

# Hus as an Apocalyptic Enemy in the Treatise of Master Rupert

---

Vít Hlinka (Prague)

An interesting, hitherto unedited treatise from the years 1414–1420, called from the incipit of the manuscript *Prophete mortui sui*, can generally be characterised as a prophetic anti-Hussite and anti-Utraquist text.<sup>1</sup> Its author is an otherwise unknown person calling himself Rupertus de Bundacia (this designation corresponds to a Vatican manuscript), or Rupertus de Gundancia, corresponding to manuscripts presently held by Czech depositories. Rupert further tells us that he is an Englishman and that he was educated at Oxford.<sup>2</sup> It is not yet possible to identify Rupert “de Bundacia” or “de Gundancia” with a known person from the turn of the fourteenth century; hence it is possible that the name is a pseudonym.

As for dating, the *terminus ad quem* is 1420, because the explicit of the Vatican manuscript, written by another scribal hand, informs us that the treatise was written in Brno precisely in 1420.<sup>3</sup> As an ultimate *terminus ab quo*, it is possible to consider 1414, when the dispute concerning lay communion sub utraque broke out in Bohemia.

---

<sup>1</sup> The treatise of Master Rupert with the incipit “Prophete mortui sunt” is available in the following manuscripts: MS Olomouc, Zemský archiv v Opavě, pobočka Olomouc, CO. 224, ff. 219v–225v; MS Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, O.19, fol. 241r–248v; MS Prague, Metropolitan Chapter Library, O.28, ff. 62r–66r; MS Prague, KNM, XVI.E.1, fol. 254r–261r; MS Prague, NK, XX.B.7, ff. 46v–53v; MS Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 4150, ff. 191v–198r. Henceforth the treatise is cited from MS Vaticano, BAV, Vat. Lat. 4150, ff. 191v–198r. The Prague manuscript XVI.E.1 together with the text samples was earlier noted by Jan Sedlák, “Několik textů z doby husitské” [Several Texts from the Hussite Period], *Hlídky* 28 (1911) 227–231. The Vatican manuscript – without showing its relationship to the Prague ones – was noted by Jaroslav Prokeš, *Husitika vatikánské knihovny v Římě* [Hussitica of the Vatican Library in Rome] (Prague 1928) 44–46. Concerning the extant manuscripts, see also the list thoroughly prepared by Mgr. Pavel Soukup, Ph.D.; it is available in electronic form on the web: <http://www.antihus.eu/search.php>.

<sup>2</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 191v; f. 198r. The author of the treatise is mentioned twice, first at the end of the first folio, where he introduced himself as: “Ego magister Rupertus de Bundancia nacione Anglicus promotus Oxonione”. For the second time in the explicit: “Tractatus prophetarum propheciarum Magistri Ruperti [...] de Bundancia nationis Anglicus.”

<sup>3</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 198r: “Scriptum Brune anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo vicesimo.”

## 1. Introduction to the Text

In the first part, Rupert refers to unspecified astrological observations.<sup>4</sup> He maintained that – according to the intent inserted by the Creator into his work – the position and movement of heavenly bodies should illuminate good and bad events for both the present and the future. Rupert stated that – after a close consideration of the movements of stars and planets – he will offer several conclusions about the Wyclifite movement in Bohemia and about the consequences of its behaviour. His words were to imitate the dealings of the Old Testament prophet Jonah, whose exhortations led the inhabitants of Nineveh to penance, thanks to which God did not inflict the intended punishments.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Enumeration of Charges

The second part of the text enumerates the lapses, each accompanied by relevant biblical quotes proving that the partisans of the heretical movement in the land were genuine servants of the Antichrist, whose activity portends the apocalyptic times and the appearance of God's eternal enemy. Rupert stressed that the greatest offense was communion sub utraque.

<sup>4</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 191v: “Quia arbitrio planete et stellarum cursus abutitur, sed iuxta naturam creantis ipsis institutam sum complent obsequium et per influentiam bonitatem ostendunt et maliciam presencium et futurorum iuxta discursum eorumdem (...) divina favente gratia respectum cursum et influentiam planetarum, signorum et stellarum, a quibus inferiora vegetantur, conservantur et in ea productur, calculacionem a me diu imaginatam et multo labore et mature compositam de predictis planetarum discursibus et motibus de wyclephistis et horum successibus duxi manifestandum, qui successus de necessitate eveniunt.”

<sup>5</sup> Rupert did not elaborate in more detail on the conjunction of heavenly bodies that had revealed to him the significance of present and future events. It is, therefore, difficult to determine, whether he let himself be inspired by possible extraordinary signs from 1415–1416 reported, for instance in the *Old Bohemian Annals*, in which the author treated an eclipse of the sun, bloody rain, and various strange heavenly phenomena; see *Staré letopisy české z vratislavského rukopisu*, ed. František Šimek (Prague 1937) 15–17. Possible astronomical signs are suggested by František Šmahel, *Dějiny Tábora, Do roku 1421* [History of Tabor: To 1421], díl I/1, (České Budějovice 1988) 249. In the context of the time, Rupert's astrological references were nothing extraordinary. Substantially more concrete conclusions deduced from the conjunctions of stars – which foretold the division and persecution of clergy, the devastation of Prague as well as a restoration of order – are mentioned, for instance, one of the versions of Archbishop Jenštejn's dream, written in 1428. The text of the manuscript was published by Jaroslav Truhlář, “Paběrky z rukopisů Klementinských: Vidění arcibiskupa Jana z Jenštejna,” [Odds and Ends from the Manuscripts of the Clementinum: The Vision of Archbishop Jan of Jenštejn] ČČH 8 (1902) 188–189, see also 189: “...quod in Bohemia instabunt tempora, quando Mars contrariabitur Saturno et Saturnus Yowi, tunc illo tempore clerus dividetur in duas partes, et persecutio cleri erit magna et inaudibilis, et claves spirituales omnes auferentur ab eis, ita quod non curabunt eos, et Pragensis civitas destruetur in tantum, quod parum de ipsa manebit.”

