain their estate, local residents wary of supporting a band of scruffy and incomprehensible monks, or parents struggling to direct their children’s destiny.”¹³⁹ Bert Roest argues that the mendicants reinforcement of their mythology of victimhood and exaggeration of persecution enhanced “their corporate identity from within by developing a Christological understanding of their orders’ tribulations.”¹⁴⁰ Perhaps more than outbursts of violence, the cruelest and most lasting act against the mendicant orders are the enduring negative stereotypes. Already fully developed by the time they were applied by Chaucer, the corrupt,

135 Ibid. p 51.

136 GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 51.

137 Ibid.p 53. GELTNER cites ANDREWS, 34-6, 132-8).

138 Ibid.p 56.

139 Ibid., p 118.

140 Ibid., p 108. GELTNER cites: ROEST Bert: *Reading the Book of History: Intellectual Contexts and Educational Functions of Franciscan Historiography 1226 -ca.1350*, Groningen, 1996 .

lecherous and shifty preacher character appears throughout European literature to this day.

2.0 Reactions to Mendicants in Central Europe

2.1 Antifraternalism in Eastern Central Europe

Unfortunately, there is a serious lack of written records from the decades immediately after the arrival of the mendicants, a deficiency noted by both domestic and foreign scholars alike.¹⁴¹ Of the literature that remained, negative reactions against the arrival of the mendicants originating in Czech literature have been interpreted differently throughout history. Christopher Ocker argues that protestant reformers were quick to use proto-reformer and lighter opponents to the mendicants in their own propaganda, reframing these proto-reformers as vehement antifraternalists.¹⁴² A particular deficiency of Western academic literature is: often the only case of anti-mendicant activity noted is that of Bishop Robert, whose story will be examined further in this work.

Most mentions of reactions against mendicants originate not as historiographical works, but within the study of literature, primarily German literature. Although negative reactions against the friars are casually acknowledged and mentioned by domestic historians within the context of their overall research in this region or on mendicant orders, there are few published works specifically addressing this issue specifically. In addition to the work of Guy Geltner and John B. Freed mentioning the Eastern Central European regions in the periphery of their research on German antifraternalists, studies of opponents to mendicant orders include work on Matthew of Janov (d. 1393) by Vlastimil Kybal,¹⁴³ Johann Eberlin von Günzburg (c. 1470-1533) by Geoffrey Dipple¹⁴⁴, Konrad of Megenberg researched by Christopher Ocker¹⁴⁵, and Jan Milíč of Kroměříž (d. 1374) by Vlastimil Kybal¹⁴⁶, as well as on pre-Hussite heresies in Bohemia by S. Harrison Thomson¹⁴⁷. Domestic academic literature include the work

141 ČERNUŠAK, Tomáš – PROKOP, Augustin – NĚMEC, Damián, eds.: *Historie Dominikánů v českých zemích*, Krystal: 2001, p 49: “nám to dokládají listiny z let 1243, 1252 a 1257 (CDB IV, č 25, s. 100; CDB IV, č. 229, s. 398 ; CDB V, č. 133, s. 213).”

142 OCKER, Christopher: *Lacrima ecclesie: Konrad of Megenberg, the Friars, and the Beguines*, In: Claudia Märtle, Gisela Drossbach, and Martin Kintzinger (eds) *Konrad von Megenberg (1309-1374) und sein Werk Das Wissen der Zeit* (Munich : C.H.Beck, 2006) pp 169-200.

143 KYBAL, V: *Matthiae de Janov Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, 6 vols, Innsbruck: Wagner University, 1908-11.

144 DIPPLE, Geoffrey: *Si sind all glichsner*, 2009.

145 OCKER, Christopher: *Lacrima ecclesie: Konrad of Megenberg, the Friars, and the Beguines*, In: Claudia Märtle, Gisela Drossbach, and Martin Kintzinger (eds) *Konrad von Megenberg (1309-1374) und sein Werk Das Wissen der Zeit*, Munich : C.H.Beck, 2006, pp 169-200. Also: *Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii praelati ecclesie Pragensis*, ed. EMLER, in *Fontes rerum Bohem.*, I (1871)

146 MATTHIAS OF JANOV: “*Narracio de Milicio*” in: *Matthias of Janov's Regulae veteris et novi testamenti*, ed. KYBAL, Vlastimil, Prague, 1911, 3:358-67.

147 THOMSON, S. Harrison: *Pre-Hussite Heresy in Bohemia*, in: *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 48., No. 189 (Jan., 1933), pp. 23-42 Oxford University Press: 1933.

of Vit Hlinka on Bishop Robert (Hlinka: 2006), and Peter Morée on the practices of preaching in fourteenth century Bohemia (Morée: 1999). With the exception of Bishop Robert, all other "antifraternalists" cited lived after the turn of the 14th century, when the situation and character of the mendicant orders had changes substantially from their origins.

Geltner notes specifically the lack of research on theologian's attitudes towards the friars, despite what he sees as substantial amount of manuscript evidence.¹⁴⁸ However, it has been reported that no works of preaching against the mendicants survived from the time of the mendicants' arrival to Bohemia and Moravia in the 13th century. In lieu of actual evidence, as, Morée argues that the „ideas [Jan] Milicus expressed in the *Sermo de die novissimo* are by no means original, but rather belong to the development of apocalyptic views of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.“¹⁴⁹ The 'apocalyptic and eschatological' arguments employed against mendicants are rather evidence of the enhanced connection these regions had with the rest of Europe in the later part of the 13th century, as they have adopted the themes propagated by William of St. Amore, which were circulated after the 1250s. Thus, such arguments neither present the first reactions to mendicants, nor an distinctly regional reaction.

2.1.1 Defining antifraternalism in Eastern Central Europe

It is essential to note the use of terms “tradition,” and dependent on the defined traditions, 'trend', within the context of mendicant orders in the history of Bohemia and Moravia. Penn Szittyia claims terms imply some governmental, cultural and self-conscious continuity,¹⁵⁰ as one may find in the long and self-conscious annals of Italian history, but this is underdeveloped in the Eastern Central Europe during the middle ages. Although some trends or coincidental correspondence may occur, they should not be construed to indicate a tradition or stemming from a stable cultural base as is understood in the urban centers of France, Italy, and to some extent, England and Germany. Szittyia defines antifraternal tradition as “a complex of hostile ideas about the friars,” which, “in all levels of medieval society . . . dominated criticism of the friars from the 1250s to the end of the Middle Ages,”¹⁵¹ which discounts the organized resistance to mendicant orders, specifically the Franciscans, that occurred in Moravia in the first half of the 13th century. By Szittyia's definition, antimendicants in Central Europe join the movement only with their adoption of Western European arguments, which occurred in the early part of the 14th century as proto-reformers employed such themes in their preaching and

148GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*, 2012, p 27.

149MOORE, John Clare: *Pope Innocent III*, 2003. p 67.

150SZITTYIA, Penn R.: *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986, p ix.

151Ibid., p ix.

propaganda.

In this context, antifraternism in 13th century Central Europe was far detached from the original motives that drove William of St. Amour to form his initial attacks against mendicants gaining power in Paris, as he was reacting in part to the political climate as well as the incursion of mendicants within the university; in Prague, however, there wasn't even the presence of a university until 1348, and university was actually nurtured by the mendicant orders, which had been already established there for a century.¹⁵² Eastern Central European opponents to the friars, of the Williamist “tradition,” were rather making use of established themes in their movement against the Catholic Church and monastic orders in general. Dipple confirms that Williamist arguments were circulating through German-speaking lands during the 1350s through the works of Archbishop Richard FitzRalph and satirical poetry.¹⁵³ The true initial reaction of the Eastern Central Europeans to the arrival of mendicants has been either overshadowed by the later reactions of reformers, or ignored in favor of the more dominant narrative of German antifraternism and its unique basis on the papal-imperial conflicts.

2.1.2 When and where to use German language sources

It is impossible, and not particularly constructive, to attempt to lay a hard line between what can be considered “Czech” or “German” reactions to mendicants. Sources themselves are more plentiful in German and Latin, regardless of the personal identification of the author, thus it is clearly misguided to make a distinction solely on linguistic identifiers. The German program of settlement and domination of the region had knitted the two cultures closely together, especially in Bohemia, and the nobility was linked with dynasties through Europe, and the clergy present were comprised of monks and priests from all corners of Christendom. Yet, while acknowledging what he calls the “inherent dualisms” of Central Europe, Oscar Halecki claims that if the western, homogeneously German element is disregarded, what is left behind is something truly different, and thus is clarified as East Central Europe.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, scholars like Morée hint at a specifically „Czech” brand of Christendom and culture maintained in spite of it all.

Aleksander Gieysztor identifies three Christian states of Central Europe – Hungarian, Polish and Czech.¹⁵⁵ This places the Czechs in an odd position, as they are not an independent empire, like the

152 SVATOŠ, Martin: <http://www.cuni.cz/UKENG-181.html> Martin, 2006, Accessed: 12.4.2013.

153 DIPPLE, Geoffrey: *Si sind all glihsner*, 2009, p 188.

154 HALECKI, Oscar: *The Borderlands of Western Civilization. A history of East Central Europe*, New Yor: Ronals, 1952, pp 3-4.

155 GIEYSZTOR, Aleksander: in *L'Europe nouvelle autour de l' An Mil. La papauté, l'Empire et les <<nouveaux venus>>* Rome, 1997.

Polish or Hungarians, but despite being a German principality, they are not grouped with the Germans. The Christianity established in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia is also incongruous, as conversion came through both the Latin tradition transmitted by Bavarian missionaries, and the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition.¹⁵⁶ Klaniczay notes that “Eastern Central Europe” perhaps held a resistance to the West, rooted in the conversion of the local pagans¹⁵⁷, and that the Germanic or Latin traditions continued to mingle with Czech Christianity and Slavonic paganism until the end of the middle ages, in a style typical of new northern and eastern kingdoms¹⁵⁸ Klaniczay, building on Szucs¹⁵⁹, goes on to say that the 13th century brought a shift “in the social patterns of nobility and peasantry, the urban network, and the organization of political institutions in East Central Europe,” furthermore pushed (along with the Poles, Hungarians and Croats) to the West with the fall of Byzantium and the Mongolian invasions.¹⁶⁰

Although there is a linguistic divide, which was accommodated through multilingualism, written sources in both German and Czech language from within the same region – a parcel of land altogether the geographic equivalent of South Carolina – overlap in style, theme, and execution. For the sake of researchers outside of Central Europe, including myself approaching the topic from an American perspective, while investigating the reactions to the arrival of mendicants in Eastern Central Europe, identifying what qualifies as “Czech” should not be based simply on linguistic indicators, but rather by separating out characteristically German reactions, identified in sources clustered around distinctly German territories, the themes of which were established in Section 1.4.3. In the final section of this work I would like to outline Czech language sources of antifraternalism in literature, as a counterbalance to the extensive work that has already been done for German language literature¹⁶¹. However, this artificial delineation should not be understood in any way to imply a structured cultural or ideological divide. The linguistic division in this work is simply a categorical device employed with the hope of clarifying different reactions to mendicants originating in Central Europe.

156KLANICZAY, Gábor: *The Birth of a New Europe About 1000 CE: Conversion, Transfer of Institutional Models, New Dynamics*, in: *Eurasian Transformations, Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries: Crystalizations, Divergences, Renaissance*, ed. Johann P. Arnason and Björn Wittrock, Leiden: Brill, 2004. p 114

157KLANICZAY, Gábor: *The Birth of a New Europe About 1000 CE*, 2004. Also: WOOD, Ian: “Pagan religions and superstitions east of the Rhine from the fifth to the ninth century”, in G. AUSENDA (ed.), *After Empire: Towards an Ethnology of Europe's Barbarians*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995. MODZELEWSKI, Karol: “Europa romana, Europa feudale, Europa barbara” in *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*, 100 (1995/96), 377-409

158KLANICZAY, Gábor: *The Birth of a New Europe About 1000 CE*, 2004, p 114. KLANICZAY cites: GRAUS, František: „Kirchliche und heidnische (magische) Komponenten der Stellung der Přemyslidenage und St Wenzels-Ideologie”, in *Seidlung und Vergassung Böhmens in der Frühzeit*, eds. František Graus and Herbert Ludat (WiesbadenL Harrossowitz, 1967), 148-61

159Ibid., p 104.

160Ibid., p 124.

161 See: SCHUPPERT, OCKER

2.2 Two periods of antifraternality in Eastern Central Europe

I propose to divide the reactions against mendicants in Eastern Central Europe into two periods: the first from their arrival in the 1220s, and the second beginning with the adoption of Williamist themes from abroad. The second period can not be dated concretely, but rather depends on exposure to propaganda from abroad occurring at different times for different individuals, although primarily at the close of the 13th century and gaining strength in the 14th.

Although most Western European scholarship focuses on negative reactions to mendicant orders after 1250s (William of St. Amour's heyday) antifraternality dissent is proven to have appeared in Moravia almost twenty years earlier, a decade after the settling of mendicant orders in Prague and Olomouc, the year in which pope Gregory IX was forced to issue three bulls regarding the problems in Bohemia and Moravia. In total nine papal bulls on the subject were issued between 1237 and 1291.¹⁶² This will be discussed at a greater length in Section 4.0.

The emphasis on arguing against the stigmata of St. Francis both chronologically and rhetorically falls within the first period of reactions against mendicants in Eastern Central Europe, demonstrating a distinctly different phase from the Williamist arguments and proto-reformers of the end of the 13th century. Moreover, the energetic response of the Pope indicates a wider movement than a single rogue individual. If Klaniczay and Morée's claims at a special "Czech" Christianity is accepted¹⁶³, then it is possible to claim that the rejection of mendicants on the basis of doctrinal error concerning stigmata is a movement unique to the region. This is further supported by the lack of Germanic interests expressed, such as thinly veiled attacks on the papacy that occurs in characteristically German antifraternality, and the moreover the in the regional placement of the movement away from heavily colonized Bohemia, in Moravia and Silesia.¹⁶⁴ Although it is difficult to demonstrate a concrete doctrinal link, it is interesting to note that the Eastern Orthodox Church, active in coeval Kievan Russia and historically tied to the Byzantine mission that converted the Moravians in the 9th century, fully rejected the thesis of stigmata.

162 DAVIDSON, Arnold I.: *Miracles of Bodily Transformations, or How St. Francis Received the Stigmata* in *Critical Inquiry* 35 (Spring 2009), (Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2009), p 456; "See also Rona Goffen, *Spirituality in Conflict: Saint Francis and Giotto's Bardi Chapel* (University Park, Penn., 1988), esp. pp. 13–22;"

163 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *The Birth of a New Europe About 1000 CE: Conversion, Transfer of Institutional Models, New Dynamics*, in: *Eurasian Transformations, Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries: Crystalizations, Divergences, Renaissance*, ed. Johann P. Arnason and Björn Wittrock, Leiden: Brill, 2004. p 113. Also: MOORE, John Clare: *Pope Innocent III: To Root Up and to Plant*, Brill: Leiden, Boston, 2003., pg 213

164 A review of all occurrences of major objections to the Stigmata can be found in: VAUCHEZ, André: *Les Stigmates de Saint Francis et leurs détracteurs dans les derniers siècles du moyen âge*, In: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, Vol.80, no. 2, 1968, pp 598–99.

2.3 Monastic orders and heresies predating mendicants

After the Wendish crusades, monasticism was spreading slowly throughout Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, lead by a vanguard of heavily structured orders -- the Teutonic knights, Premonstrate and Cistercian orders -- extending from mother houses in German lands. Prague was the largest urban center. As these monks spread out into the Eastern Central lands, acting as both crusaders and settlers, they cooperated very closely with the royal family, local nobility and upper echelons of society to insure their security and maintenance. Before the arrival of mendicants, bishoprics had been established throughout East Central Europe (meaning in this context: Bohemia, Moravia, Poland) in Prague, Olomouc, Poznań, Gniezno, Cracow, Wroclaw, Kolobrzeg, and Plock; additionally, one Slavonic/Greek observance monastery in was located Bohemia, at Sázava.¹⁶⁵

As in the rest of Europe, the presence of mendicants in Central Europe was predated by heretical sects with similar practices. Already in 1143 Eberwin of Steinfeld, a Premonstratensian prior, wrote to Bernard of Clairvaux to report on heretics in Cologne, which Bernard responded to later in 1144 by dedicating a sermon against heretics in his commentaries on the Song of Songs.¹⁶⁶ In the north, Waldensians are documented in 1199 by two letters from the 12th of July, in which Pope Innocent III addressed a settlement of the heretics in Metz.¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, there were rumored Cathars in the region of Šumava.

2.4 The arrival of mendicants

The mendicants that arrived to Eastern Central Europe were greeted by very different conditions that those where the mendicant orders were formed, nearer to the Mediterranean. While in Italy or parts of France, the mendicants naturally moved within existing urban environments. However, in Central Europe, where urban centers were under-developed, the expansion of mendicants in Germany, and by extension Czech lands, mirrors the complimenting expansion of urbanization.¹⁶⁸ Maier dates the arrival of mendicants to Prague along the May 1228 date, when the pope dispatched two Franciscan friars to Frederick II.¹⁶⁹ However, Czech scholars have demonstrated that the first Franciscans and Dominicans came to Prague, and another party of Dominicans through the Polish province both between 1225 and 1228, although the dates are unclear. According to the German Dominicans of Cologne, a Dominican house was founded in Prague around 1225.¹⁷⁰ It is undocumented, but a party of Dominicans almost

165 KLOCZOWSKI, Jerzy: *A history of Polish Christianity*, Cambridge University Press, 2000. p 14-20

166 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978. p 137-138.

167 Ibid., p 125.

168 FREED, John B.: *The Friars and German Society in the Thirteenth Century*, 1977, p 55.

169 MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the crusades*, 1994, p28 (MAIER's note: ES, i, no. 372 (= Gre. IX R, no. 193)).

170 ČERNUŠAK, Tomáš – PROKOP, Augustin – NĚMEC, Damián, eds.: *Historie Dominikánů v českých zemích*, Krystal:

certainly stopped in the cities of Znojmo, Brno, Olomouc and Opava on their way to Krakow, where they arrived in 1222, possibly establishing mendicant houses along the way.¹⁷¹ Dominicans are finally documented in Olomouc in 1227, and established themselves at St. Michael.¹⁷²

The friars did not follow the same patterns of settlement that the Cluniacs or Cistercians made; “the earliest settlements of friars are difficult to perceive precisely because they were not real ‘settlements’. The Franciscans tended to stay in caves and huts, or just wherever they could find temporary shelter.¹⁷³ Often they were invited under someone else’s roof. From all such cases there obviously remains no documentary proof of property rights secured or of convents constructed.”¹⁷⁴ In their expansion, friars had the flexibility to scout out suitable locations for settlement in pairs and establishing their communities very informally. However, unable to make use of urban centers and the trappings of such - existent hospitals, schools and other public services, stationary urban populations, a self-sufficient merchants to provide charitable funds, and safe lands to accommodate transience - the arriving mendicants were also forced to rely on the support of the nobility as previous orders had done, causing direct conflict with the existing Cistercians, Teutonic knights and other orders.

The problems commonly facing mendicants in other parts of Europe were not present in Eastern Central Europe. Conflicts in these universities, as they developed in Paris and England during the 13th century, had no chance to blossom in Czech lands, as there were no universities, and the establishment of Dominican and Franciscan schools and libraries was a welcome step towards urbanization. The issue of *stabilitas* was less relevant in northern Central Europe because the populated areas were too spread out over unsafe territory for wandering preachers, who found themselves quickly tied to residential situations, and could easily move into older churches and locations that had fallen out of use. Most important was the massive support for mendicant order that welled up from the Přemyslov family and the upper society, where the patronage of the mendicant orders was extremely fashionable. In addition to fitting into the existing Anglo-northern European pagan tradition of dynastic cults, the “reform orders [the Cluniac, Cistercian, Premonstratensian, Dominican and Franciscan] were originally keen on their independence from local secular or ecclesiastical authorities, and claimed to be subordinate only to the Holy See, but in the ‘border kingdoms’ they had to rely on their personal contacts with the court.”¹⁷⁵

2001., p19

171Ibid., p 20.

172Ibid., p 20, 21.

173 LITTLE, Lester K.: *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy*, 1978, p 159.

174 Ibid. p159

175 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *The Birth of a New Europe About 1000 CE*, 2004, p 119.