Rupert accused the Wyclifites of trying to disturb the order of things established by God. They thus committed four offenses, which would have consequences. First of all, their effort to emphasise Christ's blood does not merit any reward.<sup>6</sup> They cannot be called Christians, because they again merely shed Christ's blood and rather represent the hypocritical murderers of Christ. They rejected the humility and modesty of religious respect and sold themselves to the devil in exchange for human respect, which was rejected by Christ in the Gospels and by Gregory the Great. He attributes the next three offenses to an erroneous concept of the eucharistic sacrament.<sup>7</sup>

Firstly, disrespect for Christ's sacrifice – the Wyclifites' sin – because they distribute the sacrament at any arbitrary time, whereby they disobey Paul's command in his letter to the Corinthians (1Cor 11: 21). Secondly, they do so in inappropriate non-sacred places; thus they reject the numerous Old Testament prescriptions about liturgical vessels, which have their proper place only in the sacred precincts of the temple. Although they argue that Christ's blood had spilled on the ground, such reasoning contradicts the Saviour's statement in Matthew's Gospel: "Do not give what is holy to dogs" (Mt 7: 6). The third offense concerns the giving of Christ's blood to lay people; Rupert classified this as the most serious offense, to which he devoted most space.<sup>8</sup>

Lay communion *sub utraque*, according to Rupert, already contradicted the command of the Old Testament, which was a reflection of the New Testament. God's priest, Melchizedek, did not distribute bread and wine to lay people after Abraham's victory (Gen 14: 18–19). The prophet Elijah, a representative of the spiritual estate, did not eat or drink between awakening from a dream (with a vision of an angel) and the revelation of God on Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19: 8). The people of Israel in the desert, after their flight from Egypt, of course, did not drink, but only ate the bread given them by God. The words of the New Testament even more strictly prohibit the communion of lay people. Rupert refers to the authority of the Fourth Gospel: "...unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you" (Jn 6: 53). This text should be interpreted in the sense of spiritual – not sacramental – communion: "*Totus textus dicit necessitatem spiritualis manducationis (...) non dicit ille textus necessitatis sacramentalis manducationis.*"<sup>9</sup> After all, the Redeemer in the same chapter stated that the Spirit enlivens. Heretics, such as Nestorius, Pelagius, Cyprian, and Donatus did distribute to lay people *sub utraque*, but they were expelled from the church by Popes Gregory the Great, Innocent, and Anastasius. Cyprian and Donatus repented, Nestorius persisted in preaching heresy. Therefore, the modern heretics should be called Nestorians, not Wyclifites. In addition

<sup>6</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 191v.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 192v.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 192v–194v.

<sup>9</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 193r.

numerous canons of the church and of other holy men reject lay communion, which is sinful and represents considerable danger. After all, if – because of a priest’s carelessness – a drop of Christ’s blood landed on a sacred stole, the stole should be burnt and the priest do penance for forty days. What then should happen, if the blood of Christ were to fall on a layman’s beard? Should the layman be incinerated?<sup>10</sup>

Rupert compared Wyclif’s Bohemian adherents to the Jews, who before Pilate asked for Christ’s blood and thereby summoned many calamities. They even proclaimed that it was not a sin to kill a priest. Rupert emphatically referred to clear commands in the canon law and in Scripture about a priest’s inviolability: “Do not touch my anointed ones” (Ps 105: 15).<sup>11</sup> Thus the words, foretold by Christ about the killing and persecution of prophets, are fulfilled as are the words foretold about the painful events to take place before Christ’s second coming. So too, St. Hildegard’s prophecies about the heretics are being fulfilled. Rupert identified in the champions of heresy the figure of the rider – called “Death” and prophesied by St. John in the Apocalypse – who would seize one quarter of the earth and rule with sword, plague, and wild beasts (Rev. 6: 8).<sup>12</sup> The Wyclifites, exalting themselves above the established orders, make themselves Antichrist’s servants. They aspire to be the real and pure followers of Christ; but, of course, the contrary is the truth. This pride also causes their condemnation, because they had fulfilled the sign of Christ’s victorious coming, which St. Paul foretold to the Thessalonians [2 Thes 2: 3–4]: “Let no one deceive you in any way; for that day will not come unless the rebellion comes first and the lawless one<sup>[a]</sup> is revealed, the one destined for destruction. He opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, declaring himself to be God.”<sup>13</sup>

### 3. Jan Hus as an Apocalyptic Enemy

Rupert went on to account for the pride and the alleged self-exaltation of the Wyclifites with reference to the rider from the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse – ruling over savage beasts – as well as with reference to the Son of Perdition. For they were infected by a sickness spread by the aggressive winged creature, the goose – that is, by the symbol of the personage of Jan Hus. According to Rupert, the goose represents the six qualities of

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., f. 193v: “Si per negligenciam gutta sangwinis Cristi stillaverit super pallam consecratam, debet cremari et sacerdos XL diebus penitere. Quid tunc faciendum est, si in barbam layci stillaverit, tunc afforciori laycus cum barba comburatur, cum tamen videtur abhominabile ultra?”