2.5 Elements affecting the arrival of mendicants

A crucial factor affecting the mendicants in Eastern Central Europe. Having become previously involved in the Hohenstaufen conflicts as preachers, they were now sent by the Pope to preach the cross against the Mongol invasions. Polish and Hungarian Dominicans were reported in the *Annales S. Panteleonis* to have fled their territories to preach in Germany after the first Mongol attacks.¹⁷⁶ Although the Mongols had withdrawn from Central Europe in 1241, Alexander IV authorized friars in Germany, Bohemia, Moravia and Poland to preach against them in 1258 after the second wave of attacks.¹⁷⁷

Recruiting in Eastern Central Europe for crusade activity in Northern Europe was extensive, and produced similarly diverse effect as in Western, Germanic Central Europe, although lacking tension from the imperial-papal conflict. Maier notes that after 1256, when Alexander IV re-issued *Qui iustis causis*¹⁷⁸ of 1243 to the Dominicans in northern Germany, Scandinavia, Bohemia, Poland, and Austria, “this meant that crusade preachers were competing for the resources of the same areas of Poland and Bohemia [for the multiple crusades being conducted at the same time].”¹⁷⁹ Crusaders from Germany and Bohemia were also recruited in the 1260s to assist the Teutonic Order in Lithuania and defend their position in the Baltic; in many cases the preachers were to direct crusade business into the hands of the Teutonic order.¹⁸⁰ Unsurprisingly, in the furor, false crusade preachers appeared, collecting vow redemptions and carrying out unauthorized crusade business.¹⁸¹

With these factors in mind, it is possible to understand the reactions to the arrival of mendicant orders more clearly. Counter intuitively, in spite of the immense popularity of the mendicants, and the resistance from other orders and the perceived threat of the new religious model imported by the mendicants, the arrival of the Dominican and Franciscans orders coincides with a boom in prosperity for all orders found in Moravia. That is to say that despite competition from the mendicant orders, the other established orders did not suffer from neglect or slow their development in the region – on the contrary, they expanded. According to the data gathered by Tomáš Borovský¹⁸², between the years 1231 (about 5 years after the arrival of Dominicans, and 3 years after the arrival of Franciscans) and 1306, foundation activity of other orders did not slow, nor did the flow of donations (see: Appendix 1). The

176 MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the crusades*, 1994, p 60.

177 Ibid., p 84. MAIER cites: Inn. IV R, no. 30), PUB, i, 2, no. 59.

178 Ibid., p 84 MAIER cites: PUB i, I no 326 (= BP, i (Ale. IV) nos. 65-82; Ale, IV R. no 1448).

179 Ibid., p 88-89.

180 Ibid., p 92. MAIER cites: URBAN, *Baltic Crusade*, 217-20, URBAN, *Prussian Crusade* 269-85.

181 Ibid., p 138. MAIER cites: *Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters, späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und Kardinal-Bischofs von S. Sabina Oliverus*, ed. H. HOOGEWEG (Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart 22; Tübingen 1894) 316.

182 BOROVSKEÝ, Tomáš: *Kláštéry, panovník, a zakladatelé na středověké Moravě*, Matice moravská, Brno, 2005, pp 50-53

Cistercians, for example, are shown to receive a significant growth of donations, as well as steady progress founding new houses. From the time of the arrival of mendicant orders, around 1225, nine new male and female communities were founded. In his review of donations to 30 monasteries in Moravia, overall donations to monasteries more than double in the 50 years. As seen in the table sampling 11 of these monasteries, five of which are Cistercian and only two of which are mendicant, Cistercians received 60% of all the donations, an additional 29% going to four non-mendicant orders, the last 11% of donations went to mendicants. Although the Dominican house in the sample falls at the bottom of the list, subsided over 50% by their own activity, the mendicant community receiving a most donations was a house of Poor Clares, who, strictly cloistered and isolated, live off of these donations. This does not imply that the mendicant houses were under-supported, as they received support through begging, but rather demonstrates that the other orders were not (by this measure) significantly harmed by the arrival of the mendicants.

We can conclude that monastic communities overall were not hurt by the arrival of mendicants, and if not benefited from the fresh interest in spiritual affairs. If the mendicant orders said they didn't need much, and desired poverty, that's certainly what they got. Also, interestingly, overall female communities were on par with their male counter parts, receiving roughly equal donations. Despite minor conflicts with local clergy cited by almost every domestic historian of the orders, as well as issues with securing property in light of the necessity to establish permanent houses within city walls, the mendicants integrated into the monastic landscape of Bohemia and Moravia with little vocal resistance, compared to South and Western Europe. Untethered by the same concerns as urbanized Italy and France, perhaps this is why mendicants, as well as clerics which we may conclude were mendicants according to clues and context, are treated with jovial disrespect in Czech secular satire, rather than the biting criticism found in German texts, spurred by the imperial-papal conflicts. Moreover, the issues between the various orders were not necessarily made public,¹⁸³ so the secular works composed for public consumption reflect sentiments drawn from daily contact with mendicant brothers and sisters, rather than theological disagreements or property disputes.

To examine evidence of reactions to mendicants in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, I would like to first examine the unique acceptance and patronage of mendicants in Prague, then move onto the formal, theological arguments posed against the friars in Moravia, and finally provide an overview of coeval antifraternal and anticlerical literature preserved in the Czech language.

¹⁸³According to Helga Schuppert, poems written in Latin against the friars were often not translated, perhaps because they were meant only for insider consumption. See: SCHUPPERT, Helga: *Kirchenkritik in der lateinischen Lyrik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972.

3.0 St. Agnes (Sv. Anežka) and mendicants in Prague

In 1211 (there is no definite date, I've adopted the most commonly used one) Anežka was born to the Czech king Přemysl Otakar I and his second wife Constance, the youngest of nine children. Because of her support of the Dominican and Franciscan orders in Prague, she is remembered as the organizer of the mendicant vanguard to Bohemia. Her involvement in the establishment of mendicants in Prague represents both a compliance to established mores as well as innovation in the roles that noble women played in the religious and secular political arenas.

Anežka's deep personal involvement with the mendicant movement was not without precedence – indeed, her own mother had contributed to the founding of several monasteries, including the Cistercian convent of Porta Coeli in Tišnov, where she retired. Anežka was born into a dynastic family and region ripe with high-born women dedicated to the development and care of Christian institutions in their areas. Predating Anežka's activities was Anežka's own aunt Hedwig of Silesia (1174/8-1243) and her cousin St. Elizabeth of Hungary, while contemporaries and subsequent royal saints included her own sister Anne, who was revered in Poland despite remaining uncanonised¹⁸⁴, St. Margaret of Hungary and Margret's two sisters who married Polish princes, Cunegond and Yolanda. At the end of the 13th century, mendicants are also supported by Blessed Elizabeth of Töss (1272-1338)¹⁸⁵. Although Anežka was heavily promoted as the family saint, her older sister Blažena is purported to have found religious fame in Italy, unbeknownst to the Přemysls in Bohemia. Having gathered a cult and later declared heretical, the records of Blažena-Guglielma are inconclusive as to the legitimacy of her connection to the Přemysl family.¹⁸⁶

Guglielma appeared in Milan in 1271 with son,¹⁸⁷ claiming to be the widow of an English noble and the daughter of the King of Bohemia, having changed her name from Blažena to Wilhemina or Guglielma without explanation. The rumor of her lineage was so believed that after her death, a mission was sent to Prague, but found the king dead, and thus no confirmation could be made as there are no surviving corroborating documents.¹⁸⁸ Barbara Newman points out that whether or not Guilemia was a legitimate daughter of the King of Bohemia, such a claim would have reinforced her sanctity, as “the royal houses of Bohemia, Hungary and Poland were famous for nurturing saintly princesses.”¹⁸⁹

184 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, trans. Éva Pálmai, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2000, p 204.

185 Ibid. pp 207-208.

186 See: NEWMAN, Barbara: *The Heretic Saint: Guglielma of Bohemia, Milan, and Brunate*, in: *Church History*, Vol. 74, No. 1, March 2005. The American Society of Church History: 2005, pp 1-38.

187 POLC, Jaroslav: *Světice Anežka Přemyslovna*, Praha, 1989, p 12-13.

188 NEWMAN, Barbara: *The Heretic Saint: Guglielma of Bohemia, Milan, and Brunate*, in: *Church History*, Vol. 74, No. 1, March 2005. The American Society of Church History: 2005 pp 1-38; p 9.

189 Ibid., p 9.

The main records of her story originate from the confessions of her followers made during the inquisitional trials of 1300, in which some thirty three citizens lost their lives.¹⁹⁰ Guglielma's accusations of heresy would be difficult to disprove, as she followed several heretical trends including usurpation of the papacy (herself depicted as a royal *papessa*)¹⁹¹ and rejection of approved monastic norms by choosing association as a *pinzochere* or tertiary unaffiliated with any order.¹⁹² Whether or not Guglielma's contributions to the lay movements of the 12th century are included, Central Europe indeed historically produced a slew of noble women adopting religious reforms and supporting new movements.

Female support, including among noble women, for reform movements gained special prominence in the Cistercian and Premonstratensian movements of the 12th century. Gabor Klaniczay calls this the religious “women's movement”.¹⁹³ From even the very early Middle Ages, women were often in at the front line of Christian development, converting their husbands and children or supporting the establishment of monasteries. The most recent officially approved Christian reform movement enjoying significant support from both secular and cloistered women was the Cistercian movement. Female convents adopted officially and unofficially the Cisterican way of life, and to accommodate the growing number of independent women's houses they were even granted their own General Chapter at le Tart¹⁹⁴.

Eventually the female Cistercian houses were brought under the oversight of male houses, but support for founding and continued personal involvement in Cistercian and Premonstrate communities continued among noble women. Often, these cloisters were used to serve noble families exclusively, predominantly as temporary shelter for girls until marriage and widows after their married years had passed. This was indeed true for the Cisterican cloister in Třebnice where Anežka was placed at age 12, which had been co-founded by her aunt St. Hedwig in the year 1202, and „*jako tolik jiných klášterů, byl klášterem slezské knížecí rodiny.*“¹⁹⁵ According to her *Legenda*, she then continued her cloistered education at the Premonstratensian convent in Doksany.¹⁹⁶ “This convent had been founded in 1143, by Gertrude, Agnes's grandmother, for the purpose of educating daughters of the aristocracy. Its nuns were

190 POLC, Jaroslav: *Světice Anežka Přemyslovna*, 1989, p 13. For the trial records, see: BENEDETTI Marina, ed.: *Milano 1300: I processi inquisitoriali contro le devote e I devoti di santa Guglielma*, Milan: Libri Scheiwiller, 1999

191NEWMAN, Barbora: *The Heretic Saint*, 2005, p 5.

192NEWMAN, Barbora: *The Heretic Saint*, 2005, p 7.

193KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 2000, pp 199-120; KLANICZAY cites: ROISIN, Simone: *L'efflorescence cistercienne et le courant ...*, 1943. And: LECLERCQ, Jean *Cisterciennes et filles de S. Bernard*, 1990

194 BERMAN, Constance Hoffman: *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*, University of Pennsylvania Press: 2000, 2010, p 235.

195 POLC, Jaroslav: *Světice Anežka Přemyslovna*, 1989, p 17: „... and like so many other monasteries, it was the monaster of a noble Silesian family.”

196 *The Life and Deeds of St. Agnes of Prague of the Order of St. Clare*, trans. from the 14th century manuscript: Bamberg,

daughters of the highest nobility, and the convent was known for its pedagogical excellence.”¹⁹⁷ Klaniczay upholds that in addition to adapting the traditional cult of dynastic saints, inspired by the mendicant orders, “with the advent of the new ideal, it was the female member of the royal families who took over from the kings and princes the job of providing the dynasties with sacral legitimation.”¹⁹⁸

The “women's movement” of Central Europe shares characteristics with the Beguine movement of the Low Countries, for example, by avocation the rejection of a carnal marriage for a spiritual one.¹⁹⁹ St. Clare of Assisi especially emphasizes this in her letters to Agnes. If it can be judged by the popularity of their cults, the saintly princesses that were most enthusiastically received by the laity were those that perhaps reflected the sentiments of the times – i.e. penitent living within the obligations of lay life. This included the pursuit of an apostolic life within marriage, as the mendicant preachers had begun to legitimize and cater to (as described in section XX), including marriage as a sacrament and praising the fruits of married life. Although Agnes and Margret were virgin saints, and did great works, they were not canonized until the 20th century and did not enjoy such popular cults as the other saintly women of their family who embraced a religious lifestyle after completing their secular duties of marriage and childbearing.²⁰⁰ St. Elizabeth married, bore three children and was widowed, and although was ridiculed by some for her humble lifestyle²⁰¹, she was one of the most popular female saints of the 13th century. St. Hedwig was married and had seven children, retiring to the Cistercian abbey she had founded after being widowed. Agnes's sister Anne married Henry II and bore 10 children, enjoyed local popularity in Poland. Margret's sisters Cunegond and Yolanda compromised and married, but maintained their chastity, finally retiring to a cloistered life after being widowed.²⁰² Even Agnes's supposed sister, Blažena-Guglielma, who was revered as a local saint in Brunate and the region around Milan (although officially denounced, along with her followers, as a heretic), was famous for healing headaches and helping women who had problems nursing, characteristics in line with her identity as a wife and mother.²⁰³ Klaniczay notes that at least in Margaret's case: “There is no question that Margaret's 'self-determination' was both unconventional and unacceptable by the mores of the time.”²⁰⁴ The saintly chastity and strictly cloistered upbringing of Agnes and Margret could not

Misc. Hist. 146, E. VII, 19, <http://www.franciscan-archive.org/misc/agnesve.html>, Accessed: 20.4.2013

197 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi: Life, Writings, and Spirituality*, Brill: Leiden, 2010, p 124,

198 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 2000, p 196

199 Ibid., p 201.

200 Ibid., p 209.

201 Ibid., p203.

202 Ibid., p 207.

203 NEWMAN, Barbora: *The Heretic Saint*, 2005 pp 1-38, p 38.

204 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 2000, p 278.

seem to compete with the affection that lay-mendicancy movements reserved for those who adopted the religious life after fulfilling their secular social duties.

3.1 Support for involvement with mendicants

After all hopes of arranged marriages had failed, Agnes was allowed to focus on the Franciscan order. It is not clear when she was first exposed to mendicants, possibly in Austria, but it is certain that she invited them to Prague.²⁰⁵ Joining a penitent order was one way for a medieval woman to emancipate herself from the familial demands regarding marriage,²⁰⁶ cutting their hair and adopting penitential clothing, as Clare of Assisi had done. Agnes, on the other hand, rather than having to resort to extremes to escape marriage was supported by her family in her endeavors: “The Přemyslids seemed conspicuously desirous to foster a saint in the family. Their family chapel became a mausoleum, inspired by the Ludowing family mausoleum built up around St Elizabeth's tomb in Marburg, would be imitated by the Piasts, who had a similar burial chapel build in the convent of the Poor Clares founded by Anne in Wroclaw.²⁰⁷” Moreover, “In addition to the hospital, Agnes built a monastery that she hoped to model on S. Damiano in Assisi. While heavily endowing the hospital with her own dowry and other resources donated by the royal family with her own dowry and other resources donated by the royal family, Agnes and her family left the monastery unendowed (BF I:156-59). Supporting fully Agnes's saintly aspirations – the Přemysl dynasty did not yet have a canonized family saint – Agnes's mother, Constance, and her brother, Přemysl, Mar grave of Moravia, also donated significant resources to the hospital endowment.²⁰⁸ Scholars repeatedly note the expectation of a female saint to appear in the family, both demonstrating the occurrence of saintly women in royal families and the argument that legitimized Agnes's choice. The development of Agnes's spiritual life and the struggles she faced in her establishment of the monastery and hospital in Prague are recorded in four letters written by St. Clare to Agnes.²⁰⁹

205 The date of Franciscans arriving to Prague is unclear. For a full discussion, see: POLC, Jaroslav: *Svěťice Anežka Přemyslovna*, Praha, 1989.

206 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 34

207 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 2000, p 258, KLANICZAY cites: SOUKUPOVA-BENÁKOVÁ, Helena 1976, 1989; CROSSLEY, Paul 1997.

208 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 78

209 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 119-222 There are little doubts about the authenticity of Clare's letters, thanks to Dr. Achille RATTI, who was the archivist of the Ambrosian library and later Pope Pius XI, in 1896 discovered manuscripts in the archives of the Basilica of S. Ambrogio in Milan. Walter SETON, “unaware of Ratti's work” published an edition of the letters based on the German versions housed in the Royal Library of Bramberg, as well as other german manuscripts. In 1922 Professor Josef SUSTA reviewed Seton's book. A fourth manuscript discovered by Dr. Krsto Stošić in the Minorite monastery in Šibenik, Dalmatia. Jan Kapistrán VYSKOCIL published a critical edition of Clare's four letters in 1932.1978 Giovanni BOCCALI reedited the latin texts, and Ignacio OMAECHEVARRIA based his text on Boccali's work. The critical edition of Clare's letters in the *Sources Chrétiennes* series by Marie-France BECKER, Jean-Francois GODET and Thaddée MATURA “*Claire D'Assise: Écrits* is based on

Although Clare encouraged Agnes in her desires to found a Franciscan convent, she also cautioned to move only with papal approval, and moreover downplayed the element of poverty, as she herself was experiencing difficulties gaining official approval to adopt such a rule in her monastery at S. Damiano.²¹⁰ In the tradition of female monastics, previously following the Benedictine or Augustinian Rules, such monasteries were designed to provide a comfortable place of retirement for noble ladies to live out their lives: “Well-funded monasteries of women were a credit to the church, a conduit of resources from the wealthy, and a practical means for providing pastoral care to the laity. . .,” which is how Pope Gregory IX hoped to direct the mendicant reform convents as well.²¹¹ Although Clare wished for the women of her house to follow the *forma vitae* of the Franciscan order in full, she was not granted the *privilege of poverty* at first. Pope Gregory's resistance to granting full poverty to the women's house was understandable: since the women were strictly enclosed in their houses, they relied on mendicant brothers to not only beg for themselves but for the sisters as well. Unsurprisingly, mendicant brothers did not want this responsibility, and resisted the integration of female houses.²¹² Additionally undesirable to Pope Gregory IX, unable to express mendicant ideals such as preaching and begging, many sisters expressed their penitence through extreme self-mortification.²¹³ St. Clare and St. Margaret are strong examples of this, engaging in extensive fasting, flogging, mortification of the flesh, exposure to the elements and taking on the most difficult and dirty work work available.²¹⁴ Finally, from the purely political and fiscal view, the noble women wishing to enter a mendicant house were expected to give away all of their financial assets, including dowries and property; assets which in a Benedictine or other monastery would have been used to support the sisters, thus enabling them to be more independent of their brother houses, with the excess funds flowing back to the Church.

Loath to burden the budding mendicant communities with the care of sister houses, and unwilling to engage in the politically unpopular step of allowing noble women to escape their familial obligations and give away their dowries to live a hard life of service in poverty, Pope Gregory IX tried to steer the female mendicant houses away from fully adopting the Franciscan rule. Clare eventually won the right to keep poverty at S. Damiano, but the women had been engaged in the practice even

VYSKOČIL.

210 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 133.

211 Ibid., p 75.

212 Ibid., p 73: “Both the Dominicans and the Cistericans passed legislation in 1228, refusing the care of nuns.”

213 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 2000, p 266. Also see: BELL, Ruldolf M.: *Holy Anorexia*, University of Chicago Press, 1987.

214 Their legends and the legends of countless other saintly women of the 13th century go to great lengths to describe the self-mortification they endured, the evidence often revealed dramatically after death.

before such approval.²¹⁵

However, Joan Mueller also presents the case of a noble lady of Florence, which more clearly demonstrates the environment that Agnes would face establishing her women's monastery and hospital in Prague: Lady Avvegnente of the Florentine Albizzi family, founded a monastery of penitent women in 1219 at Monticelli, near Florence.²¹⁶ The sisters there followed the Rule of the Order of the Ladies of S. Mary of S. Damiano in Assisi, but then received the letter *Prudentibus Virginibus* from Ugolino. He put their property legally under the Holy See. They were to follow the Rule of S. Benedict and the *forma vitae* of S. Damiano. Despite demonstrating their ability to follow the same Franciscan inspired rule of St. Clare's house, Bishop Ugolino (later Pope Gregory IX) was determined to bring them into a more traditional monastic arrangement.

This type of compromised female mendicant house is called a “Ugolinian monastery” by Newman, to differentiate them from the houses that were allowed to follow the Rule of the Order of the Ladies of S. Mary of S. Damiano in Assisi in full, which had been granted the privilege of poverty and were in line with Franciscan teachings. Three key elements had to be granted in order to preserve the mendicant integrity of a female house: full enclosure of the sisters, absolute renunciation of property both physically and legally, and approval of adequately penitent practices, including strict fasting. Although the first issue was easily accommodated, the latter two were a point of contention between Agnes and Pope Gregory, creating a long debate in which Agnes's royal status both helped and hindered.

At first her active participation and political maneuverings to establish mendicant orders in Prague would seem evidence of her connection to worldly affairs and desire to act out her royal role in a sacred arena, a “heavenly court” as St. Margaret built on Rabbit Island near Buda.²¹⁷ In fact, a different intention is suggested by her actions – indeed a genuine enthusiasm and determination to found a truly mendicant women's house which she herself could join. Klaniczay notes that: “The royal ladies of the Bohemian court especially were known for ending their lives in a monastery...”²¹⁸ as her mother Constance had co-founded and later retired to Porta Coeli. If Agnes wished to join her beloved mendicants, she would have to construct all the institutional apparatus that the mendicants relied on, and then win the rights that other female houses struggled to obtain.

Although it is not known concretely when or where Agnes came into contact with the minorites

215 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 82.