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., f. 194r.

<sup>12</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., f. 194v.

the Antichrist, each of which derives from the bird's corrupt nature.<sup>14</sup> The goose yearns to fly always higher; the farther, then, it has to fall and thus her followers will fall together along with her to their damnation. Contrary to the priests of the church, who own nothing, the goose selects its land, where it wishes to dwell and constantly asks for more. The goose hisses and has a poisonous beak, with which it destroys; similarly the Wyclifites speak with a poisoned tongue. The goose's excrement makes the ground infertile; similarly the Wyclifites' teaching deprives of life the vineyard, that is, the church. Water does not stay on a goose's feathers, but flows down and goes to waste; thus her followers are further incited to perdition. On the contrary, the urine of a goose remains in her feathers and wings. Thus her body spreads poison and causes the body to sicken. The poison of the goose transferred to the Wyclifites. So the Church, the head of which is Christ, was endangered and divided. Rupert recognised – in the advocates of lay chalice – the followers of Jan Hus, who had caused schism in the Church of Christ.<sup>15</sup>

#### 4. Prophecy and Punishments of the Disciples

After this depiction of the situation, Rupert advanced to a prophecy indicating a more precise timeline for the near future. Hus's followers had spread true darkness over the land of Bohemia, which began in 1406 and will last until 1419. At that time two great lights will appear: "erunt duo luminaria magna in sua potestate et vigore," the first, an apostolic one, hence the church, will illuminate the day; the other one will illuminate the night, hence the secular power. Together, they will terminate the darkness of the Wyclifite heresy in 1422; when they will restore the true faith to the people; they will unite, what was divided, into a single mystical body of Christ; and there will be one head and one Church.

After Rupert sketched out this hopeful future, he stated that punishments, both temporal and eternal awaited the followers of heresy in Bohemia: "Scilicet divina et temporalis, divina punicio est multiplex iuxta diversas infirmitates per peccata ponderatas."<sup>16</sup> The advocates of the lay chalice and of Jan Hus are heretics, because they persist in professing an erroneous teaching; they expose their faith to danger; and they follow and defend all evident trespasses. According to canon law, such heretics are excluded from the Church.<sup>17</sup> Anybody, who professes their teachings is deprived of any kind of dignity whether secular or spiritual and is forgotten by the Church and

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., ff. 194v-195v.

<sup>15</sup> See MS Vaticano, BAV, where on f. 196r – in connection with Paul's text 1 Cor 1: 11–12 – he concluded: "Ego quidem sum Pauli. Ego autem Apollo. Ego autem Cephe. Ego autem Cristi. Sic et ipsi dicunt, dicunt et gloriantur dicentes: Ego sum Hus et tenens heresim perversam".

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., f. 196v.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., f. 197r.

loses any chance of drawing from the treasures entrusted to the Church. This happens in order that Christ's words may be fulfilled: "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire" (Mt 7: 19).<sup>18</sup> For their evil deeds they earned a triple retribution, which affects the heretics' bodies after their death.<sup>19</sup> As the first punishment, the sinners' bodies will not decompose after death, because the creatures causing decomposition will abominate them. The second punishment will be visible, because blood will flow unnaturally from their graves. Their bodies will not be buried in the ground in the customary manner with their faces turned to the skies, so that they cannot see the dwelling places of the saints, against whose symbols and images they had blasphemed. They will be buried with their faces to the ground so that they will gaze into hell. The third punishment will cause that their bodies will belong to the apocalyptic beast of Revelation 12: 3 – the beast of seven heads symbolizing the seven mortal sins. They will belong to the devil. Thus the terrible prognosis of the same book shall be fulfilled in them, when "And in those days people will seek death but will not find it; they will long to die, but death will flee from them" (Rev 9: 6). All that will happen because they followed Hus.<sup>20</sup>

## 5. Contextualisation of the Treatise

### Goose – the Winged Creature of Antichrist

Rupert based his anti-Hussite polemic on the analogy with a goose, which – with its body and nature – was to personify danger and Antichrist's power stemming from Jan Hus and his followers. Polemic of this type was nothing original. The incentive apparently came from Hus himself when, in his letters, he spoke about his own destiny to fight against the Antichrist. Among others, for instance, in a letter of November 1412, he designated himself: "cast as a non-flying domestic bird it flies high to God, he tears up their nets [lenie pták, domácí, nelétavý vysoko k bohu léci, rozdrú jim jich sieti]," because "it is true that for one cowardly goose there are in Prague many eagles and falcons, who have good eyesight, they fly high in grace and hunt birds well for the king and the Lord Jesus [... pravda za hus jednu nestatečnou dala jest Praze orlův mnoho i sokolův, jenž zrak dobrý mají, vysoko milosti léci a dobře králi a pánu Ježíšovi ptáky loví]."<sup>21</sup> In *Knížky proti knězi kuchmistrovi* [Booklets against the Priest, Master Cook] Hus recalled again his mission to extirpate Antichrist's forces by saying: "the goose, a silly bird, recognized

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., ff. 197r-197v.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., ff. 197v-198r.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., f. 198r: "Erunt itaque plagati mendicitate et ferro, quam plagam oculus non vidit nec auris audivit, que omnia Hus preparavit omnibus diligentibus et imitantibus se. Quod malum a nobis differat Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Amen."

<sup>21</sup> Novotný, 146.

that non-living hawk, therefore he did not let himself be suppressed by him, but rising up he gave an example to others of God's birds to do the same [... hus, pták pitomý poznal jest toho ostríše neživého, protož nedal se jemu přikvačiti, ale vzdvih se, dal jest příklad jiným božím ptákóm, by též činili]."<sup>22</sup> The Carthusian Štěpán of Dolany linked up with this literary form in an interesting way in several treatises, in which – especially in *Dialogus volatilis* – he presented the ideological dispute between the reformist movement and the partisans of the church in an imagined discussion between the positive figure of a sparrow and the negative one of a goose.<sup>23</sup>

In his treatise *Prophete* Rupert linked up with Štěpán's polemical note emphasising the negative elements of the winged goose. If Jan Hus identified himself – with reference to a goose – with the role of an emissary against the Antichrist, then in *Prophete* the goose exactly sums up essentially Antichrist's provenance – the apocalyptic beast itself. A description of the goose's Antichrist-like qualities follows after a mention of *bestiis terrae*, which are ruled by the apocalyptic rider on a black horse (Rev 6: 8). In the conclusion of the treatise – where Rupert recounted punishments for Hus's followers after their burial in the ground – this vocabulary was used once again. Their bodies will not decompose and – because of the heresy proclaimed during their lives – they will become parts of the seven-headed apocalyptic beast, described in Rev. 12.

In connection with similar allegories in the Bohemian milieu, it is possible to think of the expression *bestiae terrae* in Milíč's letter to Pope Urban VI, or *vermes terrae* of the Spiritual Franciscan John Rupescissa whose treatise *Vade mecum in tribulatione* was already known in Bohemia at the turn of the fourteenth century. In addition, its anti-Hussite version was produced by an unknown author in Prague in 1422 and, after another version around 1425 in Czech, it narrated: "And horrible news will be in the world that earthly worms acquired such a great audacity and strength that they would cruelly swallow up wolfs, bears, and leopards – by this I mean earthly dignitaries. [A na světě budú noviny hrozné, že červi zemští v tak velikú smělost a v sílu se oblekú, že ukrutně vlky, medvědy a levharty, jakož mním, že duostojenstvie světských zžerú]."<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> *Knížky proti knězi kuchmistrovi* [Booklets against the Priest, Master Cook], in MIHOO, IV 321–322. See also the statement from 1412 in a letter to Křišťan of Prachatic: "A je třeba, aby hus hnula křídly proti křídílům Vehemota a proti ocasu, který vždy přikrývá ohavnost šelmy Antikristovy [And it is necessary for the goose to move its wings against the wings of Behemoth, and against the tail which covers the abomination of Antichrist's beast];" in *Sto listů M. Jana Husí*, ed. Bohumil Ryba (Prague 1949) 98; Latin text: Novotný, 154.

<sup>23</sup> On this see also Jana Nechutová, "Dialogus volatilis Štěpána z Dolan," LF 107 (1984) 11–18; Eadem, "K literární morfologii husitské polemiky [Towards the Morphology of Hussite Polemic], Štěpán z Dolan, Dialogus volatilis," *SPFFBU E 29* (1984) 216–218.

<sup>24</sup> On Milíč's statement, see *List papeži Urbanovi V.*, ed. Ferdinand Menčík, (Prague 1890) 324; for Rupescissa see. *Vade mecum in tribulatione*, in *Appendix ad Fasciculum rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, ed. Edvard Brown, (London 1690) 499. On the Czech translation

Likewise one should pay attention to the description of the beast symbolising the false pontiff and other allegories employed in the description of Jenštejn's vision in the treatise of Ondřej of Brod against the Hussites. Perhaps, Rupert knew the formulations of Ondřej, whose anti-Hussite polemic in its features roughly corresponds to the treatise *Prophete*. Possibly he also knew Rupescissa's *Vade mecum*. After the passage from the introduction – about the consequences derived from astrological observations – Rupert utilised a reference to Jonah, who announced the need for repentance to the inhabitants of Nineveh, if they wished to avert the punishment decreed by God. To a high degree, Rupert wished, like Jonah, to lead all the opponents of the Church to recognise their guilt, and thus to fend off the punishments, described in the treatise's conclusion.<sup>25</sup> Thus he styled himself into the form exactly used by Rupescissa, who in the introduction to *Vade mecum in tribulatione* cried out “per poenitentiam revocetur, sicut Ninive, et ego confusus et iratus remaneam sicut Jonas.”<sup>26</sup>

### The Lay Chalice as the Sign of the Advent of the Son of Perdition

The author of *Prophete* resolutely opposed all those who approved of the lay chalice, because he viewed its introduction as a heresy disseminated by the Bohemian partisans of Wyclif and especially of Hus. The crucial text from John 6 “Nisi manducaveritis” was interpreted by him strictly in a spiritual sense “totus textus dicit necessitatem spiritualis manducacionis, ut propter ea in textu eodem, capitulo 4<sup>o</sup> Salvator solus exponit: Spiritus est, qui vivificat etc. Sine qua impossibile est hominem salvari, sed non dicit ille textus: necessitatis sacramentalis manducacionis.”<sup>27</sup> He did not realise, however, that his principal Antichristic opponent, Hus, had also adopted this conception of spiritual communion already in his treatise *De corpore Christi*.<sup>28</sup> Hence, Rupert championed the spiritual significance of the reception of Christ's blood by the laity. His positions were very close to those maintained by Ondřej of Brod. As for the interpretation of the words “Nisi manducaveritis,” strictly maintained the spiritual explication, while he viewed as heresy the insistence that the lay chalice was indispensable for salvation.<sup>29</sup>