216 Ibid., p 71.

217 KLANICZAY, Gábor: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*, 2000, p 205.

218 Ibid., p 208.

or their teachings, the first step that Agnes took was to invite minorites from Mohuč to Prague in 1232.²¹⁹ Then she carefully founded the hospital of S. Francis, according to her *Legenda*, inspired by her cousin St. Elizabeth of Hungary.²²⁰ She also founded the lay order of the Crosiers of the Red Star, under the Augustinian Rule but with Franciscan guidance, whom she made responsible for the hospital. Finally she built the Clarist convent of St. Francis next to the hospital. It is quite significant that the charitable hospital was the first of its kind in Bohemia, and the Crosiers of the Red Star were the first order established domestically.²²¹ It is possible that Agnes would have made the Crosiers of the Red Star a fully mendicant order, if not for the necessity of them running the hospital and its financial assets. The spiritual and social innovations spearheaded by Agnes as the first princess to join the mendicant movement²²² set a precedence of royal support for mendicants in Central Europe that would be carried on by the females of dynastic families in Hungary and Poland for the remainder of the twelfth century into the thirteenth.²²³ Agnes's own sister Anne also established a chapel and hospital in Vratislav around the year 1245, also run by a knight's lay order.²²⁴ „The decision of the royal Bohemian princess to enter the Franciscan Order tipped the balance of power in Europe.“²²⁵

3.2 Clare of Assisi and the path to female Franciscan houses

In her book *A Companion to Clare of Assisi: Life, Writings and Spirituality* (2010), Joan Mueller goes in to great detail outlining the external elements effecting both Agnes and Clare's work for female mendicants, including examination of each action originating from the papacy or within secular politics influenced their progress. The story of Agnes's struggles throughout her establishment of the Franciscan order in Prague are evidenced most famously in four letters of written by Clare of Assisi to Agnes personally: the first letter written after June 11, 1234, when Agnes joined her Clarist monastery in Prague; the second letter May 18, 1235 revealing the beginnings of Agnes's conflict with Pope Gregory IX; the third letter between April 14 1237 and April 15 1238, after Agnes wins the privilege of poverty from Pope Gregory IX, and the fourth letter before August 9, 1253, written at the end of Clare's life.²²⁶

219 POLC, Jaroslav: *Světice Anežka Přemyslovna*, 1989, p 39. POLC cites: BARTOLOMEJ OF PISA, who wrote towards the end of the 14th cent. (Srv. AF 4, str. 357.)

220 VYSKOČIL, J.K.: *Legenda blahoslavené Anežky a čtyři sv. Kláry: kritický rozbor textový i věcný legendy a čtyř listů s nejstarším-původním- textem milánského rukopisu*, Universum, 1932, p 106.

221 POLC, Jaroslav: *Světice Anežka Přemyslovna*, Praha, 1989, p 41

222 Ibid., p 44.

223 See: KLANICZAY, Gábor: 2000.

224 POLC, Jaroslav: *Světice Anežka Přemyslovna*, Praha, 1989, p 42.

225 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 132.

226 Ibid., Mueller dedicates a full chapter to examine the contexts of Clare's letters, p 119-168. Mueller details the various primary sources of these letters and the scholarship surrounding them in pp 119-121, the critical edition of

Thanks to the support of Agnes's royal family and funded through both her personal donations as well as donations of her family members, she was able to fairly quickly establish a functioning and well endowed hospital and the means to both run the hospital and support the mendicant sisters enclosed in the neighboring convent. However, “While heavily endowing the hospital with her own dowry and other resources donated by the royal family with her own dowry and other resources donated by the royal family, Agnes and her family left the monastery unendowed (BF I:156-59).”²²⁷ Agnes was very careful to leave the monastery free of property and possessions, so that the sisters might live from the daily donations of the mendicant brothers that begged for them. Cardinal Ugolino preferred to bring the convent of St. Francis and other female mendicant houses into line with the rules of his Ugolinian monasteries, the approval of the Clarist order was rewritten under the Rule of St. Benedict, with the option of a *formula vitae* of S. Damiano, and the requirement to request special privilege to practice absolute poverty. This created a disaster for the ambitions of Agnes's new convent: “Under the papal plan, not only did Agnes not give her dowry away to the poor, she would benefit from the significant endowment donated by others in her family that had been intended specifically for the service of the poor in the hospital. As a Franciscan sister, Agnes would have more resources at her discretion than she had had in the world.”²²⁸ Both Polc and Mueller outline the back and forths between Agnes, Pope Gregory IX and later Pope Innocent IV as Agnes took the steps to disengage her monastery from the financial endowment of the hospital and eventually win privilege *of poverty* for the convent of St. Francis in Prague. She was able to wield her political power on numerous occasions to influence Pope Gregory to grant her concessions and steer the regulations of her monastery closer to a Franciscan rule.²²⁹ Her struggle was parallel to that of Clare's at St. Damiano, and many other houses of Damianites, however, despite the burden the material trappings of royalty put on her mendicant ambitions, in the end her royal political clout helped her navigate the path to realizing her vision. In the legislation passed in 1247, Pope Innocent erased the Rule of S. Benedict from the regulations of the Damianites, and approved the Rule of St. Francis for the sisters.²³⁰ The mendicant orders remained a favorite of royal female sponsors in Central Europe throughout the 13th and 14th centuries.

4.0 Bishop Robert of Olomouc and mendicants in Moravia

Counter to Agnes's reputation of support for mendicants, Bishop Robert of Olomouc is often identified

which is the *Sources Chrétiennes* series by Marie-France Becker, Jean-Francois Godet and Thaddée Matura
"Claire D'Assise: Écrits is based on J.K. Vyskočil.

227 MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi*, 2010, p 78.

228 Ibid., 79.

229 Ibid., See: Chapter 5.

230 Ibid., p 16.

as the first main critic in Central Europe of mendicants in the first half of the 13th century. As we shall see, his stance against the mendicant orders was much more nuanced.

4.1 Rethinking Bishop Robert in foreign secondary sources

Well before the most famous antimendicant movement was initiated by William of St. Amour in Paris, antifraternality is proven to have appeared in Moravia as late as 1237, about a decade after the settling of mendicant orders in Prague and Olomouc. Western historians, such as André Vauchez, and Arnold Dickenson often cite Bishop Robert as the exemplar of antimendicant sentiment of non-Germanic origin appearing in the Eastern Central European region. This is misleading and incorrect in many ways, as Robert was originally a Cistercian monk, traditionally thought to have been born in England,²³¹ educated in Paris and coming through Germanic connections to his position in Olomouc, maintaining close connections with Margrave of Morava Přemysl and Abbot Werner at Heiligenkreuz. The details of his life, expertly outlined by Vit Hlinka, Černý, Anna Pumprová, create a portrait of a true European, straddling several cultures, who, as a monk and bishop, probably shared more in common with his peers within the Church than with the locals of his diocese.

Most significantly, Robert was apparently acting within a wider movement in Moravia, as evidenced by the three papal bulls issued in 1237, which were targeted at the entire Central European region. Vauchez attributes resistance to the thesis of stigmata to "the German and Slavic lands, which had remained spiritually and ecclesiastically very traditional."²³² Bishop Robert may represent the "traditional religious disposition" of Central Europeans, driven by political motivations, inspired by Cistercian spirituality, but the argument against stigmata was employed by members of even the Dominican order²³³, implying that it is a wider phenomenon. Possibly the denial of stigmata was a Germanic-Slavic idiosyncrasy, but it is not certain that Robert was the originator of this approach, nor the representative leader of the movement – at most it may be claimed that he made use of the argument as it suited both the theological convictions of his order, and his political prerogatives at the time.

Robert's actions are known through the three bulls that Pope Gregory IX was forced to issue regarding the problems in Bohemia and Moravia. In total nine papal bulls on the subject were issued

231 Robert was possibly born in Herefordshire. For the most detailed information available on the life of Bishop Robert, see: HLINKA, Vít: *Olomoucký biskup Robert*, in: *Cisterciáci na Moravě*, ed. Miloslav Pojsl, Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci: Olomouc: 2006, pp 79-92.

232 VAUCHEZ, André: *Les Stigmates de Saint Francis et leurs détracteurs dans les derniers siècles du moyen âge*, In: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, Vol.80, no. 2, 1968, pp 598–99., p 602: „On notera avec intérêt que cette première série de documents pontificaux concerne surtout les pays slaves et germaniques, où la spiritualité et l'ecclésiologie demeuraient très traditionnelles.“

233 Burchard of Opava, accused in the letter from Gregory.

between 1237 and 1291.²³⁴ The first bull, *Non minus dolentes*²³⁵, was in condemnation of a Dominican friar "Evechardus," for his sermon delivered in the Silesian city of Opava, denying the validity of St. Francis' stigmata, and declaring the friars "false preachers."²³⁶ Another bull issued three days later, *Confessor Domini*²³⁷, addressing all the faithful of the Germanic nation, and entreats them to reject untruths circulating about the stigmata of St. Francis.²³⁸ As evidenced in the third bull, *Usque ad terminus*²³⁹, issued on the 11th of April 1237, pope Gregory IX directly chastises Bishop Robert of Olomouc (*Robertus episcopus Olomucensi*), in Moravia, for allowing preaching against the thesis of the stigmata, specifically regarding the depiction of stigmata and the case of St. Francis. "In censuring this bishop, Gregory IX referred to Christ's adornment of Francis as "the great and singular miracle" (*grande ac singular miraculum*), words repeated by Alexander IV in 1255,"²⁴⁰ a few years before his excommunication of William of St. Amour. Although they are unique amongst the antimendicant writings appearing elsewhere in Europe at the same time, it is not clear if Bishop Robert's arguments against the Franciscans are entirely unprecedented.

They are, however, the first arguments in evidence that use the issue of stigmata as an argument against the Franciscan order. Before this, rejection of stigmata was expounded by the Catholic Church itself, having denied every case of stigmata up until the approval of pope Honorius III bestowed on Francis.²⁴¹ The reversal of the Church's stance on stigmata was theologically legitimated by the presence of stigmata in the bible.²⁴² However, this alone could not validate the legitimacy of stigmata for all, causing the Eastern Orthodox church to dismiss the thesis of stigmata entirely as heresy, and requiring great efforts by the Catholic Church to defend their position and control claims of stigmata thereafter.

4.2 A Cistercian argument

Bishop Robert's reported actions after the arrival of mendicant orders could be seen as a

234 DAVIDSON, Arnold I.: "Miracles of Bodily Transformations, or How St. Francis Recieved the Stigmata" in: *Critical Inquiry* 35 (Spring 2009), Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2009, p 456. DAVIDSON notes: "GOFFEN, Rona: *Spirituality in Conflict: Saint Francis and Giotto's Bardi Chapel*, University Park, Penn., 1988., esp. pp. 13–22"

235 *Non minus dolentes* (2 duben 1237) Codice pp 10-11, et Bull. Franc. I, p. 213.

236 VAUCHEZ, André: *Les Stigmates de Saint Francis et leurs de'tracteurs dans les derniers sie`cles du moyen age*, In: *Me'langes d'arche'ologie et d'histoire*, Vol.80, no. 2, 1968, pp 598–99, p 602.

237 *Confessor Domini* (5 duben 1237) Codice. pp 11-12, and Bull. Franc. I, p 214.

238 VAUCHEZ, André: *Les Stigmates de Saint Francis*, 1968, pp 598–99, p 602.

239 CDB III. 1, C. 157, s. 190-192.

240 DAVIDSON, Arnold I.: *Miracles of Bodily Transformations, or How St. Francis Recieved the Stigmata*, in: *Critical Inquiry* 35 (Spring 2009), Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2009 pp 451-480, p 457.

241 VAUCHEZ, André: *Les Stigmates de Saint Francis*, 1968, p 598–99.

242 Galatians 6:17, where Paul is quoted as saying: "ego enim stigmata Iesu in corpora meo porto." There are no other mentions of stigmata within the old or new testaments.

protective instinct to preserve the established clerical and political environment of Moravia, but I would also argue that his emphasis on the heresy of stigmata signifies also a position in line with his Cistercian origins, famously expressed by Bernard of Clairvoyance. As Davidson argues:

"From the perspective of the history of mysticism, Francis' stigmata represent the beginning of a new form of mysticism, in which mystical experience is no longer merely spiritual but is accompanied by phenomena and transformations that are physical. Stigmata, levitation, bilocation, fasting, and transverberation are physical events that became associated with mystical experience. These phenomena contrast with older forms of mysticism *not* expressed in the body. For example, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, in Sermon 74 on *The Song of Songs*, alludes to this older form when he writes:

So when the Bridegroom, the Word, came to me, he never made known his coming by any signs, not by sight, not by sound, not by touch. . . . In the renewal and remaking of the spirit of my mind, that is of my inmost being, I have perceived the excellence of his glorious beauty.¹²⁴³

As many historians have maintained, the introduction of this new form of mysticism must be linked to a changed attitude and a new devotion towards the humanity of Christ, his Incarnation, his Passion and, more generally, the corporeal existence that characterizes him as human."²⁴⁴

Additionally, the 65th and 66th sermons on the Song of Songs are directed at heretics, specifically the Cathar movement. He applies the analogy of heretics as foxes, sneaking around in the vineyard of the faithful, spoiling the vines. Bernard very specifically uses this platform to explicitly argue against the marriage and celibacy issues presented by the Cathar heresy. These two sermons express Bernard's ideas about the heretics and their practices clearly and in deliberate detail.

4.3 *Compilatio super Canica canticorum*

Robert of Olomouc also wrote a lengthy commentary on the Song of Songs, although it most likely predates his staking a position against the stigmata of St. Francis, being dated after the completion of his Paris education yet lacking any reference to his position to the thesis of stigmata. The work fails to include any indication of an argument against stigmata, instead presenting material that

²⁴³DAVIDSON'S notes: *Bernard of Clairvaux, On the Song of Songs*, trans. Irene Edmonds, 4 vols., Kalamazoo, Mich., 1971–80, 4:91. See: FRUGONI, Chiara, "Le mistiche, le visioni e l'iconografia: Rapporti e influssi," in *Temi e problemi nella mistica femminile trecentesca*, ed. Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale (Todi, 1983), pp. 148–49 n. 27. Frugoni uses the terms old and new mysticism."

²⁴⁴ DAVIDSON, Arnold I.: *Miracles of Bodily Transformations, or How St. Francis Recieved the Stigmata*, in: *Critical Inquiry* 35 (Spring 2009), Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2009 pp 451-480, p 452.

would suggest a quite different set of sentiments.²⁴⁵ One reading Bishop Robert's *Compilatio* would hardly imagine that the author would later take an active position, if the Pope Gregory's admonitions are to be taken at full value, against the depiction of stigmata or the validity of St. Francis' claim. Although he had the opportunity and precedence to apply Bernard of Clairveaux's arguments against heretical practices, he quotes Bernard on other topics, and prefers to cite heavily from the work of Peter Cantor, as Anna Pumprová has demonstrated in her critical edition of the *Compilatio*.²⁴⁶ Peter Cantor was a university master in Paris at the end of the 12th century; Pumprová confirms that Robert probably came into contact with him or his works during his time in Paris.²⁴⁷

By way of citations and personal emphasis, the focus of Robert's commentary appears to be on preachers, exalting both their work and their position. He makes countless analogies detailing the relationships between priests, parishes and the Church. His following work, which has been preserved through several manuscripts, also caters to priests; a guide to giving penance.²⁴⁸ The last body of Bishop Robert's known works is a collection of over one hundred epistolary sermons, currently being digitalized and translated into Czech by Martin Novotný.²⁴⁹ Outside of Bishop Robert's formal written production as “notář Otokar 5”²⁵⁰, all of his works revolve around priests and clerical duties. His esteem for preachers is endless:

*“Hii comparantur turri David propter constantiam et fortitudinem, quam habent ad edificia fidei defendenda et ad fideles defendendos contra violentias et insidias hereticorum et demonum et principum ecclesiam opprimentium. Quod enim facit turris in civitate, hoc facit Cristus in ecclesia, quia per turrem, id est predicatores, ipsam defendit et tuetur.”*²⁵¹

He portrays preachers specifically as defenders of Church against the threat of heretics.

Both stigmata and heretics are mentioned in Robert's *Compilatio*, including a citation of

245 BISHOP ROBERT OF OLOMOUC: *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (Robertus Olomucensis, *Compilatio super Canica canticorum*), Oberösterreichische Landesbibliothek, Linz, cod. Lat. 400, f. 161r.

246 PUMPROVÁ, Anna: *Robert Olomoucký: Výklad Písň písni*, Matice moravská: Brno, 2010. p xxxviii.

247 Ibid. , p lvi.

248 “*Příručka pro udílení svátosti pokání*” is held as a manuscript in the monastery of Heiligenkreuz: č. 57, fol. 113r – 120r; rukopis NKP (Původně v Admontu) XX A 7, fol. 175v – 192r; rukopis státní knihovny v Mnichově clm 11338, fol. 57V – 62r; rukopis státní knihovny v Mnichově clm 2632, fol. 160r – 177r; rukopis státní knihovny v Mnichově clm 12722, fol. 112r – 114v. <http://www.martinoviny.cz/zivot-biskupa-roberta-olomouckeho/>, Accessed: 20.4.2013.

249 NOVOTNÝ, Martin, <http://www.martinoviny.cz/biskup-robert-olomoucky-kazani/super-epistolaz-seznam-kazani/>, Accessed: 20.4.2013.

250 Šebánek, J.: *Kdo byl notář Otakar 5.* in: *Studie k české diplomatice doby přemyslovské*. Praha 1959, s. 3-39; ŠEBÁNEK J.: *Notář Otakar 5 a nejstarší listiny oslavanské a velehradské*. Časopis Matice moravské , č. 67, 1947, s. 222-290.

251 PUMPROVÁ, Anna: *Robert Olomoucký*, 2010, p 109. (LXIII 11-16, citations: LXIII 11/15 hii-ecclesia cfr. ibid [cfr. Gloss. ord. Cant. Ad 4, 4 (44), p. 235.

Bernard's fox analogy²⁵², but a they are not the main focus of his message.²⁵³ He makes no negative mention of mendicants or “preaching” brothers, which seems like an almost conscious omission, considering the prevalence of lay preaching and contemporary mendicant movements that he would have been aware of at the time. Two passages that could possibly refer to mendicants focus rather on transient brothers; wandering heretics, who fail to adopt approved doctrines (“*quorum greges vagando imitantur, quicum que se eorum pravis dogmatibus vel operibus conformant.*”²⁵⁴) or those who engage in vain and passing pleasures (*vanas et transitorias delectationes eorum sequendo*²⁵⁵). However, in a highly geographically stable monastic tradition, distrust of transience is even written directly into the Benedictine Rule. Thus, Robert's statements may not necessarily refer to the friars of the early 13th century, and there is no further evidence to suggest that they do.

There are two statements more in line with the arguments that would later define antifraternalism as it was expressed later by William of St. Amour and others: hypocrisy and the “sale” of scriptures. The first is a statement that could be construed as a comment on the thesis of stigmata or false doctrine focuses on the heretics as wolves in sheep’s clothing:

“ . . . *vulpecule sunt astucie dyaboli, que se transfigurant in angelos lucis, sunt et virtutes simulate, sunt et heretice doctrine fuco veritatis palliate, sunt et viri simulatores , qui extrinsecus vestiuntur vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces. Precipua vulpes est ypocrisis, id est equitatis simulatio in actu iniquitatis, quia “simulata equitas duplex est iniquitas.*”²⁵⁶

In Bernard's sermon 66, he mentions several historic heretical sects by name and goes into great detail specifying and arguing against some of the more famous errant practices of the Cathars, while omitting the name of the sect itself. Although Bishop Robert employed Bernard's fox analogy, he does not go further to state any other qualities that would identify what heretical group he might be referring to, and does not name any heretical sects or doctrines. The second passage refers to fleecing the public and profiting from the scriptures:

“ . . . *est enim congregatio thaurorum, id est hereticorum et malorum prelatorum, etiam ruditate et stoliditate plebium deceptorum, ut excludant eos, id est exclusi appareant et eminentes, qui probati sunt argento, id est famosi et nominati in doctrina Sacre*

252cfr: *Bern. Clar. Cant. 64, 6.8*, cited at in the *Compilatio* at ct 2.15 XLV, 5-6

253Heretics are mentioned or alluded to only at the following passages: 161r 333-339 (PUMPROVA, p 12), 161r 353-356 (PUMPROVA, p 13), 161r 360-365 (PUMPROVA, p 13), ct 2.15 XLV 2-7 (PUMPROVA, p 68), LVI 60-64 (PUMPROVA, 94).

254PUMPROVÁ, Anna: *Robert Olomoucký: Výklad Písň písni*, Matice moravská: Brno, 2010. p 13. Cites:/ 161r 353-356

255Ibid., p 13, cites: / 161r 360-365

256Ibid., p 68, cites: ct 2.15 XLV 2-7

scripture."²⁵⁷

Pumprová notes that the bulk of this passage, up to "argento" is a citation as well.²⁵⁸ If this implies that "*id est famosi et nominati in doctrina Sacre scripture*" is Robert's personal addition, this could possibly point to wandering preachers who were accused of making their living from distribution of the Word. Again, this is only conjecture, as Robert does not make any clear statements that describe his stance on mendicants or St. Francis.

Robert does mention stigmata and the tortures of Jesus explicitly in several passages, and not in the framing that one would expect from a man later accused of denying the stigmata of St. Francis.²⁵⁹ He includes a very floral passage about Paul's biblical reference to the stigmata:

*"Hii tales sunt, sicut ait Paulus, qui exuunt pristiname vitiorum conversationem, id est veterem hominem, qui corrumpitur secundum <Deum> creatus est, id est vite iustioris et sanctioris novitatem. Isti florent sicut rosa rubore verecundie insigniti, quia per carnis continentiam motificationem Ihesu Cristi circumferunt in corpore suo. Florent ut lilia per candorem purioris vite et per repandulam humilitatem obedientie."*²⁶⁰

Later on he again refers to "wearing" the Passion of Christ, this time referring to the colors worn by the clergy:

*"Hec sunt sicut purpura regis, quia ex eis contextitur regia vestis virtuose conversationis, quam rex celestis non dedignatur induere. Hex rubet per fidem passionis Cristi et eius imitationem, hec est vestis de qua dicit Paulus: Ego stigmata passionis Cristi circumfero in corpore meo."*²⁶¹

Although this passage is a mix of citations, Robert's composition of them is clearly favorable to the secondary, imitative experience of Jesus' stigmata. Undoubtedly, Bishop Robert donned the same garments while performing his clerical duties. The line dividing acceptable and heretical depiction of the Passion on oneself must have been, for Robert, a fine line indeed.

The shift in Robert's stance on stigmata and mendicants could possibly be discovered in the collection of previously unexamined example sermons written after his *Compilatio*. Unfortunately, currently only eleven of the 100 sermons collected have been digitalized and translated, while the rest

²⁵⁷Ibid., p 94, cites: LVI 60-64

²⁵⁸Ibid., p 94, cites: LVI 57/63, increpa-argento Ps 67-31

²⁵⁹Passages referring to the stigmata or corporal signs of Jesus's torture: PUMPROVA, p48 29 42-46, PUMPROVA, p 54 and 2, 5, 38 30-37, PUMPROVA, CT 215 7.5 121 7-12

²⁶⁰PUMPROVÁ, Anna: *Robert Olomoucký: Výklad Písňe písni*, Matice moravská: Brno, 2010, p 54. Cites: ct 2, 5, XXXIII 30-37, citations 31/34 exuunt-novitatem, cfr. Eph 4.24

²⁶¹ Ibid., p 363, cites: CXXI 11 stigmata] seq. Ihesu del. L ; CXXI, 11/12 Ego-meo] cfr. Gal 6, 17; CXXI 9/10 Hec - imitationem cfr. ibid. (47)

remain in the National Library in Prague under the signature XX.A.11. Of these eleven²⁶², none of them so much as allude to themes of stigmata, heretics, or mendicants, nor do they carry sub-contextual citations related to those themes.

Less critical portrayals of Bishop Robert define him rather by his political maneuverings, and emphasize the more scandalous accusations against him²⁶³, implying that his arguments against stigmata, and his actions against the mendicant orders in Moravia are evidence only of his deep involvement in secular affairs. It is true that Bishop Robert worked closely with Margrave Přemysl of Moravia and his mother Constance (wife of Přemysl Otakar I) in tandem with his agenda of establishing Cistercian monasteries throughout Moravia, and other actions taken as bishop, but in many ways this was in keeping with the old habits of monastic organization, and more over reflected the unique social climate in the western Slavic regions at the time. This perhaps explains the attachment to traditional values that André Vauchez refers to²⁶⁴, which is the product of the unique history of the Eastern Central European region. However, it is inadequate to use Bishop Robert as a figurehead of these so-called 'traditional values', and thus his place in the history of antifraternalism ought to be reconsidered.

I would like to propose the following hypothesis about the situation of Bishop Robert in regards to his international reputation as an antimendicant. From what can be gleaned by his *Compilatio*, he didn't hold, at least at that time, any radical or contrary theological convictions that would cause conflict with mendicants. In fact, his enthusiasm for preachers would presuppose an interest in the Dominican order especially. In addition to being a worldly, educated man, unlikely to be doctrinally influenced by the supposed 'traditional' leanings of the region, his understanding of stigmata is very accepting and actually quite mystical, and dogmatically sound. However, in the papal bull *Usque ad terminos*, he is accused of denying the stigmata of St. Francis and hindering the Franciscan order in his region.

This is related to the prior bull, *Non minus dolentes*, where a specific culprit was named, a Dominican no less. Perhaps Gregory IX was frustrated that Bishop Robert had not solved the issue quickly enough. However, although Olomouc is geographically closer to Opava, it is strange that such a complaint was not sent also to Tomáš I (Kozlowaroga), the contemporary bishop of Vratislav (Wrocław, Breslau), who would have had oversight of the Dominicans in Silesia, as the Dominican

262 Manuscripts listed by the "Gamingský code" 72v-73r x; 60r-60v, 60v-61r, 61r-61v, 61v-62r, 70r-70v, 70v-71r, 71r-71v, 71v-72r, 72r-72v, 72v,

263HLINKA, Vít: *Olomoucký biskup Robert*, 2006, p 79-92.

264 VAUCHEZ, André, P 602 *On notera avec intérêt que cette première série de documents pontificaux concerne surtout les pays slaves et germaniques, où la spiritualité et l'ecclésiologie demeuraient très traditionnelles.*

houses in Moravia were under the oversight of the Polish province (whereas the Franciscans were under German oversight) until 1301.²⁶⁵ Moreover, both the Dominicans and Franciscans in Olomouc, where Bishop Robert was seated, didn't seem to particularly suffer, being assisted directly by Přemysl Otakar II and the Margrave of Moravia (with whom Bishop Robert worked closely) to establish houses for them by 1250²⁶⁶, in the meanwhile allowing them to work in hospices and parishes as early as before 1240.²⁶⁷ The situation in Olomouc does not demonstrate significantly later development than seen elsewhere in Moravia and Bohemia, and the foundation of monasteries was, in general, more active in Bohemia for all orders, mendicant or otherwise.

Perhaps the choice to direct vitriol towards Bishop Robert was a continuation of his long history of conflicts with the papacy (expertly outlined in detail by Vít Hlinka²⁶⁸). While the previous accusations against Bishop Robert had been lifted, this case was perhaps serious enough to finally remove him from his seat, and the Pope took advantage of the situation. Indeed, Bishop Robert abdicated his position in 1240. It can be said with relative certainty that the Dominican Evechardus, in Opava, was anti-Franciscan. It can also be said that the situation of mendicants in Bohemia and Moravia, due to territorial disputes between the German and Polish provinces and the unique elements effecting urban and rural life in the region, faced special obstacles. Unless the later writings of Bishop Robert yield concrete proof, there is not quite enough evidence to definitively call him an antimendicant, an opponent of the thesis of stigmata, or even an obstacle to mendicants in Moravia. Meanwhile, the urge to pin Bishop Robert as an antimendicant is possibly the result of modern influence; the attempt of reformers or later researchers to pre-date the clearer antimendicant stance of proto-reformers, or the retroactive application of wider, European antimendicant concepts, and an insensitivity to the circumstances surrounding the papal bulls of 1237.

5.0 Reactions to mendicants in domestic source material

Compared to other regions of Europe, mendicants integrated into Eastern Central Europe with relative ease. This perhaps explains why mendicants, and clerics which we may conclude were mendicants according to clues and context, are treated with jovial disrespect in Czech secular satire, rather than the biting criticism found in German texts. The conflicts between the various orders were not necessarily

265 FREED, John B., *The Friars and Germany Societ*, 1977, p 56.

266 ČERNUŠAK, Tomáš – PROKOP, Augustin – NĚMEC, Damián, eds.: *Historie Dominikánů v českých zemích*, Krystal: 2001, p23.

267 ČERNUŠAK, Tomáš – PROKOP, Augustin – NĚMEC, Damián, eds.: *Historie Dominikánů v českých zemích*, Krystal: 2001, p 23.

268 HLINKA, Vít: *Olomoucký biskup Robert* 2006, p 80-88.

made public,²⁶⁹ so the secular works composed for public consumption reflect sentiments drawn from daily contact with mendicant brothers and sisters.

5.1 *Dalimil Chronicle vs. The Ointment Seller*

The reactions to the arrival of mendicants is perhaps most simply summed up by two sources of opposite extremes: The Dalimil Chronicle²⁷⁰ and the Easter play "The Ointment Seller."²⁷¹ The Dalimil Chronicle records the arrival of "preachers" to Prague in a detached and neutral manner, noting that they settled at St. Klements at the bridge on the edge of the city walls, before changing focus to political events.²⁷² It is evident by the extremely nationalistic, anti-German tone of the work that the main concern of the demographic represented by Dalimil was not religious conflicts, as they were very publicly played out in Italy, France and England, but rather in reaction to their neighbors. Dalimil was much too busy directing vitriol towards the Germans to even notice the row concerning stigmata that played out in Moravia, which passed with little public commentary except for the papal bulls, as far as we can tell from existent, publicized documents.

This brings me to "*Mastičkář*" (*The Ointment Seller*; excerpts in Appendix 2) which represents the tone of anticlerical and antifraternel reactions originating from lay secular sources. The *Mastičkář* is an Easter play, focusing on the ointment seller that the three Maries visit, but in such a obscene way that made it inappropriate for performance in church. While talking up the quality and powers of the various ointments he has to sell, the ointment seller, Rubin, jokes about monastic virtue several times, saying:

*A tuto mast činil mnich v chyšce
mnich sedě na jěptišce.
Ktož jie z vás okusí koli,*

269According to Helga Schuppert, poems written in Latin against the friars were often not translated, perhaps because they were meant only for insider consumption. See: SCHUPPERT, Helga: *Kirchenkritik in der lateinischen Lyrik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972.

270DALIMILOVA KRONIKA: the oldest Czech versified chronicle, written in the beginning of the 14th century, outlining events from the very beginning of Czech history to events of the year 1325. A multitude of fragments, manuscripts and historic translations of the chronicle can be found in the National Library in Prague. There is a version of the text publicly available at:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20070804091914/http://people.fsv.cvut.cz/~gagan/jag/litera/dalimil.htm>
(© Academia 1988 © Ceska spolecnost rukopisna), Accessed: 14.3.2013.

271"MASTIČKÁŘ": is the oldest czech liturgical drama, written as a versified satirical farce, first recorded in the 14th century. It is considered to be an adaption of German vagrant poetry, such as Carmina Burana. It exists in several fragments and copies, which are held in the National Library in Prague, two of which - Muzejní and Drkolensky - are publicly available here: <http://www.flu.cas.cz/Com/stcl/mastickar.htm>, Accessed: 14.3.2013.

272<http://web.archive.org/web/20070804091914/http://people.fsv.cvut.cz/~gagan/jag/litera/dalimil.htm> (© Academia 1988 © Ceska spolecnost rukopisna) Accessed: 14.3.2013.

*vstane jmu jako pól žebračie holi.*²⁷³

then later when Pustrpulk speaks of his two brothers who are monks, Rubin replies:

Praviš mi o svém rodě,

a já to tak dobře vědě!

Má tetka Jitka

a druhá Milka,

těť sě po světu tkáta,

*avšak po Pražě všechny mnichy znáta.*²⁷⁴

There is not much specification about which monastic order these jokes are aimed at, beyond the “mendicant's tonsure,” and the sense of the composition is much more light than a biting satire or antimendicant commentary.

5.2 Discovering antifraternalism in Old Czech lyric poetry

Counter to the bulk of German language satires, yet well within Europe estate satire traditions, the portrait made by surviving texts of antimendicant sentiment occurring during or soon after the 13th century is expressed through jocular, sexual satire, especially targeting female religious persons. Theological and social objections, as they appear in French, English and German satirical works are omitted from Czech satire until the arrival of these themes during the proto-reform era of the mid 14th century. In a survey of the surviving examples of old Czech lyric poetry from the 13th and 14th century²⁷⁵, every occurrence of anticlerical commentary has been collected. Anticlerical satire is almost exclusively directed towards lay reform movements and mendicants, and to be predominately based on sexual and gender based humor.

A delightful example of the playfulness of Czech satire is the poem *Naše sestra Jana*²⁷⁶ (Our Sister Jana, excerpts in Appendix 3). This student's lyric was first written down in the mid 14th century, but M. Kopecký has identified it as originating in earlier folk tradition.²⁷⁷ The poem is ripe with sexual innuendos as it describes Jana's flirtations with a young mendicant student, alluding to "half a snake and two eggs" and the student offering her his "sausage," the meaning being so clear that when Jana recalls this to her mother, the poem concludes with the desperate mother exclaiming: "Ostaviž se zlého/

273 ČERNÝ, Václav, *Staročeská milostná lyrika*, Praha 1999. p 247-261

274 Ibid.

275 In: ČERNÝ, Václav, *Staročeská milostná lyrika*, Praha 1999. and LEHÁR, Jan – STICH, Alexandr: *Kniha Textů 1: od počátků do raného obrození 9. století-1. třetina 19. století*, In the series: *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny: Praha: 2000.

276 LEHÁR, Jan, ed.: *Česka středověka lyrika*, Praha: Vyšehrad: 1990, p 254.

277 LEHÁR, Jan, ed.: *Česka středověka lyrika*, Praha: Vyšehrad: 1990, p 369.

nečín nic dobrého! / Drž se toho odpustka, / bude z tebe jeptiška."²⁷⁸ This poem both reflects the regularity that young mendicants interacted with the townsfolk, and indeed the accidents that naturally resulted from that. Also, it is evidence of a secular understanding of nuns - what leads one to become a nun, and how the laity might view convents as a safe refuge for wayward girls.²⁷⁹

In Moravia, for example, there was substantial activity for founding Cistercian women's houses in the 13th century. This could have been a societal response to the short lifespan of men in the area, where constant warfare and brutal social conditions resulted in a large part of the female population loose and without their own means of security. Bishop Robert himself was accused of spending far too much time in the local women's monasteries, furthermore possibly exaggerated charges by the Pope of fornication and debauchery.²⁸⁰ However, in Robert's position of responsibility for the second most populated area in the Czech principality, which was also the most unstable and tumultuous, dealing with the large population of widows or otherwise displaced women was certainly a priority.

The theme of wanton monks and nuns is reoccurring, and a slightly later poem removes the innuendo, and allows a directly advertizes the laxity of religious females. The entire context of the parody *Stala se jest příhoda* (excerpts in Appendix 4²⁸¹) subsists on the narrator praising the services of a nun who will teach a young student The Word, but only in secret, at night. It goes on to say that "*Tu' mu bába biblí vloží / pěkné, velmi ohrúhlé; / k hruškám byšta podobné / a tak velmi bílé.*"²⁸² This poem perhaps implies to a follower of Wyclif, as the women's name is ostentatiously *Viklefice* ("Wyclifette," as it could be translated). But, later in the poem the woman is also referred to as a beguine (*bekyňe*) so it's possible to that this composition is based on an earlier theme related to beguines, female tertiaries or later mendicant, as the titles can signify any uncloistered, non-traditionally religious woman. The beguine movement itself was not as prominent in Central Europe as in the Low Countries. The mixing of terminology could indicate that the author may have adapted the known, obscene trope into a parody undermining the followers of Wyclif and proto-reformers.

The influence of long established western European themes appears in the mid-14th century, creating a marked break from previous, secular based motifs in Czech lyric poetry. The sudden increase in poetry and openly anticlerical themes can be attributed to two innovations: the establishment of the

278 "Ostaviž se zlého, nečín nic dobrého! Drž se toho odpustka, bude z tebe jeptiška." from: LEHÁR, Jan – STICH, Alexandr: *"Kniha Textů 1: od počátků do raného obrození 9. století-1. třetina 19. století"* Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny: Praha: 2000, p 254.

279 SWANSON, R.N.: *Religion and Devotion in Europe: c. 1215-c. 1515* Cambridge University Press, 1995. pp 106-112.

280 POJSL, Miroslav, ed.: *Cisterciáci na Moravě: sborník k 800. výročí příchodu cisterciáků na Moravu a počátek Velehradu*, Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci: 2006. p 86.

281 ČERNÝ, Václav: *Staročeská Milostná lyrika*, 1948, p 292.

282 Ibid, p 292.

first university in Prague, and the negative reaction of proto-reformers against the rapid rise to power of the mendicant orders in the decades since their arrival. After the development of the university many compositions that had been in circulation for a much longer time, such as *Mastičkář*, were finally formally recorded. In some cases, such as *Naše sestra Jana*, the older folk themes are identifiable.²⁸³ However, there are certain contemporary works that clearly have connections to western European tradition and established themes of antifraternality.

*O pravdě*²⁸⁴ (About Truth, excerpts in Appendix 5) is a proto-reform composition that demonstrates the application of western European anticlerical themes into the Czech literary tradition. J. Lehár notes that dialogues with the personification of Truth became a very popular platform for Hussite writers, and although it was theorized by F. Menčíka that this poem was based on the poem "Das recht ist layder in der welt verschwunden" by German, often also antimendicant²⁸⁵, poet Heinrich Frauenlob, whose works were circulated throughout the German speaking territories. This theory was later disproven by K. Bertau,²⁸⁶ concluding that does not copy Frauenlob and is indeed of Czech provenance, either through a Latin original or written in Czech. The poem is distinctly antimendicant, but demonstrates the antimendicantism that developed at the end of the 13th century, which led to the criticism of the proto-reformers and the adoption of well circulated western European themes that focus on the incompetence of the papacy and the material greed of the friars.

In *O Pravdě*, the negative portrayal extends to all levels of the church, from the pope, who claims to know nothing and redirects Truth to speak to two black friars, to the friars themselves who will not let Truth pass on her way until enough gold is paid. The poem bemoans the state of the church, having created the disorder of two popes, and then soon after two emperors. This reflects an awareness and concern for trans-European conflicts that is not seen in earlier works. Broader awareness and better education came as a result of the maturity of urbanization processes from the 13th and 14th centuries in the Eastern Central European region; earlier, such a theme would have been unthinkable. This represents Eastern Central European reactions to mendicant orders belatedly expressed due to the retarded process of urbanization, and yet so quickly brought into line with the larger European trends thanks to the connectivity that increased throughout the 13th century.

The subtle shift towards the application of western European themes can be found in another notable Czech source, finally concerning theological debates rather than raunchy humor; the poem

283Ibid, p 369.

284Ibid, pp 71-72.

285For more on Frauenlob and other antimendicant German writers, see: DIPPLE, 2009.

286 BERTAU, K.: *Frauenlob, Leichs, Sangsprüche, Leider 1-2*, (Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl. III, 119–120), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981, p 125.

Spor tělo s duši (Conflict between the body and soul, excerpts in Appendix 6). This poem finally mentions the issue of monks keeping property, which is in direct contest with the mendicant doctrine of apostolic poverty, but would not concern the other orders.²⁸⁷ The body chides the soul:

Jež a pí, měj se vesele,
netbaj na to, což v kostele
kněžie hrozie;
mniši množie,
druh před druhem ludbu* tvořie.

Tato slova v srdci znímaj,
na to, duše, rozpomínaj:
peniez v městě
j' ve vší cestě
najvětčí přítel jest jistě!"

The seriousness of this composition is different from the rest of the body of old Czech antimendicantism, but it incorporates the medieval motive of a dialogue between the body and soul, representing the tension between the worldly and spiritual. While Bishop Robert of Olomouc's *Compilatio* only briefly mentions the selling of The Word, this poem has also adopted the issue of holding property that was a pivotal argument of antimendicancy in Western Europe, as mentioned in Section 1.4, although it has not fully incorporated the “Williamist” arguments or eschatological framing. This poem was also recorded around 1320²⁸⁸, almost a century after the arrival of mendicants, and further demonstrated the shift of antimendicant portrayal of the mid-13th century.

The final lyric poem I would like to draw attention to is the very unique composition *Podkoní a žák* (The Stableman and the Student, excerpts in Appendix 7), dated towards the end of the 14th century. Amidst the general concession to western European antimendicant themes, this student's poem takes the form of a dialectic dispute between two young men representing two opposing ways of life. The student defends himself and his lifestyle:

My žáci i také kněžie,
kamž koli po světě běžie,
tot', vedě, malá věc nenie,

287LEHÁR, Jan – STICH, Alexandr: *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku. Kniha textů 1, Od počátků do raného obrození, 9. století - 1. třetina 19. století*. Praha: Lidové Noviny, 2000, p 148.

288Ibid., p 148.

nebojíme se oběšenie.
Ale vy, hubené panošky,
vy nejste bezpečni trošky;
vy strachy zdrastíte kčici,
jedúc mimo šibenici.
Vám se třeba ohlédati
a před sebú se žehnati,
neb jest pilně třeba toho.²⁸⁹

Although it is created for an audience of possibly Dominican novices, perhaps to prepare them to defend themselves against actual public opposition, the lines delivered by the stableman are not without an edge. On the other hand, the poor composure of the novice is in itself detracting to the mendicant's defense, making the poem overall unsympathetic towards the student.

The dispute genre had been popular in European literature since the 13th century; *Podkoní a žák* arrives as a natural permutation. Also, the context of the poem is certainly not lost on today's modern readers any more than it would have resonated with readers in the late Middle Ages - the stableman and the mendicant novice get into a good, old-fashioned, drunken brawl at the local pub. In this lengthy poem, the insults used by the two young men attack the drawbacks to each of their lifestyles, and in turn their defensive statements show what each would like to believe about the better qualities of their chosen path. The antimendicant temperamental arguments of the stableman are met with the sometimes feeble retorts of the student, both demonstrating their side of the conflict.