The similarity between Rupert and Ondřej is noticeable also in the issue of the concept of Cyprian and the mention of the possibility of Christ's blood

---

from 1425 see Ferdinand Menčík, *Česká prorocství* (Prague 1918) 22. On Rupescissa's writings in Bohemia, see Robert E. Lerner, “Popular Justice”, Rupescissa in Hussite Bohemia,” in *Eschatologie und Hussitismus*, edd. Alexander Patschovsky and František Šmahel (Prague 1996) 39–43; now in an original and complex way, Pavlína Cermanová, *Čechy na konci věků* [Bohemia at the End of Ages] (Prague 2013) 213–225.

<sup>25</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, ff.191v-192r: “De Ninivitis, ad quos Yonas missus fuerat, quorum dolor penitentia et contricio voluntatem Dei mutavit.”

<sup>26</sup> Johannes Rupescissa, *Vade mecum*, 497.

<sup>27</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 193r.

<sup>28</sup> *De corpore Christi*, ed. Václav Flajšhans (Prague 1903) 26–29.

<sup>29</sup> Traktát mistra Ondřeje z Brodu o původu husitů, ed. Jaroslav Kadlec (Tábor 1980) 24.



being desecrated by laymen's beards. Rupert included Cyprian among those who gave lay people communion *sub utraque* and were excommunicated from the church. Ondřej of Brod during his polemic with the chief propagator of the chalice, Jakoubek of Stříbro, in his treatise *De sumptione* from 1415 appealed to the authority of Augustine, who maintained that not all of Cyprian's works were accepted by the Church.<sup>30</sup> To the contrary, Jakoubek – in the explication of the words *Nisi manducaveritis* – shielded communion *sub utraque* by the authority of Cyprian, among others in his treatise *Salvator noster*.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, an extended composition *Otázka nyní taková běží* [A Question Now *au courant*] also cited Cyprian's authority.<sup>32</sup> Ondřej called attention to the risk of spilt wine in communicating bearded men in his treatise *De sumptione* in connection with the arguments of the party *sub utraque*, which referred to the practices of the Eastern Church.<sup>33</sup> In his retort, Jakoubek replied that a beard did not interfere with communion.<sup>34</sup>

Rupert classified the Wyclifites as a fulfilment of the advent of the Antichrist, the Son of Lies and Perdition, according to the Letter to the Thessalonians (2 Thes 2: 3–4), because:

“...wiklephiste se extollant, tamquam ipsi fiunt solidi et veri Cristi cultatores ut imitatores, quod est falsum. Quia ipse non superbit, sed pacienciam suos discipulos et imitatores docuit, sine qua re impossibile est salvarí.”<sup>35</sup>

While thus, for Rupert, the stress on communion *sub utraque* enunciated Antichrist's advent, authors advocating *sub utraque* were reaching exactly opposite conclusions. Romolo Cegna has documented with proper references to several instances that for Nicholas of Dresden – then living in Prague – communion *sub utraque* meant an important bulwark in the struggle against Antichrist.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Jaroslav Kadlec, *Studien und Texte zum Leben und Wirken des Prager Magisters Andreas von Brod*, (Münster 1982) 191; see also Helena. Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* [Studies and Texts on the Origin of the Chalice in Bohemia] (Brno 1997) 44.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. M. Jacobi de Mysa *Salvator noster, De comunione spirituali et sacramenta integra sub duplici forma panis et vini comuniatem plebium concernente*, in *Betlémské texty*, ed. Bohumil Ryba (Prague 1951) 121–124.

<sup>32</sup> In the composition *Otázka nyní taková běží* from 1417, attributed to Jan Čapek, this text of Cyprian's quote is used identically, see František Svejkovský, *Veršované skladby doby husitské* [Compositions in Verse of the Hussite Period] (Prague 1963) 94–95.

<sup>33</sup> J. Kadlec, *Studien und Texte*, 222; Idem, “Reformní postila a synodální kázání mistra Ondřeje z Brodu [The Reformed Homiliary and Synodal Sermons of Ondřej of Brod],” *Studie o rukopisech* 15 (1977) 13–26.

<sup>34</sup> With the relevant transcription of the manuscript, see H. Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha*, 52.

<sup>35</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, f. 194v.

<sup>36</sup> Romolo Cegna, “La Scuola della Rosa Nera e Nicolo detto da Dresda (1380–1417), Maestro tedesco al collegio della Rosa Nera in Praga (1412–1415),” *MPP* 30 (1990) 83–84.