Conclusion

France and England share several antifraternal trends and themes in regards to the reception of mendicants, although the conflicts at the university in Paris stand as a particular element in French antifraternalism. Germany reflects the standard arguments against mendicants, but reactions to mendicants in Germany is heavily influenced by elements unique to Western (or Germanic) Central Europe. These include resistance to mendicants due to cultural and linguistic divides, sparser urbanization, resistance based on the conflict between the German Holy Roman Emperor and the papacy in Rome, and the emphasis on financial abuses and hypocrisy of mendicants employed by the courtly minnesanger in their political lyric poetry.

Because of the idiosyncracies of Germanic antifraternalism, East Central Europe should be

289LEHÁR, Jan – STICH, Alexandr: *Česká literatura*, 2000, p 161.

considered separately – in this work, regional consideration is limited to Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia and, in due to its fundamental connections to the affairs of the aforementioned regions, Poland. The environment in Eastern Central Europe was unique compared to Italy, France, England and Germany. Due to the limited status of urbanization in the region, mendicants in Bohemia, Moravia and Poland followed different patterns of settlement than in the south. This included a process of invitation and direct patronage by the highest echelons of society, primarily royal women.

The expansion of mendicants in Eastern Central Europe included special attention to the founding of female houses, during which the negotiations of St. Agnes of Bohemia with the papacy directly influenced the development of the Order of Poor Ladies (*Ordo Sanctae Clarae*), in cooperation with St. Clare of Assisi. In partial thanks to the work of St. Agnes in her efforts to secure the privilege of poverty for her convent of St. Francis in Prague, the Hugolinian reforms of women's houses and artificial weakening of the apostolic poverty for northern women's houses were reversed and women's houses were allowed to maintain the same level of absolute poverty as the men's houses.

Another distinct chapter in the settlement of mendicants in Eastern Central Europe includes the issue of mendicants in Moravia. Connected with the condemnation of the Dominican brother Evechardus, Bishop Robert of Olomouc is also accused of denying the stigmata of St. Francis and of hindering the settlement of mendicants in his diocese. Bishop Robert is often cited as one of the notorious antifraternalists in Central Europe, however the evidence supporting this reputation is perhaps insufficient. In examining eleven of Bishop Robert's sermons, and the entirety of his *Compilatio*, a very accepting and mystical understanding of stigmata is demonstrated, which would suggest that – barring a sudden change of theological persuasion – Bishop Robert may not have personally rejected the thesis of stigmata, but rather was being grouped into the accusations surrounding brother Evechardus and an issue with denial of the stigmata of St. Francis affecting Central Europe in general.²⁹⁰ It is possible that the choice to target on Bishop Robert was a culmination of his history of conflict with the papacy.

Considering evidence of the success of non-mendicant monastic and canonical orders (Cistercian, Premonstrasian, Teutonic Knights, Benedictine, etc) after the arrival of mendicants, the rate of mendicant development and the relatively even distribution of progress towards settlement mirrors the rate of continued expansion by of all monastic orders in the region. This implies that the other orders did not suffer a drastic retraction of patronage after the arrival of mendicants. Moreover, it does not indicate any pinpointed obstacle to the settlement of mendicants, as could be seen in Germany (for

²⁹⁰As evidenced by the papal bull *Confessor Domini*, 1237, which was addressed to *all* the faithful of the German nation.

example Cologne) where mendicants were directly prevented from settlement.

Finally, in contrast to the coeval anti-mendicant themes found in poetry and prose in Western Europe and Germany, focusing on arguments of hypocrisy and eschatological framing, anticlerical and antimendicant motifs appearing in the earliest examples lyric poetry are primarily light and sexual in nature. Although very few examples of lyric poetry remain from the 13th century, and among those even fewer that mention monks or clergy at all, several references can be found in the Easter play *Mastičkář*, and in derivative poetry of the 14th century proto-reformers, such as *Naše sestra Jana*, *Stala se jest příhoda*, *O pravdě*, *Spor tělo s duši* and *Podkoní a žák*. By the mid-14th century a shift is evident in the work of proto-reformer, such as Jan Milič, showing an adoption of the antimendicant themes developed in France, England and Germany and the eschatological rhetoric typical of the 13th and 14th centuries.

As can be judged by the primary sources and scholarship available, the reaction to mendicants in Central Europe was in many ways negative in Western/Germanic Central Europe, while relatively neutral in Eastern Central Europe. Although there were isolated incidents of resistance to the mendicant orders, both Franciscans, Dominicans and women's communities found great support for their settlement in the region, moreover, provided for extensively by the nobility to compensate for the lack of urbanization that would have otherwise hindered the mendicants. Although this is not a conclusion to the research waiting to be done, I hope that the cases of St. Agnes, Bishop Robert and the assorted literary examples demonstrate the range of sources available to rectify the perceived lacuna regarding antifraternalism in the Eastern Central Europe region.

Resumé

Záměrem této práce je objasnit zdroje popisující příchod mendikantů do Střední Evropy a zároveň identifikovat zdroje, které obsahují nějaký druh reakce odmítnutí nebo podpory vůči mendikantům. Motivy antifraternalismu stejné jako ty, které byly použity k popisu situace ve Francii, Anglii a Německu, jsou použity jako měřítko pro kategorizaci a kvalifikaci reakcí na mendikanty ve Středovýchodní Evropě.

Mendikantské řády byly založeny v první polovině 13. století a začaly se rozšiřovat po Evropě. Přestože jejich expanze byla nakonec úspěšná, učenci identifikovali několik elementů odporu a argumenty proti mendikantským řádům. Tyto anti – mendikantské argumenty nesouhlasí s *vita apostolica*, *privilegii*, odevzdáváním peněz, kázáním kříže, konflikty s farními mnichy, konflikty s židovskými komunitami, ženami a laiky v řádech, konflikty na poli vzdělání a akty násilí vůči mendikantům, za účelem zaměření průzkumu těchto problémů byla situace mendikantů prověřena ve Francii, Anglii a Německu (Říši).

Pro jasnější pochopením situace mendikantů v tehdejších regionech je možné zčít prověřovat reakce na jejich příchod do Střední Evropy. Zásaditosti specificky spojené s německy hovořícími zeměmi jsou prověřeny zvláště, proto je pozornost zaměřena především na Středovýchodně Evropský region, jmenovitě západní slovanské oblasti – tedy Čechy, Moravu a Slezsko a v některých případech Polsko. Dnešní Slovensko a Maďarsko jsou z této skupiny vynechány. Speciální charakteristiky definující příchod mendikantů do Středovýchodní Evropy jsou: zapojení do křížáckých aktivit, podpora šlechty (zejména žen), zaznamenané anti-mendikantské aktivity na Moravě a popis mendikantů ve staročeské lyrické poezii. Tyto charakteristiky jsou demonstrovány specifickými příklady: role mendikantů v kázáních kříže pro křížové výpravy do Pobaltí, role sv. Anežky v zakládání františkánských klášterů a řádu křížovníků s červenou hvězdou v Praze, antifraternální obvinění biskupa Roberta z Olomouce a výběr lyrické poezie s odkazem na mendikanty a mnichy.

Primary sources

- ANTHONY OF PADUA**, *Sermones dominicales*, in: locatelli, a m., ed: *Anthony of Padua: sermones dominicales*, 3 vols, padua, 1895-1907
- BERNARD OF CLAIRVEAUX** *Sermons on the Song of Songs*. In: EDMONDS, Irene, trans: *Bernard of Clairvaux, On the Song of Songs*, 4 vols., Kalamazoo, Mich., 1971–80.
- BISHOP ROBERT OF OLOMOUC** *Compilatio super Canica canticorum*, In: PUMPROVÁ, Anna: *Robert Olomoucký: Výklad Písňe písni*, Matice moravská : Brno : 2010
- Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215**, In: SCHROEDER H. J.ed.: *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary*, (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1937). pp. 236-296. <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/lateran4.asp>, Last access: 23.4.2013.
- DALIMIL CHRONICLE** In: KRČMOVÁ, Marie: *Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila / ze staročeského originálu přeložila ; přebásnila Hana Vrbová ; úvod, stať o kronice, poznámky a rejstříky napsala a sestavila Marie Bláhová]. . Praha ; Litomyšl : Paseka, 2005*
- GUI DE TOULOUSE**, *Tractatus qui dicitur Regula mercatorum*, In: KAEPPELI, Thomas: “Guido Tolosanus”, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, Rome, Sancta Sabina, t. 2, 1975, p. 74-75, no 1405.
- HUMBERT OF ROMANS**, *On the utility of studies in our order*, In: BRETT, Edward Tracy, *The Life and Works of Humbert of Romans: Fifth Master General of the Dominican Order (1254-1263)*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Department of Publications, 1984
- JAMES LE PALMER** *Omne bonum, fratres mendicantes* In: SANDLER, Lucy Freeman: *Omne Bonum: A Fourteenth-Century Encyclopedia of Universal Knowledge: British Library MSS Royal 6 E VI-6 E VII*, 2 vols, London: Harvey Miller, 1996,
- JORDAN OF GIANO**, *Chronica fratris Jordani*, in: AUWEILER, Edwin J.: *The Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano: A Dissertation*, Kessinger Publishing: 2010, *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, ed. H. Boehmer (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1908), Also: JORDÁN z GIANO, *Kronika Jordána z Giano* , in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, s. 11 - 39.
- KLÁRA Z ASSISI**, *První list sv. Anežce Pražské*, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, pp. 234 – 235.
- KLÁRA Z ASSISI**, *Druhý list sv. Anežce Pražské*, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, pp 236 – 237.
- KLÁRA Z ASSISI**, *Třetí list sv. Anežce Pražské*, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994,

pp. 237 – 239.

KLÁRA Z ASSISI, *Čtvrtý list sv. Anežce Pražské*, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, pp. 239 – 241.

KLÁRA Z ASSISI, *Řehole svaté Kláry*, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, pp 213 – 225.

KLÁRA Z ASSISI, *Závěť svaté Kláry*, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, pp 226 – 230.

Legenda svaté Anežky České, in: *Františkánské prameny II.*, Český Těšín 1994, pp 348-382

Legend of Święty Jacek Odrowąż (St. Hyacinth of Poland), In: Zdanek, Maciej, ed.: *Święty Jacek Odrowąż: Studia i źródła*, Espirit, Krakow, 2007.

MATTHEW PARIS *Chronica Maiora*, In: LUARD, Henry Richards: *Matthæi Parisiensis: Monachi Santi Albani, Chronica Majora*, Longman & Co: 1872.

RICHARD FITZRALPH *Defensio curatorum*, In: PERRY, Aaron Jenkins, ed. – TREVISA, John, trans.,: “Richard FitzRalph's sermon: 'Defensio curatorum' and Methodius: 'þe bygynnyng of þe world and þe ende of worldes'”, with Saint Methodius (of Olympus), Issue 167 of *Dialogus inter militem et clericum*, H.Milford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1925

Rule of St. Benedict, Saint-Gall manuscript, In: FOSSAS, Ignasi M.[et al.]: *Regla per als monjos: text llatí/català*, Barcelona, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997 (Subsidia Monastica, 21)

Sacrum commercium sancti Francisci cum Domina Paupertate. In: BRUFANI, Stefano, ed.: *Sacrum commercium sancti Francisci cum Domina Paupertate*. (Testi, I.) Assisi: Edizioni Porziuncola, 1990.

THOMAS OF CELANO *The first life of St. Francis of Assisi* In: STACE, Christopher, trans.: *The first life of : St. Francis of Assisi*, Caledonian International, Glasgow, 2000

WILLIAM OF PAGULA, *Summa summarum*, In: BOYLE, Leonard E. *A Study of the Works Attributed to William of Pagula: With Special Reference to the Oculus Sacerdotis and Summa Summarum*, Volume 1 University of Oxford, 1956

Selected Documents relevant to St. Agnes of Bohemia (Sv. Anežka Česka)

Sincerum animi, 08/30/1234 – From Gregory IX, In praise of Agnes.

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 134-35, ep.138. <http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/561.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Cum relicta seculi vanitate, 05/18/1235 –From Gregory IX, In praise of Agnes.

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 156, ep.165; also Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolarius Regni Bohemiae, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague, 1942)ep.110.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/562.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Dilecte filie, 7/25/1235 – From Gregory IX, approving the monastery of St. Francis in Prague.

Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolarius Regni Bohemiae, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague: Wiesner, 1942), 3.1, ep.118; Bullarium Franciscanum, 1, p.171-72, ep.178.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/833.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Cum seculi vanitate relicta, 04/04/1237 –From Gregory IX,

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 213, ep.222.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/564.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Cum sicut propositum, 4/9/1237 From Gregory IX, weakening the rule at St. Francis in consideration of climate.

Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolarius Regni Bohemiae, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague: Wiesner, 1942), 3.1, ep.156; Bullarium Franciscanum, 1, p.215, ep.225.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/835.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Prudentibus virginibus, 4/14/1237 – From Gregory IX, in regards to the monastery, hospital and property.

Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolarius Regni Bohemiae, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague: Wiesner, 1942), 3.1, ep.159; Bullarium Franciscanum, 1, p.215-16, ep.226.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/836.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Pia credulitate tenentes, 04/15/1238 – –From Gregory IX, Agnes wins the grant of the privilege of poverty for St. Francis in Prague.

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 236-7, ep.255.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/565.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

De Conditoris omnium, 05/09/1238 –From Gregory IX,

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 241-42, ep.263.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/567.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Angelis gaudium, 05/11/1238 - --From Gregory IX, weakening the rules of poverty for Agnes' monastery.

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 242-44, ep.264.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/568.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Ex parte carissimae, 12/18/1238 – From Gregory IX, weakening the fasting requirements.

Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolarius Regni Bohemiae, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague: Wiesner, 1942), 3.2, ep.203; Bullarium Franciscanum, 1, p.258-59, ep.286.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/837.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Piis votis omnium, 11/13/1243 – From Innocent IV, again weakening the poverty at St. Francis.

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 314-15, ep.16.

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/570.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

In divini timoris, 11/13/1243 – From Innocent IV

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 315-17, ep.17

<http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/571.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

In nomine sancte trinitati, before 2/6/1236 - A letter from Wenceslaus I, king of Bohemia to Agnes, in support.

Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolarius Regni Bohemiae, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague: Wiesner, 1942), 3.1, ep.130, <http://epistolae.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/letter/834.html> Accessed: 4.24.2013

Selected Papal Documents Relevant to Bishop Robert

Non minus dolentes 1237 - condemnation of a Dominican friar "Evechardus," for his sermon delivered in the Silesian city of Opava.

Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, 1 (Rome: Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1759, repr. Santa Maria degli Angeli: Proziuncola, 1983), 214
Confessor Domini 1237 - addressing all the faithful of the Germanic nation, and entreats them to reject untruths circulating about the stigmata of St. Francis.

Bullarium Diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum, Taurinensis editio, Tomus III, Augustae Taurinorum, DALMAZZO, Seb. Franco and Henrico, eds., 1857-72. p 497
Usque ad terminus 1237 - Letter to Bishop Robert for allowing preaching against the thesis of the stigmata, specifically regarding the depiction of stigmata and the case of St. Francis.

Codex diplomaticus nec non epistolaris regni Bohemiae. FRIEDRICH, G. (ed.).
Tomus III. Pars 1. Praha 1942. č. 157, s. 190-192

Secondary Materials

BAILEY, Michael D.: *Religious Poverty, Mendicancy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages* in Church History, 72:3 (September 2003, The American Society of Church History) pp 457-483.

BARRACLOUGH, Geoffrey. *The Medieval Papacy*. New York 1968.

BARBER, Malcom *The Two Cities: Medieval Europe 1050-1320*, Routledge, 2004.

BENEŠ, Petr Regalát Th.D.– HLAVÁČEK, Petr – POSPÍŠIL, Ctirad V. – et al: *Františkánství v kontaktech s jiným a cizím*, Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta: Filosofia, 2009.

-----: *Hagiografie sv. Františka v obrazech ze 13. Století* <http://www.frantiskanstvi.cz/regalat-hagio/hagiografie%20ii%20obrazy.doc> Last accessed: 24.4.2013.

BEREND, Ivan T: *The Historical Evolution of Eastern Europe as a Region*. In: *International Organization*, Vol. 40, No. 2, *Power, Purpose and Collective Choice: Economic Strategy in Socialist States* (Spring 1986), pp 329-346, MIT Press: Boston 1986.

BERMAN, Constance Hoffman: *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*, University of Pennsylvania Press: 2000,2010.

BLÁHOVÁ, Marie, ed.: *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila : v kontextu středověké historiografie latinského kulturního okruhu a její pramenná hodnota*. Díl 3, *Historický komentář, rejstřík*, Praha : Academia, 1995.

BLOCK, Marc. *Feudal Society: Vol 1: The Growth of Ties of Dependence; Feudal Society: Vol 2: Social Classes and Political Organisation*, University of Chicago Press: 1989.

BOROVSKÝ, Tomáš: *Kláštery, panovník, a zakladatelé na středověké Moravě*, Matice moravská,

Brno, 2005

- BOYLE, Leonard E. *A Study of the Works Attributed to William of Pagula: With Special Reference to the Oculus Sacerdotis and Summa Summarum*, Volume 1 University of Oxford, 1956
- BUDILOVÁ, Pavla: *Františkáni v Plzni: 1293-2010* . Plzeň, 2011.
- CLEVE, T.C. Van: *Emperor Fredrick II of Hohenstaufen*, Oxford, 1972 .
- CLOPPER, Lawrence M.: *Langland and the Franciscans on Dominum*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life* ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV, 2009.
- COAKLEY, John: *Gender and the Authroity of Friars: The Significance of Holy Women for Thirteenth-Century Franciscans and Dominicans*, in: *Church History*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Dec. 1991), pp 445-460. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991.
- COHEN, Jeremy. *The Friars and the Jews*, Cornell Univeristy Press, 1984.
- COLEMAN, Janet: "Using, Not Owning - Duties, Not Rights" *The Consequences of Some Franciscan Perspectives on Politics*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life* ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV: 2009.
- COURTENAY, William J: *Franciscan Learning: University education and biblical exegesis*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner, Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV: 2009.
- ČERNUŠAK, Tomáš – PROKOP, Augustin – NĚMEC, Damián, eds.: *Historie Dominikánů v českých zemích*, Krystal: 2001.
- ČERNÝ, Václav: *Staročeská Milostná lykrika*, Vydavatelstvo Družstevní práce: Praha: 1948.
- DAVIDSON, Arnold I.: *Miracles of Bodily Transformations, or How St. Francis Recieved the Stigmata*, in: *Critical Inquiry* 35 (Spring 2009), Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 2009 pp 451-480 The body of this text originally appeared as *Miracles of Bodily Transformation, or, How St. Francis Received the Stigmata*, in: *Picturing Science, Producing Art*, ed. Caroline A. Jones and Peter Galison (New York, 1998), pp. 101–24.
- DE VRIES, Jan: *European Urbanization 1500-1800*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- DUFEIL, Michel-Marie: *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne, 1250-1259*, in: *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France*, 1974, Volume 60, No. 164, pp. 109-111.
- DIPPLE, Geoffrey: *Si sind all glichsner: Antifraternalism in Medieval and Renaissance German Literature*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, eds. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV: 2009.
- DRESSER Robert M.: *'Sacrum commercium,' an early Franciscan tract, as theological literature*,

- ETD Collection for Fordham University: 1990.
- FIALA, Jiří: *Dějiny města Olomouce v datech I (do roku 1526)*, Danal: Olomouc, 1995.
- FOSSAS, Ignasi M.[et al.]: *Regla per als monjos: text llatí/català*, In: *Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat*, Subsidia Monastica, 21, Barcelona: 1997.
- FRANK, Thomas: *Exploring the Boundries of Law in the Middle Ages: Franciscan Debates on Poverty, Property, and Inheritance*, in: *Law and Literature*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer 2008), pp 243-260, University of California Press: 2008.
- FREED, John B.: *The Friars and German Society in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1977.
- : *The mendicant orders in Germany 1219-73*, Princeton University PhD thesis 1969.
- GELTNER, G.: *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance, and Rememberance*, Oxford University Press, 2012.
- trans.: *William of Saint-Amour: De periculis novissimorum temporum*. Peeters Publishers: 2008.
- : *Faux Semblants : Antifraternalism Reconsidered in Jean de Meun and Chaucer*, in: *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 101, No. 4, Fall 2004, Univeristy of North Carolina Press,, 2004. pp 357-380.
- .: *William of St. Amour's De periculis novissimorum temporum: A false start to medieval antifraternalism?*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV: 2009, 105-118.
- GIEYSZTOR, Aleksander: *L'Europe nouvelle autour de l' An Mil. La papauté, l'Empire et les "nouveaux venus"*, Rome, 1997.
- GÖBEL, F. ed.: *Bertholds Predigten*, Regensburg: 1905.
- GÓRECKI, Piotr S. – DEUSEN, Nancy van, eds: *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages: a cultural history*, Tauris Academic Studies: London, 2009.
- GRUNDMANN, Herbert: *Religious movements in the Middle Ages: the historical links between heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the women's religious movement in the twelfth and thirteenth century, with the historical foundations of German mysticism*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.
- HALECKI, Oscar: *The Borderlands of Western Civilization. A history of East Central Europe*, New York: Ronals, 1952.
- HALVERSON, James L., ed.: *Contesting Christendom: Readings in Medieval Religion and Culture*, Rowan & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2008.
- HLAVÁČEK, Petr: *"Čeští františkáni na přelomu středověku a novověku*, Academia: Praha: 2005.

- HLINKA, Vít: *Olomoucký biskup Robert*, in: *Cisterciáci na Moravě*, ed. Miloslav Pojsl, Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci: Olomouc: 2006 p 79-92.
- HOFFMANN, František: *Středověké město v Čechách a na Moravě*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 1992, 2009.
- HOUŠKA P. A.: *České františkánství*, Praha 1996.
- HUGHES, Malcolm K., – DIAZ, Henry F.: *Was there a 'medieval warm period', and if so, where and when?* In: *Climatic Change*. March 1994, Volume 26, Issue 2-3, pp 109-142.
- JIRÁSKO, Luděk: *Kláštery ve městech v Čechách a na Moravě ve 13. století*, *Hospodářské dějiny* 4, 1979, s. 133-159.
- KALNÝ, Mojmir Ing: *Stručný přehled osudů české církve ve 2. tisíciletí se zvláštním zřetelem ke vztahu státu k církvi a k systému financování církve*. http://www.klastervyssibrod.cz/_d/Historie-cirkevniho-majetku.pdf, Accessed: 24.4.2013.
- KLANICZAY, Gábor: *The Birth of a New Europe About 1000 CE: Conversion, Transfer of Institutional Models, New Dynamics*, in: *Eurasian Transformations, Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries: Crystalizations, Divergences, Renaissance*, ed. Johann P. Arnason and Björn Wittrock, Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- : *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, trans. Éva Pálmai, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2000.
- KLÁPŠTĚ, Jan: *Proměna českých zemí ve středověku*, Praha 2006.
- KLOCZOWSKI, Jerzy: *A history of Polish Christianity*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- KOPECKÝ, Milan: Chapters 2-3 in: KUBIČEK, Tomáš: *Literární Morava*, in: *Vlastivěda moravská : země a lid : nová řada*. Sv. 11, skolektivem. Brno: Muzejní a vlastivědná společnost, 2002.
- KYBAL, Vlastimil: *Matěj z Janova : jeho život, spisy a učení*, Mezinárodní centrum pro kulturní a náboženský dialog, Brno : L. Marek, 2000.
- : *Svatá Anežka Česká : historický obraz ze 13. století*, Mezinárodní centrum pro kulturní a náboženský dialog, Brno: L. Marek, 2001.
- LAMBERT, Malcom: *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus*, reprint of the 2nd edition, Blackwell Publishers: Oxford, 1994.
- LEFF, Gordon: *Heresy in the later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, C. 1250-1450*, Manchester University Press, 1999, pp 83-100.
- LEHÁR, Jan: *Česká středověká lyrika*, Vyšehrad: Praha, 1990.

- LITTLE, A.G. : *Chronicles of the mendicant friars : in Franciscan Papers, Lists, and Documents*, Publications of the University of Manchester, 284; Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, 81, Manchester; Manchester University Press, 1943.
- LITTLE, Lester K.: *Imitatio Francisci: The Influence of Francis of Assisi on Late Medieval Religious Life*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner, Leiden: Koninklijk Brill NV: 2009.
- : *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- MAIER, Christoph T.: *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- : *Crusade Propaganda and Ideology: Model Sermons for the Preaching of the Cross*, Cambridge University Press: 2000.
- MCDONNELL, *Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture: with special emphasis on the Belgian scene*. Octagon Books, 1969.
- McMICHAEL, Steven J. – MYER, Susan E., eds.: *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Brill: Leiden, 2004.
- MERTENS, Volker, *Berthold von Regensburg*, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters, Bd. 1*, München, Zürich: Artemis 1980, Sp.2035, <http://www.berthold-von-regensburg.de/bibliographie.htm>, accessed 4.11.2013
- MLADĚJOVSKÁ, M.: *Legenda o bl. Anežce, Chebské zlomky*, Praha, 1948.
- MOORE , John Clare: *Pope Innocent III: To Root Up and to Plant*, Brill: Leiden, Boston, 2003.
- MORÉE, Peter C. A.: *Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Bohemia*, Emam, 1999.
- MUELLER, Joan: *A Companion to Clare of Assisi: Life, Writings, and Spirituality*, Brill: Leiden, 2010.
- MULHAHEY, M.M.: *First the Bow is Bent in Study: Dominican Education before 1350*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies; 1998.
- NECHUTOVÁ, Jana: *Latinská literatura českého středověku do r. 1400*, Vyšehrad: Praha: 2000.
- NEWMAN, Barbora: *The Heretic Saint: Guglielma of Bohemia, Milan, and Brunate*, in: *Church History*, Vol. 74, No. 1, March 2005. The American Society of Church History: 2005 pp 1-38.
- POJSL, Miroslav, ed.: *Cisterciáci na Moravě: sborník k 800. výročí příchodu cisterciáků na Moravu a počátek Velehradu*, Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci: 2006.
- POLC, Jaroslav: *Svěťice Anežka Přemyslovna*, Praha, 1989.
- POLYKARP: *Dějiny klášterů sv. Otce Františka v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku*. Krnov : Zahrádka sv. Františka, 1889, System Kramerius; Digitální knihovna Městské knihovny v Praze,

- <http://kramerius.mlp.cz/kramerius/MShowMonograph.do?id=6257>, Accessed: 23.4.2013.
- POPÍŠILOVÁ, S.M. Ludmila OSF: *Anežka a její boj o řeholi*, in: *Církev, žena a společnost ve středověku*, Usti nad Orlicí, 2010.
- : *Sv. Klára z Assisi a Sv. Anežka Česká*. Praha: 2010.
- POSTAN, M.M.: *The Medieval Economy and Society: An Economic History of Britain, 1100-1500*, University of California Press; 1st edition, 1973.
- PUČALIK, Marek O.Cr.: *Církev, žena a společnost ve středověku : svatá Anežka Česká a její doba* , Ústí nad Orlicí: 2010.
- PUMPROVÁ, Anna: *Robert Olomoucký: Výklad Písňe písni*, Matice moravská: Brno, 2010.
- RIGG, A.G.: *Satire*, in: *Medieval Latin, An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg, Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press: 1996, pp 562-568.
- ROBINSON, Jonathan: *Qui praedicat periculum in illo peribit: William of St.-Amour's Anti-Mendicant Sermons*, in: *Weapons of Mass Instruction — A St. Michael's College Symposium*, Joseph Goering, Francesco Guardiani, Giulio Silano eds. Ottawa: Legas, 2008
- Joseph Goering, Francesco Guardiani, Giulio Silano eds. Ottawa: Legas, 2008.
- ROEST, Bert : *A history of Franciscan Education (c. 1210-1517)*, In: *Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, XI*, Leiden: 2000.
- : *Reading the Book of History: Intellectual Contexts and Educational Functions of Franciscan Historiography 1226 -ca.1350*, Groningen, 1996
- ROSENWEIN, B. – LITTLE, L. K.: *Social Meaning in the Monastic and Mendicant Spiritualities*, in: *Past and Present*, No. 63, (May, 1974) Oxford: 1974, pp 4-32.
- ŠANTORA, Jan: *Usídlení mendikantů v moravských městech ve 13.století*, bakalařska diplomova prace, Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Tomáš Borovsky, Ph.D. Brno 2007.
- ŠEBÁNEK, J.: *Kdo byl notář Otakar 5*. In: *Studie k české diplomatice doby přemyslovské*. Praha 1959, s. 3-39,
- ŠEBÁNEK J.: *Notář Otakar 5 a nejstarší listiny oslavanské a velehradské*. Matice Morava, č. 67, 1947, s. 222-290.
- SCHROEDER, H. J.: *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary*, St. Louis: B. Herder, 1937. pp. 236-296
- ŠEDIVÝ, Juraj: *Studie: Chápaní etník v nemeckých konikách a obraz starých maďarovna prelome 1. a 2. tisícročia*, in: *Historický Časopis*, Vol. 44, 1996, No. 3, p 359.
- SVOBODOVÁ, Eva: *Olomoucký Biskup Robert a církevní řády na Moravě*, Magisterská diplomová

- práce, vedoucí práce: Jan Stejskal, Olomouc, 2010.
- SWANSON, R.N.: *Religion and Devotion in Europe: c. 1215-c. 1515* Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- SZITTYA, Penn: *Kicking the habit*, in: *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, ed. Michael F. Cusato and G. Geltner, Leiden: Koninklijkr Brill NV: 2009, pp 105-118.
- : *The Friar as False Apostle: Antifraternal Exegesis and the 'Summoner's Tale'*, In: *Studies in Philosophy*, Vol. 71, Np. 1, Jan 1974, University of North Carolina Press 1974, pp 19-46.
- : *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- THOMSON, S. Harrison: *Pre-Hussite Heresy in Bohemia*, in: *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 48., No. 189 (Jan., 1933), pp. 23-42 Oxford University Press: 1933.
- VAUCHEZ, André: *Les Stigmates de Saint Franc,ois et leurs de'tracteurs dans les derniers sie`cles du moyen âge*, In: *Me'langes d'arche'ologie et d'histoire*, Vol.80, no. 2, 1968, pp 598–99.
- VELTRUSKY, Jarmila F.: *Posvátné a světské : osm studií o starém českém divadle*, Praha: Divadelní ústav, 2006.
- VYSKOČIL, J.K.: *Legenda blahoslavené Anežky a čtyři sv. Kláry: kritický rozbor textový i věcný legendy a čtyř listů s nejstarším-původním- textem milánského rukopisu*, Universum, 1932.
- WALLWORK, Ernest: *Religion and Social Structure in the Division of Labor*, in: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 86, No. 1 (Mar. 1984) pp 43-64, Wiley: 1984.
- ZEMAN, J.K.: *Restitution and Dissent in the Late Medieval Renewal Movements: The Waldensians, the Hussites and the Bohemian Brethren*. In: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Mar. 1976),pp 7-27, Oxford University Press: 1976.
- ŽEMLIČKA, Josef : *Teritus rex Bohemorum: Přemysl Otakar I., král na rozhraní epoch*, in: *Cisterciáci na Moravě*, ed. Miloslav Pojzl, p 42-52, Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci: Olomouc: 2006.

List of Appendix Items:

Appendix 1: Table of Donation Data for Monasteries in Moravia until 1300	83
Appendix 2: <i>Mastičkář</i>	85
Appendix 3: <i>Naše sestra Jana</i>	90
Appendix 4: <i>Stala se jest příhoda</i>	91
Appendix 5: <i>O pravdě</i>	92
Appendix 6: <i>Spor tělo s duši</i>	93
Appendix 7: <i>Podkoni a žák</i>	94

Appendix 1: Table of Donation Data for Monasteries in Moravia until 1300

From: BOROVSKEÝ, Tomáš, *Kláštery, panovník a zakladatelé na středověké Moravě*, Matice moravská, Brno, 2005, pp 50-53.

Tabulka 2a

Období	Počet donaci	Šlechtické donace	Panovnické donace	ostatní	Vlastní aktivity
1197-1230	16+6	5+2	8+4	3	3

počet obdarovaných klášterů: 7

Tabulka 2b

Období	Počet donaci	Šlechtické donace	Panovnické donace	ostatní	Vlastní aktivity
1231-1253	34+3	10+1	21+1	3+1	3

počet obdarovaných klášterů:12

Tabulka 2c

Období	Počet donaci	Šlechtické donace	Panovnické donace	ostatní	Vlastní aktivity
1253-1278	25+2	21+2	1	3	8

počet obdarovaných klášterů:11

Tabulka 2d

Období	Počet donaci	Šlechtické donace	Panovnické donace	ostatní	Vlastní aktivity
1278-1306	40	30	9	1	15

počet obdarovaných klášterů:16

Tabulka 2e

Období	Počet donaci	Šlechtické donace	Panovnické donace	ostatní	Vlastní aktivity
1306-1333	38	24	8	6	16

počet obdarovaných klášterů:21

Tabulka 2f

Období	Počet donaci	Šlechtické donace	Panovnické donace	ostatní	Vlastní aktivity
1197-1333	153+11	90+5	47+5	16+1	45

počet obdarovaných klášterů:30

The author's sample of the top 12 monasteries out of the 30 analyzed, who gained 136 of the 153+11 donations.

Tabulka 3

Klášter	Počet donaci	Panovnické donace	Šlechtické donace	ostatní
Cisterciáčky Oslavany	29	4	22	3
Cisterciáci Velehrad	18	6	10	2
Cistersiáci Žd'ár	14	1	13	-
Premonstráti Hradiště	13	3	9	1
Cisterciáčky Staré Brno	12	7	5	2
Premonstráti Louka	11	4	5	2
Cisterciáčky Tišnov	9	6	2	1
Řeholnice u sv. Petra (Jakuba) v Olomouci	8	3	1	4
Klarisky Znojmo	8	3	4	1
Premonstráti Zábřovice	7	2	5	-
Harburky (dominikánky) Brno	7	3	-	4

Appendix 2: Mastičkář

Both texts are from: ČERNÝ, Václav, *Staročeská milostná lyrika*, Praha 1999.

MASTIČKÁŘ MUZEJNÍ

RUBÍN (příběhne):

Sed', mistře, sed', jáz k tobě běžu!
Snad se tobě dobře hoziu.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Vítaj milý Idonechu!

Dávě lidem dosti smiechu.

Pověz mi, kak ti pravé jmě dějú,
ať s tobú cěle sděju.

RUBÍN:

Mistře, jsem ti dvorný holomek, dějút'
mi Rubín z Benátek.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Pověz mi to, Rubíne,
co chceš vzieti ote mne?

RUBÍN:

Mistře, od tebe chcu vzieti hirnec
kysělicě

a k tomu tři nové lžicě.

Móž-li mi to od tebe přijíti,
chcu jáz ovšem tvój rád býti.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne, to ti vše jáz rád dám,
co jsi potřéboval sám.

Jedno na to všdy ptaj
a těch miest pytaj,

kde bychom mohli svój krám vyklásti
a své masti draho prodati.

RUBÍN:

Mistře, hin' jsú miesta sdravá
a v nich jest krásná úprava.

Tu rač své seděnie jmiati
a své drahé masti vyniati.

Mistře, vstúpě na Tuť' o stoliciu,
posadiž k sobě svú ženu holicíu. - Silete!

(Potom zpívají s Pustrpalkem píseň):

"Sed', vem přišel mistr Ipokras
de gratia divina!

Neniet horšieho v tento čas
in arte medicína.

Komu která nemoc škodí
a chtěl by rád živ býti,

on jeho chce usdraviti,
žet' musí dušě zbyti."

(Pak říká):

Poslúchajte, dobří lidie,
mnoho vám radosti přibude,
těch novin, jěž vám povědě,
jěž velmi užitečné vědě.

A vy, baby, své šeptanie
puste i vše klevetanie,
v čas ti milčeti neškodí.

Poslúchajtež, dobřě vem hodi!

Přišel' je host ovšem slavný,

lékař múdry, chytrý, dávný,
vám bohdá na vši útěchu.

Neniet' nic podobno k smiechu!

Což pravíu, věřte mi jistě,
jakžto rožc-<ě> na siej tistě!

Ni v Čechách, ni u Moravě,

jakžto učení mistří pravie,

ni v Rakúsiech, ni v Uhřiech,

ni u Bavořiech ani v Rusiech,

ni u Polaniech, ni v Korutaniech,

právět vešde jeho jmě světie,

krátčě řkúce, po všem světě,

nikdiež jemu nenie rovně,

kromě žet' pirdí neskrovně.

I jmát' také drahé masti,

ježť jest přinesl z daleké vlasti,

jimiž nemoci všeliké,

rány kakož koli veliké

zacěli bez pomeškánie.

Bóh jeho poraz, ktož jho hanie!

Ktož je boden nebo sěčen

neb snad palicěmi měčen,

neb snad jmá-li v svém ušě zpary,

přide-li k mému mistří s dary,

mój mistr jeho tak naučí:

pomaže sě, jako pes vskučí

a potom sě náhle vzpručí.

A vy, páni, chcete-li dobří býti,

móžete jej kyji býti. - Silete!

(Domluvív, vběhne mezi lidi.)

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne! Rubíne!

(Rubín neodpovídá.)

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne, vo pístu?

RUBÍN:

Sed', mistře, dirži za řit tistu.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne, vo pístu kvest?

RUBÍN:

Sed', mistře, chlupatú tistu za pezď.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne! Rubíne!

RUBÍN:

Co kážeš, mistře Severíne?

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Milý Rubíne, kde sě tak dlúho tkáš,
že o svém mistřě ničse netbáš?

RUBÍN:

Mistře, v ónomno biech počal lidi léčiti,

tu mi počěchu staré báby pod nos

pzdieti. -Mistře, v ónomno kútě biech,

tu mi sě sta dvorný smiech,

rozedřěchu mi s puškami měch.

Potom sem k tobě běžěti uchvátil,

abych po tobě vešken liud obrátil. -

Silete!

MASTIČKÁŘ (volá dvakrát):

Rubíne!

(Rubín neodpovídá. Mastičkář volá

podruhé. Rubín odpoví jako dřive.

Mastičkář volá potřetí):

Rubíne!

(Rubín přicházeje mluví jako dřive.)

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Milý Rubíne! (jako dřive.)

RUBÍN:

Milý mistře, ty všdy na mě křikáš

i svém hněvem na mě kdýkáš!

U velikém sě mistrovstvě znáš,

však proto i hovna júz nejmáš.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Toť je ot starých slýcháno

i u Písmě také jest to psáno:

Ač co s bláznem kdy ulovíš,

ale nerovně s ním rozdělíš.

RUBÍN:

Tak sě musí vešdy státi,

<žet'> sě zlob zlobí <ob>rátí

a dobré dobrým sě oplatí,

ktož zle myslí, ten všdy ztratí.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne, pust'vě tento hněv na stranu!

Hověž lépe svému pánu!

Budevě v ten čas bohata,

mine najú všě zlá ztráta.

RUBÍN:

Takož, milý mistře, tako,

tiehněvě oba za jednako !

Vše po najú vólú bude,

potom náma d'ábel shude. - Silete!

MASTIČKÁŘ (volá třikrát):

Rubíne!

RUBÍN (dvakrát neodpoví. Přichází na

třetí zavolání):

Co kážeš, mistře Severíne?