Jakoubek of Stříbro gave the final form to John's theses about frequent communion, which in time of the final persecution by Antichrist assured a connection with Christ and, therefore, Antichrist tried with all his power to prevent it.<sup>37</sup> In one of his Bethlehem sermons in 1416, Jakoubek declared:

“Věděti máte a zajisté věřiti a držeti, že den zarmoucení a nátiskuov přišel jest a že se již počíná skonání světa a také Antikristovi časové přibližují se, abychom jsouc hotovi všickni stáli k boji, aniž co jiného, jedné o slávu věčného života a korunu vyznání Božského myslíme, aniž se domnívejme, že by tyto věci, kteréž jsou pomínuly. Těžší nyní a ukrutnější boj nastává, kterémuž boji věřu neporušenou a ctností silnou připravovati se mají Kristovi rytíři, znamenajíce, že proto na každý den z kalichu krev pijí, aby mohli i oni pro Krista krev proliti. Nebo to jest chtěti s Kristem nalezenou býti, tak Krista následovati, jakož jest on činil i učil.”<sup>38</sup>

A few years later, in his large *Exposition of the Revelation* [Vyklad na zjevení] he interpreted Rev 12 about the seven-headed beast struggling with the woman clothed in the sun. The only real aid in the struggle against the beast was offered by the communion sub utraque:

“Krev Ježíše Krista najvíce spojuje obce tyto v boji proti Antikristu, kteréhož sau přemohli také na tomto světě těchto dnuov, a činí pomoc přemáhati hříechy v duši a pokušení.”<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *Regulae V*, 158: “Quare autem hec omnia in populo christiano moderno, vel unde, nisi ex eo, quod ceci duces, imprudentes et infideles servi (Mat. 15: 14; 25: 26), pseudochristi et pseudoprophete, ministri, que sua sunt, queres (Phil. 2: 21), et que Christi sunt, negligentes, iuge dei sacrificium a populo christiano communiter abstulerunt (Dan 12: 11), vel non dando sacramentum altaris requirentibus, vel non poscentes non invitando, vel ne sepe poscant aut cottidie, dissuadendo, deterrendo et prohibendo, infelices Gog et Magog (Rev 20: 7) obtecti ac obstricti sua infausta ignorancia et cecitate timoreque, ubi nullus est timor, trepidantes (Ps 52: 6).”

<sup>38</sup> See Jakoubek ze Stříbra, *Betlémská kázání z roku 1416*, ed. Karel Sita (Prague 1951) 122–123: “You are supposed to know and for sure hold and believe that the day of sorrow and oppression has come and that the ending of the world already is beginning, and also the times of the Antichrist are approaching, so that we all should be ready to stand and fight, without any other thought but the glory of eternal life and the crown of divine confession, without assuming that these things, that are happening, would pass away. A harder and more cruel fight is beginning, for which struggle Christ's knights should prepare with uncorrupted faith and powerful virtue, being aware that they drink blood from the chalice every day so that they can also shed blood for Christ. Because that is the way of wishing to be found with Christ, so to follow Christ, as he himself did and taught.”

<sup>39</sup> See *Výklad na Zjevení sv. Jana* [Exposition of the Revelation of St. John], v. I, ed. František Šimek (Prague 1932) 479: “The blood of Christ most connects these communities in the struggle against the Antichrist, whom they have also overcome in the world of these days, and it provides aid in overcoming sins in the soul and temptation.”

Rupert's position was exactly the opposite. The advocates of heresy – thanks to their stubborn demand – were to bring about a direct incorporation into the body of the dragon of Rev 12. They represented for him the ultimate threat to the established order of the world, determined by God, on which the total unity of the world – both secular and spiritual – rested. Therefore, they had to be extirpated.

### **The Prophecy of the Advent of the Herald of Renewal**

Rupert first in his treatise *Prophete* calculated the duration of darkness in Bohemia to be from 1406 to 1419. Then he foretold the arrival of two great lights “duo luminaria magna in sua potestate et vigore,” who will commence the renewal understood as a defeat of heresy, in this case of the advocates of the reform, and a restoration of the earlier conditions. One apostolic light will illumine the day, that is the spiritual power, the other one the night, which is the secular one.<sup>40</sup>

The year, in which the darkness in Bohemia began, was apparently connected with a more open defence of Wyclif's teaching at the University of Prague. The year 1419 also obviously related to the expected arrival of the Emperor Sigismund, who, from 25 December 1419 until January of the following year, stayed in Brno, that is, in the place where the treatise was copied. Rupert did not anywhere explain the concrete reasons that led him to choose that exact year, nor did he give a reason for using the biblical quotation from the first chapter of Genesis [1: 16] about the two great lights, stating: “Bůh učinil dvě veliké světla: větší, aby vládla dni, a menší, aby vládla noci” [God made the two great lights—the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night]. The fact that Rupert placed the existence of the two lights into the years 1419–1422 may have been inspired by the traditional placement of the activities of two witnesses from Rev 11, Elijah and Enoch in the interval of 1260 days, or three and a half years. The interval 1419–1422 would then correspond exactly with the literal sense of the *Apocalypse*. In his treatise, Rupert referred to Elijah only in the relation to the impossibility of the lay chalice. Rupert did not explicitly consider – according to the example of the authors of the previous chapters of this work – a new advent of the emissaries of renewal in the spirit of Elijah and Enoch. Rupert's non-concrete

<sup>40</sup> MS Vaticano, BAV, fol. 196r-196v: “Quia cum scribebatur anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo sexto, incipiebatur tenebrosa heresis in regno Boemie et hec tenebre durabunt, licet non ita vigorose, usque scribetur anno Domini M<sup>o</sup>CCCCXCIX<sup>o</sup>: Tunc erunt duo luminaria magna in sua potestate et vigore. licet anno XXII<sup>o</sup> corroborabuntur. Unum videlicet apostolicum illuminabit diem, id est spirituales et ecclesiasticos, aliud noctem, id est seculares potestates, que luminaria fugabunt tunc tenebras heresis, spoliabunt corpore wycliphistas, ditabunt fide cristianos et tunc divisio cristianorum, ymmo Cristi, ut ibidem dicit Paulus, si visus est Cristus, integraliter in membris et corpore mistico. Et sic erunt caput unum et unum corpus invisibiliter permansurum etc.” Tuto část také Sedlák přepsal podle admontského rukopisu ve své studii, srov. J. Sedlák, *Několik textů z doby husitské*, 231.