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne, rozprostrí mój krám,
ať s' jáz sde liudem znáti dám!
RUBÍN:
Prav to každý juž vás druh k druhu,
že ke všelikému neduhu
i ke všelikéj nemoci
mého mistra masti mohú spomoci.
Ktož jmá ktorú nádchu v nozě,
od tohoť jmá mléko kozie.
A ktož jmá zimnici v týlu
neb snad neskrovnú kýlu
neb snad jmu dna lámá uši
neb jmá snad čirvy v duši,
to vše mój mistr usdraví
í všie nemoci zbaví.
MASTIČKÁŘ:
Rubíne, skóro-li mé masti budú?
RUBÍN:
Jednak, mistře, před tobú budú,
až jich z pytlíka dobudu.
MASTIČKÁŘ:
Rubíne, južť je počal mazanec kvísti.
Rač mi masti sém mé vyčísti!
(Pokračuje):
Kto chcete rady slyšeti,
můžete sém rádi hleděti!
RUBÍN:
Požehnaj mě, Boží synu i svatý Duše,
ať mne ďábel nepokúšie!
(Dále mluví):
Toto ti je, mistře, pírva puška,
od téť s' počíná vole jako hruška;
najpírveť bude jako dýně
a potom bude jako skříně.
Toto je, mistře, puška druhá,
od téť zpleskajú vole tuhá;
coť ona pírva neduha zapudí,
a tatoť více neduha zbudí.
A toto ti jest puška třetíe,
pro tuť baby s skřietkem k čertu vzletie.
Toto ti je, mistře, puška čtvrtá,
tať pohříchu jako nebožezem virtá.
A u pátěj měl jsem tři svirčky
a pól čtverta komára;
tu je snědla onano baba stará.
Tato ti jest, mistře, mast z Babyloně;
v niejť je taká drahá vuoně,
ktož jie kúpí, tako tvirdie,
pójde od nie pzdě a pirdě.
A toto ti jest mast tak drahá,
žeť jie nejmá Viedně ani Praha.
Činila ju paní mladá,
vše z komárového sádla,
pzdin k niej málo pričínila,
aby birzo nezvěťřela.
Tuť mi všickni najlépe chválé.
Pompkni jie tam k sobě dále,

ať jie každý nepokúšie;
tať jedno k milosti slušie!
A tatoť, mistře, najlépe vonie;
znamenaj, co je do nie!
Bych jie komu v zuby podal,
že bych to vám viděti dal,
všdy by s' dřéve zatočil,
než by jednu nohú kročil.
**A tuto mast činil mnich v chyšcě
mnich sedě na jěptišcě.**
**Ktož jie z vás okusí kolí,
vstane jmu jako pól žebračie holi.**
A to jest mast nade všě masti,
ale nenieť jie v téjto vlasti.
Tlukúť jiu žáci na školném prazě
leč buď v teple, leč na mrazě.
Ale nemož-ti jie žvátí,
jedno oblú v život cpátí.
Ale to z vás každá věz,
žeť pěkně léčí bez peněz.
Pakli nepěkná přide s dary,
tėjť lacniej dadie páry,
buď od čirta, buď od chlapa,
i posledniej dadie kvapa.
A pakli je v kteréj nemoci,
kažte jiej přijíti na tři noci,
budeť sdráva jako ryba,
neb tú mastiú nebývá chyba.
A jiných mastí jmáš dosti,
prodávajž jě, ažť někto stepe tvé kosti. -
Silete!
(K Pustrpalkovi):
Birzo masti natluc dosti,
po čas budem mieti hosti!
Dřéves mi jie byl dal málo,
až s' jie mnohým nedostalo.
Přikydníž mi jie sém více,
ať nečakajú stojeece!
Jiných, mistře, pušek jmáš piln krám
a z těch učiniš, co chceš sám.
(Rubín běží hned mezi lid.)
MASTIČKÁŘ:
Rubíne! Rubíne!
(Dále praví):
Hý, Rubíne, žeť vran oka nevykline,
že mój tih cný pro tě hyne!
Rubíne, móžeš prudkým, zlým,
nevěrným synem býti,
že kdy tebe volajiu, a ty nechceš ke mně
přijíti?
RUBÍN:
É, žádný mistře, nemluv mi na hanbu
mnoho,
neb sem nedóstojen slova toho.
Neb kdež jáz stojiu neb chozu,
tuť vešdy tvú čest ploziu.
MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne, mój věrný slúho,
tuto býti nemóžem dlúho.
Nechce k náma i jeden kupec přijíti,
juž musívě odsud přič jíti.
RUBÍN:
É, žádný mistře, rač vesel býti,
chce k náma dobrý' kupec přijíti.
Vizut' ondeno dobrého druhu syna,
a u něho jest veliká lysina.
Bude náma zaplacena tohoto postu
vyzina,
jež lepší bude než s veliky noci kozina.
MASTIČKÁŘ:
Slyšal sem, Rubíne, zvěstě,
že jsú sde tři panie u městě,
a tyť, Rubíne, dobrých mastí ptajú.
A zdať ty mne, Rubíne, neznajú?
Zdát mi s' ežť ondeno stojie,
ežť s' o nich liudé brojje.
Doběhni tam, Rubíne, k nim
a cestu ukaž ke mně jim!
RUBÍN
(k Mariím):
Dobrojtro vám, krásné panie!
Vy tepírv jdete zejspanie
a nesúce hlavy jako lanie?
Slyšal jsem, že drahých mastí ptáte!
Hin jich u mého mistra plín krám jmáte.
— Silete!
PRVNÍ MARIE (ihned zpívá):
Omnipotens pater altissime,
angelorum rector mitissime,
quid faciemus nos miserrime?
Heu, quantus est noster dolor!
(Potom říká):
Hospodine všemohúci,
anjelský králu žádúci!
I co je nám sobě sdieti,
že nemóžem tebe viděti?
DRUHÁ MARIE (zpívá):
Amisimus enim solacium,
Ihesum Christum, Marie filium.
Ipse erat nostra redempcio.
Heu, quantus est noster dolor!
(Potom říká):
Ztratily smy mistra svého,
Jesu Krista nebeského.
Ztratily smy svú útěchu,
ješto nám Židie odjěchu,
Jesu Krista laskavého,
přieteľa ovšem věrného,
jenž jest tírpeľ za všě za ny
na svém těle lutné rány.
TŘETÍ MARIE (zpívá):
Sed eamus unguentum emere,
cum quo bene possumus ungere
corpus Domini sacratum.

(Potom říká):

Jako se ovčičky rozběhují,
kdyžto pastušky nejmajú,
takéž my bez mistra svého,
Jesu Krista nebeského,
ješto nás často utěšoval
a mnoho nemocných usdravoval.

MASTIČKÁŘ (zpívá):

Huc propius flentes accedite,
hoc unguentum si vultis emere,
cum quo bene potestis ungere
corpus Domini sacratum.

MARIE (zpívají, obráteny k mastičkáři):

Dic tu nobis, mercator iuvenis,
hoc unguentum si tu vendideris,
dic precium, quod tibi dabimus.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Sěmo blíže přistúpite
a u mne masti kúpite!

(K Rubínovi):

Vstaň, Rubíne, volaj na ně!
Viz umirlcé bez pomeškáme,
těmto paniem na pokušenie
a mým mastem na pochválenie.
(Přichází Abraham a nese s Rubínem
svého syna.)

ABRAHÁM:

Bych mohl vzvědėti od mistra Severína,
by mi mohl uléčiti mého syna,
chtěl bych jemu <dati> tři hříby a pól
sýra.

(Jde k mastičkáři):

Vítaj, mistře cný a slovutný!
Jáz sem přišel k tobě smutný,
hořem sám nečuju sebe!
Protož snažně prošu tebe,
by ráčil mému synu z mirtvých kázati
vstáti.

Chtl' bych mnoho zlata dáti.
pohynulo nebožátko!

Předivné bieše děťátko!

...bielý chléb jedieše,

a o ržěném nerodieše.

A když na kampna vsedieše,
tehdy vidieše,

co se prostřéd jistby dějieše.

Také dobrú vášniu jmějieše:

když pivo uzrieše,

na vodu oka neprodrieše.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Abrahame, to já tobě chcu řeci,

že já tvého syna uléčiu,

ač mi dáš tři hřivny zlata

a k tomu svú dceř Meču.

ABRAHÁM:

Mistře, to ti vše rád dám,

cos potřěboval sám.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Pomáhaj mi, Boží synu,
ať jáz u méj pravdě nehynu!

Ve jmě božie jáz tě mažiu,

jiužť chytrosti vstáti kážiu!

I co ty ležíš, Izáku,

čině otcu žalost takú?

Vstaň, daj chválu Hospodinu,

svaté Mařie, jejie synu!

(Po těchto slovech mu lijí kvasnice na
zadnici.)

IZÁK (vstáváje):

Avech, auvech, avech, ach!

Kak to, mistře, dosti spach,

avšak jako z mirtvých vstach,

k tomu se bezmál neosrach.

Děkuju tobě, mistře, z toho,

ež mi učinil cti přieliš mnoho.

Jiní mistři po svém právu

maží svými mastmi hlavu,

ale tys mi, mistře, dobře zhodil,

ež mi všichnu řit mastiú oblil. — Silete!

MASTIČKÁŘ (k Mariim):

Milé panie, sém vítajte,

co vem třeba, toho ptajte!

Slyšal sem, ež dobrých mastí ptáte.

Ted' jich u mne pln krám jmáte!

(Pokračuje):

Letos, den svaté Mařie,

přinesl sem tuto mast z zámořie.

Nynie, u Veliký pátek,

přinesl sem tuto mast z Benátek.

Tať má mast velikú moc,

žeť usdravuje všelikú nemoc.

Jest-li v uonomno kútě která stará baba

a jest na jejie břišě kóžě slába,

jakž se túto masti pomaže,

tak sobě třetí den zvoniti káže.

Líčíte-li se, panie, rády,

túto mastiú pomažete líčka i brady,

tať se mast k tomu dobře hodí,

ale dušit' velmi škodí.

TŘI MARIE:

Milý mistře, my se mladým liudem

slúbiti nežádáme,

proto také masti nehledáme,

kromě náš smutek veliký zjevujem tobě,

že náš Jesus Kristus pohřeben v hrobě.

Proto bychom chtěly umazati jeho tělo,

aby se tiem šlechtnějie jmělo.

Máš-li mast s myrrú a s tymiánem,

s kadidlem a s balsánem, dobrý družě,

prodaj nem!

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Zajisté, panie, když u mne té masti ptáte,

ted' jie u mne velikú pušku jmáte.

Letos, den svatého Jana,

činil sem tuto mast z myrry a z tymiána.

Přičinil sem k tomu rozličného kořenie,

v němž jest silné božie stvořenie.

Jest-li které mirtvé tělo,

že je dlúho v hrobě hřbělo,

bude-li tú mastiú mazáno,

tiem bude šlechtnějie zachováno.

MARIE:

Milý mistře, rač nem to zjeviti,

zač nem jest tu mast (jmieti neb) přijieti.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Zajisté, panie! Když sem jiným liudem

takú mast prodával,

za tři hřivny zlata sem ju dával,

ale pro veliký smutek vám

za dvě hřivně zlata dám.

ŽENA MASTIČKÁŘOVA:

I kam, milý muži, hádáš,

že se mladým nevěstkám slúbiti žádáš,

že taká mast za dvě hřivně zlata

vykládáš?

I co pášeš sám nad sobú

i nade mnú, chudú ženú?

Proto ty lkáš chudobú

a já také, hubená, s tobú!

Nebo je to mé vše úsilé,

a já sem vydala na něj své obilé.

A to jie neponesú ty panie

dřieve, než mi hřivny tři zlata dadie.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Mnohé ženy ten obyčej jmajú,

kdy se zapiú, tehdy bajú.

Takéž tato biednicě nešvarná

mluví vešdy slova prázná!

Zapivši se, mluviš mnoho,

a jiuž zlým uživeš toho!

Nebo co ty jmáš do toho,

že mě opravuješ velmi mnoho?

Radilť bych, aby přestala,

mně s pokojem býti dala!

Pakli toho nepřestaneš,

snad ode mne s pláčem vstaneš!

Náhle opravěj svú přěslicu,

nebt' dám pěstiú po tvém licu!

ŽENA MASTIČKÁŘOVA:

To-li je mé k hodóm nové rúcho,

že mě tepeš za mé ucho?

Pro mé dobré dávné děnie

dáváš mi poličky za oděnie.

Pro mú vešdy dobrú radu

tuzbils mi hlavu jako hađu.

A to se jiuž drcu s tobú (rozdělití nebo)

rozlúčiti,

tě všem čertóm poručiti.

PUSTRPALK:

Vítajte, vy panie drahné!

Vy jste mladým žáčkom viděti hodné.

RUBÍN:

Pustrpalku, mohl by mluvití tíšě,
až by se obořily chyšě.

PUSTRPALK:

Rubíne, by ty mój rod znal,
snad by na mě lépe tbal.

RUBÍN:

Postrpalku, dáš-li mi svůj rod znáti,
chcu já na tě lépe tbatí.

PUSTRPALK:

Rubíne, chceš-li o mém rodě slyšěti,
to tobě chcu pověděti:

Má střícě oba,

Soba i také Koba,
prodáváta hřiby, hlívy
i také hlušicě, slívy.

Často chvostišě prodáváta,
protoť velikú čest jmáta.

RUBÍN:

I což ty, žebráče chudý,
tkajě se sudy i onudy,
pravíš mi o svéj rodině?
Jáz tobě lepšie povědě
to, ješto lepšie vědě!

Má teta Vavřena

byla v stodole zavřena

s jedniem mnichem komendorem

bliz pod jeho dvorem.

A má strýna Hodava
často kysělicu prodává.

Dřievet jest krúpy dřěla,
protoť jest velikú čest jměla.

Fi, kde bych se stavil,
bych tobě veš svůj rod vypravil!

Tebe bych všie cti zbavil

a sebe bych za jednu planú hnilicu
nepopravil.

Náhle přěstaň, nevolaj mnoho,
nebo zlým uživeš toho!

Přěstaň, nebo tě přěvrácu,

žíly, kosti tiemto kyjem v tobě zmlácu!
— Silete!

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Cné panie, na to vy ničs netbajte!

MASTIČKÁŘ DRKOLENSKÝ

<MASTIČKÁŘ:>

Viz, bychom něco utěžěli
a svých peněz přispořili.

RUBÍN:

Mistře, chceš-li, ať bych slúžil,
abych toho dobrým užil,
přěj mi někakého panošě,

aby nosil po mně košě.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Tohot chci rád přieti.

Dobud' sobě, kterého móžeš mieti,
bychom od něho neměli strastí,
by nám nepokradl našich mastí.

RUBÍN:

Jest-li tu který otrok,
rychlý, brzký jako klopot,
ješto by chtěl věrně slúžiti,
chtěl bych jej prhy nakrmiti.

PUSTRPALK:

Ted', pane, já k tobě běžím
a svůj peniez s věrú těžím.

Umiem krásti a svoditi,
do školy krásné panie voditi.

Hodímť já se dobřě tobě!

Prošit', přijmi mě spieše k sobě!

RUBÍN:

Vítaj, milé pachole!

Za je tobě bratr Popele?

Podoben si k němu, to věz,
neb máš jistý kozí palcieť.

A podobena k němu kčicí,
ale jsi okružlú, osličí licí.

Chceš-li se mnú trh sdieti,
pověz, co chceš ode mne vzieti?

Budeš po mně posteli mésti
a v tějto mošně pušky <nésti>.

Pověz mi, kak ti ději,

ať tuto s tebú ihned sději.

PUSTRPALK:

Pane, mně ději Pustrpalk!

Ját sem velmi veliký šalk.

Chceš mi odplatu dáti,

chcit slúžiti, že mi nebudeš děkovati.

RUBÍN:

Pustrpalku, dámt' hacný pás

a dvě onuci ode mne máš

a k tomu blchu jednookú,

tiem zaplaci službu tvú.

PUSTRPALK:

Tot' učiním, pane, pro tě

a přidaj mi někaké kotě!

RUBÍN:

Sěď, Pustrpalku, u mého pána,

střěha jeho a jeho kráma,

a vezmi tento koš k sobě,

ažť se vráci opět k tobě!

(K mastičkáři):

Milý mistře, odpust mě vyniti,

a věru ihned chci přijíti,

aneb již nemohu státi,

ano mi se chce velmi sráti.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Třěba-liť k čritu jíti,

protoť já budu pivo píti.

ANDEĹÉ (zpívají: Silete):

Milčte! Poslúch<aj>te!

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubíne! Rubínče!

RUBÍN:

Co kážeš, mistře hubenče?

MASTIČKÁŘ:

I kdes tam byl tak dlúho,

kurvy synu, a ne slúho?

RUBÍN:

Věru, mistře, lidé jdiechu

a velmi na mě hlediechu,

protoť musich počekati,

nemoha se okakati.

ŽID (necht' říká, zpívá: Chiri):

Chiri, chiri, achamari!

Vítaj, mistře veliký,

lékaři velmi daleký!

Mohl-li by to učiniti,

mé dětátko oživiti?

Tři hřivny zlata jmám,

ty od něho tobě dám.

Pohynulo nebožátko,

a bieše dobré dětátko!

Když biely chléb uzřieše,

ihned režný povřieše.

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Chcit' to, žide, učiniti,

žeť je mohu oživiti.

(Volá Rubína):

Rubiene! Rubiene!

Rubiene, panošě mój!

RUBÍN:

Ted' sem, mistře, slúha tvój!

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Rubiene, vo pis tu kvest?

RUBÍN:

Ted' sem, mistře, polib mě v pezď!

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Milý brachu, kde se tkáš,

o svém pánu i hovna netbáš!

Budeš ty žebrákem vskorě,

ačť se nestane ješče hoře!

RUBÍN:

Milý pane, že tak mnoho skřěkáš

a svým na mě žvadlem bekáš!

Velikým se pánem zdáš,

však proto i hovna nemáš!

MASTIČKÁŘ:

Tot' jest i v knihách psáno

i od stary' ch dávno slýcháno:

Ač co s bláznem umluvíš,

ale neprávě rozdělíš! —

Rubiene, kde je tvój Pustrpalek?

RUBÍN:

Nevědě, pane, kde je z kurvy šalek.

(volá):

Pustrpalk! Postrpalk!
Pustrpalku, vo pistu?
PUSTRPALK:
Ted' dru stará babu za pudu.
RUBÍN:
Ach, Postrpalku, co pro tě ztraci!
Již tobě tvé služby ukráci!
PUSTRPALK:
Ba, milý Rubiene, čím se sdáš,
že na mně toliko skřekáš?
Známy tě, kteréhos rodu,
všaks biřicův syn z Českého Brodu!
Mně se nemůžeš vrovňati,
ač mne chceš právě znamenati.
Méjt mateří dějí Havlicě,
tať je v Pražě všech mnichův svódnicě.
A má bratry oba,
Šebek a také Koba,
tať se v Praze v rohoži tkáta
a potom cti dosti máta.
RUBÍN:
By ty můj rod lépe znal,
dobrý by mi pokoj dal.
Co se chlubiš, chlapýši,
aneb tě túto palicí tkyši!
**Praviš mi o svém rodě,
a já to tak dobře vědě!**
**Má tetka Jitka
a druhá Milka,
tět' se po světu tkáta,
avšak po Pražě všechny mnichy znáta.**
**A má sestra Běta
a druhá Květa
podolkyť raky lovie.**
Ktož tam býval, tent' lép povie.
Proto mlč, nemúdré tele,
ať tebe můj kyj nezmele!
PUSTRPALK:
Rubiene, milý pane můj,
ját' sem věrný slúha tvój.

Pust'va ten hněv s obú stranú,
slúžva lépe svému pánu!
RUBÍN:
Tako, milý Pustrpalku,
neučiní nad tobú jednoho kvaltu.
Sěďvě a natlucvě mastí!
Jednak budú hosté z daleké vlasti.
(Zpívá píseň):
"Straka na stracě přeletěla řěku,
maso bez kostí provrtělo dievku,
okolo turnejě, hoho,
i vrazi se mezi nohy to mnoho!"
PUSTRPALK:
Ba, mistře, kak tato mast dobřě vonie
a jako samé hovno konie.
RUBÍN:
Mistře, již sem tuto mast tlúkl dosti,
až mě bolejí mé všě kosti.
MASTIČKÁŘ:
Rubiene, sěm mi postav masti,
jednak přídú kupci z daleké vlasti.
RUBÍN:
Jednak, mistře, budú,
až jich z této krósně dobudu.
(Dále vykládá):
Prav to každý druh druhu,
že k rozličnému neduhu,
k rúpóm, k nehtu, k rozličné] pakosti
mohú spomoci tuto masti! (Vykládá:)
Totoť jest mast prvá, drahá,
nemát' jie Viedeň ani Praha.
Kteráž mužě žena jmá,
ješto v noci nevstává,
kup u nás masti této,
budeš mieti lepši dvě to!
Když svému muži málo pomažeš,
kdy chceš, kokrhati jmu kážeš
Totoť jest mast druhá,
v téjto masti stará vstuhá.
Mělt' sem s tú mastí mnoho prácě

a vtlúkl sem v ni staré háčě.
Přičinich v ni kobyležého mozku
a také přiložich prašivú kózku.
Totě mast velmi čistá!
Nenit lživá, ale jistá.
Přilil sem k niej myšieho tuka,
Pustrpalek v ni prděl tluka.
A tať mast tu moc má:
kteráž ji baba právě zná,
když jie sobě k zubóm dobude,
hned i s mastí u všěch črtóv bude.
Totoť jest mast z Míšně!
Kúpil sem ji za tři bielé višně.
Dělánať je z sčinomat,
Pustrpalek ji dělál chodě srat.
Téjt' masti nemóz nic býti rovno,
takt' je drahá, nestojít' za psie hovno.
Totoť jest mast čtvrtá,
ješto ženy mezi nohy vrtá.
A toť jest mast té moci:
kterát' se jí pomaže ve dne neb v noci,
dřiev než spadne prvá rosa,
zroste jiej břich výše nosa.
**Tatoť jest mast z Náchoda,
vónit' má jako z mnichového záchoda.**
K zimnici a k rúpóm velmi mocna,
k hluchotě a k slepotě velmi zpomocna.
Jakž by jie kto prvý u nás kúpil,
hned by jiej črt do pekla i s mastí zlúpil.
Tato jest mast z Dobrušky!
Kúpil sem ji za tři plané hrušky.
Kteráž panna pomaže své pušky,
zrostú jiej v nadřiech kuželaté hrušky
PUSTRPALK:
Co chváliš masti lstivé
a mluvě řeči lživé?...

Appendix 3 *Naše Sestra Jana*

From: LEHÁR, Jan, ed.: *Česka středověka lyrika*, Praha: Vyšehrad: 1990, p 254.

Naše sestra Jana (UK XIV G 45, fol. 95a-95b, Praha)

Notes: An obscene students song. It's artistic origins are connected to folk traditions, and the language dates it to second half of 14th cent, as demonstrated by M. Kopecký,(LEHÁR, *Česka středověka lyrika*, 1990, p 368).

Naše sestra Jana
do školy jest dána,
ta nevěrna rána,
ta jie provrtána.

Chceš u nás přistačiti?
Chcemyt' dobrú mzdu dáti,
nic budeš dělati,
jedno cepy sbierati."

Ját' je sama uvařím,
v mém hrnečku přistavím,
svú slepičku přiložím,
a krmičku osdobím."

Ve škole jest známa,
tam nelehne sama,
měkká je jest sláma:
"Vrat' se!" laje máma.

" Ját' je velmi ráda,
byt' byl jak puol hada,
a k tomu dvě vajci,
budu veselá hraji."

"Moje cero Jano,
cot' ve škole dáno
u pondělí ráno,
ješto s tebu hráno?"

"Ját' se pak nevráti,
ažt' chvíli pokráci.
Milí jsú mi žáci,
chtít' medníka dáti."

"Když přideš po chvíli,
žák tebe pochuchle.
Ó předrahá ochochule,
svrbít'-li tě karkule?"