allusion to Hildegard of Bingen, who foretold the appearance of heretics at the end of world's history, however, supports the assumption about the character of Rupert's emissaries of renewal in the spirit of Elijah and Enoch.<sup>41</sup> Rupert's description corresponds to Hildegard's narrative in the treatise *Scivias*, in which she foretold the coming of Antichrist – the beast, the Son of Perdition – whose advent would be heralded by heresies and schisms. She also foretold Antichrist's defeat and the triumph of faith with a conversion of all thanks to the activities of Elijah and Enoch.<sup>42</sup> Hildegard founded the victory of faith on the symbolism of light – church – hence on a description close to Rupert's narrative of two lights.<sup>43</sup> She did not, of course, link the two witnesses with the two lights.

In the exegesis of the church fathers of the first four centuries, the biblical text of *Genesis* 1: 16 about the two lights (sun and moon) was interpreted as the sun representing Christ, and the moon – the church.<sup>44</sup> In medieval explanations, the same text of from *Genesis* was utilised in the extended and tense disputes between papal and imperial/secular powers, Papacy, represented by the sun, justified its superiority over secular power/the moon with reference to the implication of the order of the world as created by God. The biblical argumentation was typically put forth by popes Gregory VII and Innocent III, who presented the derivation of the secular from the spiritual power on the basis of the solar and lunar imagery.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., ff. 194r-194v: "Et sic ipsi passionem dyabolicam pallidi efficientur, qui color proprius est hereticorum, ut patet in visionibus sancte Hildegardis. Quos proprius color omnes et imitatores eorum inferius et dampnatio sequetur, tamen de primo secundum malum est, quod eos sequetur, quia ultra omnes Deo dedicatos sacerdotes et levitas se extollent tamquam Anticristi servitores, de quo dicitur II<sup>a</sup> Thessalonicorum II<sup>o</sup> Capitulo."

<sup>42</sup> See also *Scivias Hildegardis sive libri visionum*, in PL 197, coll. 720: "Sed duos testes meos quos ad id tempus in secreto voluntatis meae reservavi, scilicet Enoch et Eliam; ut ipsi repugnent et ut errantes ad viam veritatis reducant emittam. Qui fortissimas et robustissimas virtutes fidelibus ostendent; quia cum verba testimonii eorum in ore utriusque sibi aequaliter consentient, fidem audientes adhibebunt. Nam idcirco hi duo testes veritatis tamdiu per me reservati sunt, ut tunc ipsis procedentibus, sermo eorum in cordibus electorum meorum teneatur et solidetur, quatenus inde germen Ecclesiae meae in magna humilitate subsistat."

<sup>43</sup> See also *ibid.*, coll. 722: "Et ecce pedes praefatae muliebris imaginis candidi apparent, splendorem super splendorem solis reddentes: hoc est quod fortitudo fundamenti et sustentatio sponsae filii mei multum candorem fidei ostendet, et pulchritudinem illam quae omnem pulchritudinem terrena claritatis superat demonstrabit, cum filio perditionis ut dictum est prostrato, multi ex iis qui erraverant ad veritatem revertentur. Sed post casum illius impii, quando novissimus dies in solutione mundi occurrat mortalis homo non quaerat; quia eum scire non poterit, quoniam eum Pater in abscondito secreti sui servavit."

<sup>44</sup> For a survey of these exegeses, see especially Hugo Rahner, *L'ecclésiologia dei Padri, Simboli della Chiesa* (Roma 1971) 147–287.

<sup>45</sup> On Gregory's use of biblical formulation in the cited context, see, for instance, his letter to the English King William from 1080 in *Das Register Gregors VII*, ed. Erich Casper [MGH Epistolae selectae, tom. II/II] (Berlin 1923) 505–506. Innocent III also used it abundantly in his bull, *Sicut universitatis conditor* from the year 1198, Cf. PL 214, coll. 387–388.

Rupert's concept of *duo luminaria magna*, despite its reference to the dualism of spiritual and secular power, is still far remote from the sharply defined explanation of the conflict between the papacy and the empire between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. However, it is definitely closer to the concept of the two witnesses in Rev 11, used especially in the Joachimite prophetic literature of the thirteenth century. It originated in the circle of Spiritual Franciscans, who redefined certain categories of historical interpretation of the great exegete and prophet of the Antichrist, Joachim of Fiore.<sup>46</sup>

Although Joachim did not use the formulation *duo luminaria magna*, he did put forth a grandiose vista of two monastic orders *viri spiritualis* with reference to the two witnesses from Rev 11, namely, Enoch and Elijah. These two personages – forty years after the death of the Calabrian abbot – became in the writings of the Spiritual Franciscans important prototypes for presenting Franciscans and Dominicans as the two orders, who were predestined for the principal role as fighters against Antichrist and as architects of renewal. Moreover, in some of these writings, the most important of which are *Super Hieremiam* and *Super Isaiam*, the two mendicant orders – which are to lead humanity into the harmonious age – are called, besides two witnesses of the *Apocalypse* or two candelabras, also as “duo luminaria magna.”<sup>47</sup> The treatise *Super Hieremiam*, pretending to be the work of Joachim of Fiore and written between 1240 and 1248, assigned to the two mendicant orders the main role in the realisation of the work of renewal. Providence destined the

<sup>46</sup> On the historical concept of Joachim of Fiore, see especially Bernhard Töpfer, *Das kommende Reich des Friedens: Zur Entwicklung chiliastischer Zukunftshoffnungen im Hochmittelalter* (Berlin, 1964) 48–103; Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in Later Middle Ages. A study in Joachimism* (New York, 2000); Bernard McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought*. (New York, 1985); Gian Luca Potestà, *Il tempo dell'Apocalisse* (Roma-Bari 2004); Fabio Troncarelli, *Gioacchino da Fiore, La vita, il pensiero, le opere* (Rome, 2002) 10–32; Robert E. Lerner, “Refreshment of the Saints: The Time after Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought,” *Traditio* 32 (1976) 97–144; Idem, “Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore,” *Speculum* 60 (1985) 553–570; Idem, “Estatic dissent,” *Speculum* 67 (1992) 33–52; Idem, *Scrutare il futuro, L'eredità di Gioacchino da Fiore alla fine del Medioevo* (Rome, 2008); Roberto Rusconi (ed.), *Gioacchino da Fiore tra Bernardo di Clairvaux e Innocenzo III* (Rome, 2001).

<sup>47</sup> On these two Joachimite writings, see especially Bernhard Töpfer, *Das kommende Reich des Friedens*, 133–147; Fiorella Simoni, “Il „Super Hieremiam” e il gioachimismo francescano,” *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 82 (1970) 13–46; Robert Moynihan, “The Development of the „Pseudo-Joachim” Commentary „Super Hieremiam”: New Manuscript Evidence,” *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Age-Temps modernes* 98 (1986) 109–142; Idem, “The Manuscript Tradition of the „Super Hieremiam” and the Venetian Editions of the Early Sixteenth Century,” in *Il profetismo gioachimita tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, ed. Gian Luca Potestà, (Genova 1991), 129–137; Stephen E. Wessley, *Joachim of Fiore and Monastic Reform*, (New York 1990) 101–135; Gian Luca Potestà, “Gioacchino riformatore monastico nel „Tractatus de vita sancti Benedicti” e nella coscienza dei primi fiorensi,” *Florensia* 6 (1992) 73–93.

two orders to conduct humanity over the many traps through the end of the Second Age into the fullness of the Third Age. The two orders were sent: “k útěše a odpočinku věrných jako slunce a měsíc kontemplujících pravd [for the comfort and rest of the faithful like the sun and the moon contemplating the truths].” In several places further on, the author states that God made the two orders, “duo luminaria magna,” to illuminate the road to Jerusalem.<sup>48</sup>

In 1249, the Alexander Minorita OFM expressed himself in the same sense in his *Expositio in Apocalypsim*. Alexander knew well several of Joachim’s writings; he frequently referred to them and surely he must have known also *Super Hieremiam*. Contrary to Joachim and his interpreters, however, he abandoned the concept of history that postulates a progressive development toward a fulfilment. Of course, he still assigned to the orders of Sts, Francis and Dominic the role of principal protagonists in the final phase of history, which was to terminate around 1326.<sup>49</sup> Alexander also designated both orders as *duo luminaria magna*, in their capacity to help humanity escape from darkness and to be led by the lights of innocence and repentance.

In 1255 the two contemporary ministers general of the Minorites and the Dominicans – John of Parma (known also as *magnus Joachita*) and Umberto of Romans – sent a joint circular letter to members of their two orders. They expressed, in an usual manner, the idea that the two orders were despatched to save the world – “Novissime diebus istis in fine seculorum duos nostros Ordines in ministerium salutis” – and further, in repeated parallels, announced that the two orders were:

“...duo luminaria magna, duae tubae vere Moyses, duo Cherubim, duo ubera sponsae, duo filii olivae splendoris. Hi sunt duo testes Christi, qui saccis amicti iam praedicant et testimonium perhibent veritati. Hi sunt illae due stellae lucidae, quae secundum Sibyllinum vaticinium habent species quatuor animalium, in diebus novissimis nomine Agni vociferantes in directione humilitatis et voluntariae paupertatis.”<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> *Abbatis Joachim divina prorsus in Jeremiam prophetam interpretatio*, ed. F. Silvester de Castilione Aretino (Cologne) 1577, 136, 159, 165, 169–170, 179–180, 187.

<sup>49</sup> Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, ed. Alois Wachtel [MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, Bd. 1] (Weimar, 1955) 413.

<sup>50</sup> On the year 1255, see *Annales minorum*, III, ed. Lucas Wadding (Ad Claras Aquas 1931) 429–430. On the prophecy of the Sybiline Oracles, see Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy*, 146; Roberto Rusconi, *L’Attesa della fine. Crisi della società, profezia ed Apocalisse in Italia al tempo del grande scisma d’Occidente (1378–1417)* (Rome, 1979) 97, 167; Sabine Schmolinsky, *Der Apokalypsenkommentar des Alexander Minorita: zur frühen Rezeption Joachims von Fiore in Deutschland* [MGH Studien und Texte 3] (Hannover 1991) 52–65; Christian Jostmann, “Die Sibilla Eritrea. Eine historiographische