"Moje milá matko,
tot' mi bieše sladko:
žáček nebožátko
opařil kuřátko."

"A my tobě dámy,
co ve škole mámy:
dvanáct žákov, k tomu dva,
tit' sú rodem z Chujova.

"Mój milý žáčku,
mój milý bracháčku,
k nynějšíemu čásku
daj mi svú klovásku.

"Ostaviž se zlého,
nečiň nic dobrého!
Drž se toho odpustka,
bude z tebe jeptiška."

Appendix 4 *Stala se jest příhoda*

From: ČERNÝ, Václav: *Staročeská Milostná lyrika*, Vydavatelstvo Družstevní práce: Praha: 1948. p 292

Notes: because this poem perhaps alludes to a follower of Wyclif - Viklefice - it should be dated to the second half of 14th cent. but as it also refers to the woman as a beguine - *bekyně* - it's possibly based on an earlier theme. The woman is clearly a member of a mendicant lay movement, rather than a proper, cloistered mendicant nun.

Stala se jest příhoda,
nynie tohoto hoda,
že jedna Viklefice
pozvala k sobě panice
a chtiec ho vieře naučiti.

a řkúc: "Pro Ježíše,
příd ke mně velmi tiše!
Chci tě vieře naučiti,
ač ty mne chceš poslúchatí,
chcit' Pismo otevřítí."

Panic Viklefce odpovědě
a na ni velmi mile hledě
řka: "Já chci rád vše učiniti,
ač ty mne chceš naučiti
v tvém zákoně býti."

Vece Viklefka: "Zežři na mě,
paniče, příd ke mně
až po klidu,
když tu nebude lidu;
chcit' Pismo zjeviti."

Panic bez meškanie
učini jejie kázanie.
Po večeri v neděli,
když uhlédal svú chvíli,
přišel jest k ní tiše.

Vece Viklefice bez lenosti:
"Vitej, mój milý hosti,
ce sem dávno žádala,
po němž má duše práhla!
Rač ke mně vstúpiti,

se mnú málo poseděti,
chcit' Pismo vyložiti,
biblí i také čtenie
s námat' žádného nenie,
budeš sám obierati."

Tut' mu bába biblí vyloží,
dvě kapitole vyloží
pěkné, velmi okružlé;
k hruškám byšta podobné
a tak velmi bílé.

Panic vece bez strachu:
"Podáš jich sem, milá brachu!"
Je se biblí rozkládati
s večera až do světu.

A když poče svítati,
panic se chtieše pryč bráti.
Viklefice se ho chvátí
a řkúc: "Zdeť jest ostatí
se mnú jitřní dohonati."

Začechu Te Deum laudamus
zhóru,
jakž slušie k tomu dvoru . . .
ještat' se diškantovati.

Když sú jitřní skonašta,
pěkněť se mile objašta
v božie lásce i v milosti.
Nebylo tu nemilosti,
což mohu znamenati.

Nuž, vy mladí jinoše
i vy nádobné panoše,
kteří chcete zákon uměti,
máte se k bekyniem ptáti,
od nich se učiti.

Svědomyť sú zákona,
Reum knih i Šalomúna,
tak Davida v žaltáři.
Muožte jim rádi slúžiti.

Sladkět' maji výklady,
úplné, beze všie vady,
Komut' jich dadí požití,
muož dobře vesel býti.
Rač je, Bože, ploditi!

Appendix 5 *O pravdě*

From: ČERNÝ, Václav: *Staročeská Milostná lyrika*, Vydavatelstvo Družstevní práce: Praha: 1948, p 209

Notes: the theme "about truth" was popular for Hussites, and the form of this poem is thought to be based on an earlier Frauleben poem, although this is contested. This combines later themes of monks (and others in the ecclesiastical hierarchy) of being interested only in money, and contemporary complaints about the pope and antipope, and two emperors. NOTE: poem is very long, this is only the first segment.

Pravdo milá, tiežit' tebe:
Pročs od nás vstúpila v nebe?
Komu si nás poručila,
tiežit' tebe, Pravdo milá!

Pravda k tomu odpovedě:
"Milý synu, toť povědě.
Neviem se zde kam podieti,
žádný mne nechtěl přijieti.

Kdež sem se bydlí nadála,
tam jidech, and přitála
Křivda vóbec včesky k sobě,
Tepruv tehdy steščech sobě.

I jidech tam ku papeži,
k němužt' každý vóbec běží,
i počech na něm žádati,
by mi ráčil radu dáti,

kterak bych Křivdu pře mohla,
ješto u mé věno sáhla.
Papež odpovedě k tomu:
"Ját' nemám prázdnoti k tomu.

Poručím tě kardinálóm,
rúče beř se v jich tam dóm,
at' poradie i pomohú,
cožt' oni najléle mohú."

Učinich jeho kázanie,
brách se já tam mezi ně,

mniec, bych mohla tam prospěti,
proti Křivdě konec vzieti.

Když tam mezi ně přijidech,
tepruv tesknosti dojidech.
Otáza mne jeden z nich,
jsa v černé kápi jakžto mnich:

**"Pravdo, proč si přišla, co zde chceš,
proč před nás cestú nejdeš?
Chceš-li sobě konec vzieti,
musíš mnoho zlatých mieti."**

**Druhý podlé něho sedě,
otpovedě, na mě hledě:
"Pravdo, zde konce nemaš,
když nám dosti zlatých nedáš."**

Pravda: "Tak smutně stojěci,
žádného se nebojěci,
otpovedě velmi tiše
a řkúc: 'Ano, svatá říše

ot vás kněží v zmatek přišla.'
Viz jich nemúdrého smysla,
kterak divným během běžie
kardinálští ti kněžie!

Učinili dva papeže,
ihned k tomu dva ciesaře;
pro jich nemúdré volenie
svarú cierkev, říši plenie.....

Appendix 6 *Spor tělo s duši*

From: LEHÁR, Jan – STICH, Alexandr: *Kniha Textů 1: od počátků do raného obrození 9. století-1. třetina 19. století*, In the series: *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny: Praha: 2000, p 145-151.

EXCERPT: just the relevant segment about monks possessing property.

TĚLO (vece):

"Bud' vesela, duše milá,
chval Boha, ž' sěs přihodila
u mé tělo;

věz začelo*

mnět' silné sbožie přijělo.

Kážu stodoly zbořiti,
chcu větčie nové stvořiti;
pro náděju

v ně vše zděju,
se mé sbožie dobré dějú.

Jež a pí, měj sě vesele,
netbaj na to, což v kostele
kněžie hrozie;
mniši množie,
druh před druhem ludbu tvořie.

Tato slova v srdci znímaj,
na to, duše, rozpomínaj:
peniez v městě

j' ve vši cěstě
najvětčí přietel jest jistě!"

APPENDIX 7 Podkoní a žák

From: LEHÁR, Jan – STICH, Alexandr, *Kniha Textů 1: od počátků do raného obrození 9. století -1. třetina 19. století*, In the series: *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny: Praha: 2000, pp 152-167.

Shown here are pages 152-164: an excerpt only, demonstrating selected instances of antimedicant sentiment, or defense. Such instances have been bolded by the author.

p152

Příhodich se jednu k tomu,
kdež nalezech v jednom domu
právě také v túž hodinu
dva, jenž přišla pohostinu,
ana sedíta na pivě.

Tu učiništa poctivě,
oba právě bez meškánie
dašta mi milé vítanie.

A já, přiblíživ se k nima,
posadich se mezi nima,
jakož často v krčmě bývá,
křičéc: "Paní, nalí piva!"

Jechomť se v odplatu ctíti,
podávajíc sobě píti.
Poslúchajte tuto právě,
poviemť vám o jich postavě.

Z těch jeden člověk bieše mladý,
nejmieše známě brady,
na němž sukně šerá, umlená,
a k tomu kukla zelená;
ta také zedrána bieše.
Mošnu na hrdle jmieše,
v niž by vložil, což mu třeba,
mním, že knihy, také chleba;
dešť'ky jmieše u pasu.

Jakž jej viděch při tom času

p153

i jinú k tomu přípravú,
vše bieše skolskú postavú.

Druhý, ten se starší zdáše,
vždy sedě bradku súkáše,

na němž kabátec úzký, krátký,
a dosti zedrané šatky;
okasalý tak dvorně,
k tomuť bieše obut v škorně:
tyť biechu drahně povetšely,
avšak okolo děr cely,
skrže něž viděti nohy.
A také bieše vpial ostrohy,
točenku maje na hlavě.
Tak, jakž jej vzezřech právě,
jistěť mi se dvořák zdieše;
hřbelce za pasem jmějieše.

Ten mluvieše, hrdě sedě,
na své špice pyšně hledě,
řka: "Nenie v světě toho,
ani kto má zbožie tak mnoho,
bych chtěl jeho zbožie vzieti
a dvora se odpověděti.
Neb jest tu tolik utěšenie!
V světě ten jeden nenie,
když by dvořenie okusil,
věčně by dvořiti musil.
Ktož mi o lepšiem bydlu praví,
každý se ve lži ostaví.
Dotud mluvě usta trudi,
až žaka na se vzbudi.

Ten mu k tomu odpovědě

p154

a řka: "Já to dobře vědě
a tomu já také věři,
že páni i také rytieři,
tiť u dvora dobrú mají,
i bohatí, to já znaji.
Ale nebořátka chudí!

Div, že se jum neostudí
pro zlé bydlo jich dvořenie,
neb již věčši psoty nenie.
Tit' se chodiec psotú klonie,
vy ze všech najhorší máte,
kromě že se v tom neznáte.
Byšte se chtěli poznati,
svú psotu popsati dáti,
což vy jie máte, podkonie:
v světě věčšie psoty nenie,
než vy ji trpíte dobrovolně.
Ale naše bydlo školnie,
tot' já tobě pravím hole,
tuť je ve všem pravá zvóle,
i od pitie, i od jedenie,
v ničemž nedostatku nenie.
Myt' netrpíme niky hladu.
Když již tovařišie sadú,
tuť já dosáhna úkruha,
nenie partéka tak sucham
bych jie nerozmočil jíchú,
tiem lekuje svému břichu;
i budemy dobře syti.
K tomu máme dosti píti
pitie ctného do nerody.
Častokrát také vody
napijemy se pro zdravie,
neb jest velmi dobra hlavě.

p156

Ba, od ztravyt' se mámy pyšně,
masa, kúr dosti přielišně -
tot' jest na každé posviecenie,
v ničemž nedostatka nenie:
když to koli u nás byvá,
mámy přieliš dosti piva.

Ale vám miesto sniedanie
dadie políček za ranie.
Však ste jedno za ranie syti.
bývajúce vždycky biti.
Miesto jedenie oběda
kyjevá rána prisedá."

A když žák přesta mluvení,
dvořák vece: "Toho nenie!"
Okřiče se naň hněvivě
a řka: "Žáku, mluvíš křivě,
bychom byli hladoviti
u dvora a kyjem biti.
Ach, přehubená partéko,
i co jest tobě řeči této
o nás mluviti třeba,
sám nejsa nikdy syt chleba?
Co dobrého do vás, žáci?
**Však ste vy hubení žebráci,
jenž tečete dóm od domu,
hekajúce a chtiece tomu,
by vám dali jíchy mastné.
Auvech, vaše bydlo strastné!
Tut' vám dadie partéku režnú
a s tiem vás pesky vyženú.
Pakli již na vaše šťastie
vám dadie v některém miestě
jíchy nemastné a málo,
vej, kak se vám dobře stalo!
Jíž se vše zdálo po vóli.**

p 157

**S tiem pak běžíte do školy,
a to s velmi dobrú myslí
mniec, byšte na hody přišli.**
Tut' vás pak starší omýtie,
i chléb, i jíchu vám vzchytie
a to všecko zjedie sami.
Jmút' se vás bíti metlami,
budút' se nad vámi mstíti
hněvy, nejsúc dobře syti.
Ach, tot' vám psota nehovie!
Slýchalt' sem dávné příslovie,
žet' zákóm draho vařenie.
Protož ty nechaj svářenie
se mnú, neb' já také vědě
praviti o vašiej biedě,
což vy jie máte, žáci.
Ale my, panici dvořáci,

když již za stolem sedem,
in的角度 na se lúčiemy chlebem.
Myt' nic nešetřímý toho,
neb ho mámy přieliš mnoho.
Tut' nám dadie jiesti dosti.
Pakliže pro jiné hosti
nás kuchaři zapomanú,
in的角度 já od stola vstanu
i běžím tam sám k kuchyni:
dadiet' mi dosti svěřiny -
pakli nenie, ale kaše.
Tot' jest vše útěcha naše,
žet' jí ukydá druh druhu
a tudy nás mine túha.
Někdy se vladař v mě vpeři
a mě svú holí udeři
v pleci nebo v hlavu ranú.
In角度 já odběhnu v stranu,
p 158
tohot' nikakž nenechají,
od mateřet' mu nalají;
kromě leč by byla hlucha,
tožt' jiej nepovzní u ucha.
Když pak bude po večeri,
což nás koli, dvorské sběři,
běremy se dolóv s hradu
a netrpiece v ničemž hladu.
Ale vy, žáci nebožátka!
Ach, že vás jest vaše matka
těžce nosivši v životě
přirodila k takěj psotě!
Já se tomu velmi divi,
že jste jedno bitím živi.
Však vás za obyčej tepú,
jednak burcují , jednak svlekú,
vymyšlují muky nové,
o vy kazieci metly březové."

Netaže toho dořeci,
žák se chtieše hněvy vztéci
a řka:"Vy, podkoní hubení,
však ste vy tak zahubeni!
U vás jsú zakrsaly kosti,
pro psotu nemohúc rósti.
Kdyžs mne nechtěl zbaviti,
jíž chci z knih o tom praviti,
což já o vás psáno mám.
Když jeden jel cestú sám,

hodného pacholka ptaje,
podkonie sobě nemaje,
tut' se jemu črt pokázal;
in角度 mu se přikázal
i slúžil mu k jeho vóli.

p 159

Což jedno rozkázal koli,
v tom nikdy nebyl rozpačen,
avšak často za vrch vláčen.
To on všecko trpěl míle
až právě do jedné chvíle,
když se tak pověťrie zrudi,
hroznú slotu s deščem zbudi,
o němž jest strach pověděti.
Šťastný, kdož mohl useděti
toho nečasu pod střechú.
Črtu nebieše do smiechu,
ano s něho šaty berú,
kuklu i plášč s hrdla derú
podlé obyčeje i práva,
jako se i dnes třepačkám stává.
Opět vše téhož času
slunce pokáza svú krásu,
pisti svůj paprslek jasný;
by čas horký, velmi krásný.
Tuž panoše každý zvlášče
pacholku podává plášče,
a plášč mokr a pln dešče!
Tut' se tepruv črtu stešče,
i zjevi se pánu svému
a takto povědě jemu:
Tutot' mého bydla nenie,
berut', pane, odpuščenje.
Jižt' sem dobře zkusil tohom
žet' mají zlého bydla mnoho
třepačky; kudyž se obrátie,
vždycky v psotě chvíli krátie.
Viece mluviti nerodě,
in角度 se kamosi podě.
Vzprnu se jim všem z očí,
p160
jedne že se vicher zatoči. -
Čím ty se pak chceš chlubití?
Vidiš, že črt nechtěl třepačku býti.
Tot' jest dosti znamenie,
že horšieho bydla nenie,
než vy je máte, třepačky.
Ale já, když sedím s žáčky,

tot' bez chlúpy chci pověděti,
tuť sú mnohé městské děti,
jenž jsú také pod mú stráží.
Tyt' já všecky metlú káži
a sám se pak bitie zhojím.
V svátek se jeho nic nebojím.
A když přijde čas postný,
mně vděčný a velmi radostný,
o němž jest dlúhé pravenie,
co mám tehdy utěšenie!
Když já již budu na poli,
ano všecko po méj vůli,
neviem nic o chudobě,
sem sám dobrovolen sobě.
Jakž koli přídu ke vsi,
in的角度 bojuji se psy,
an každý přeč běží, skolí,
a já jej ranil svú holí.
Jakž mě náhle sedlky zočie,
in的角度 ke mně přiskočie;
neučiniet' k tomu lémě,
padnú na svoji koleně,
mé obrázky celují
a mě dařiti slibují,
tepúce se v prsi náramně,
tiežic, co bych ráčil, na mně.
Já jie za vajce poproši,
anat' in角度 běží k koši,
i po všech se hřadách zplazí
p161
a kde které hniezdo zlazí,
ve všech kútiach pilně hledá,
mněť' vždy práznu jíti nedá.
Pak odtad pójdu s radostí
a nabrav již vajce dosti.
A kdež se naměte slepice,
hus neb která kačice,
kdyz já ji popadnu koli,
tėj jest vždy jíti do školy.
A sedlák se chce hořem vztéci,
však mi nesmie nice řeci -
ani protivného slova,
boje se póhonu do Pasova.
**My žáci i také knězie,
kamž koli po světě bězie,
tot', vedě, malá věc nenie,
nebojíme se oběšenie.**
Ale vy, hubené panošky,

vy nejste bezpečni trošky;
vy strachy zdrastíte kčici,
jedúc mimo šibenici.
Vám se třeba ohlédati
a před sebú se žehnati,
neb jest pilně třeba toho."

Dvořák se rozhněva z toho
a řka: "Mizero nevlídná,
k čemu tobě ta řec nesklidná?
Však ty za plěšku nestojíš,
nebs huben, metly se bojíš
a jsi živ na světě sotně,
obcházeje se robotně.
Ty se robotně obchodíš
a k tomu v zlých šatech chodíš;
p162
ale tot' hanba nenie v školském
běhu.
Kterak pak o tvém noclehu?
Ty ležeš na kamnách nynie,
ale až bude ondy zimě,
in角度 se o to s tebú svadie
a na kamnat' viac nedadie.
Ješče bud' tobě blaze,
dadie-lit' léci na podlaze.
Tu ležíš dosti neměkce,
zim) se třasa a zuby ščekce-
A k tomu vstanie rané!
Ksyž se pak na tě dostane
vše školská pracná třieda,
tepruv tobě bude běda.
Když ty již dieš, že prost budeš,
toho nikoli nezbudeš.
Tu tobě vše způsobiti,
školu mésti i ztopiti,
ničehož nic neminúti
a léhaje velmi tvrdě?
Ale jáť' se mám od toho hrdě.
By ty viděl mú posteli,
když já sobě slámy nasteli!
Tut' já ležím v pokoji.
Častokrát také pospím v hnoji;
toho já nečiním pro jiné,
kromě kdyžť' deščem zmoknu
jediné,
aby mé rúcho zeschlo k jitru.
Tot' já vstana pěkně vytru,

aby na mně stálo čistě.
Tot' já tobě pravi jistě,
žet' se mne chlapi velmi bojie,
kadyž chodie nebo stojie,
p 163
pokorněť' mi se klanějí,
vežde: Vítaj, paniče!, dějí.
Sedlácit' přede mnú sršie,
i také slepice přšie,
s nimiž já mám hroznú útěchu:
kterěž dosáhnu do měchu,
tat' se viac nepozná zase,
sniemt' ji s tovařisiv kvase.
Tot' také pravi neskrýtě,
žer' nemám péce na bitie.
Nam tomt' bych mohl přsieci,
že v tomto celém měsieci
nejsem já bit pro mú vinu,
kromě vyjmúc jedínú,
leč kdy z klamu po hlavici
neb za vrch nebo po líci.
V tom já nice pána nevini,
neb on to vše z klamu činí.
Mám pána po všiej svéj vůli,
dát' mi, což poprosím koli;
mát' mi nový kabát dáti,
netáhnet' jeho jedne zedrati.
Což mi se pak nedostává,
když mi jedno hlava zdráva?
Však již netrpím psoty viece.
Ale však, pravdu praviece,
já z mladu na svéj hlavici
nosil sem těžkú přielbici,
doniž sem ryněrem byl.
Ale již sem já té psoty zbyl.
V tomt' se pochlubiti mohu
a z toho děkuji Bohum
žet' sem tak velmi povýšen,
všem žákóm mohu výti pyšen.
p164
Sám však znamenaj cti této:
sem podkoním sedmé léto
a k tomu mám dobrú naději
a to jistě řeci směji:
netáhnet' mój pán dluhóv zbyti,
měť' chce stčelcem uřiniti.
Pakt' neponesu tlumoka,
ano samostřiel u boka

a k tomu sukně čistá,
na nejž haklíkov na tři sta.
Kdež budu v neznámén kraji,
mět' vežde za pána mají.
Protož, hubený sagitáři,
i kacít' sú tvoji sváři?
Proti mně jest věčně ve psí býti.
Vám jest přísuzena psota,
byšte ji měli do života."

Žáku to bieše protivno.
Vece: " Jest mi velmi divno,
hrdú řeč slyše od tebe.
I zda sám již neznáš sebe?
Vy, třepačky nebožátka,
tot' vám nikdy nenie svátka.
Všaks ty hubená satrapa!
Čím chceš lepší dýti chlapa,
na každý den hnój kydaje
a k lepšímu čáky nemaje?
**Ty se nevrovnáš žáku,
neb my máme lepší čáku,
ne jako vy, chlapi hlupí,
Z žákóvt' bývají biskupi,
komuž toho Bóh popřeje,
v němž jest má dobrá naděje.**

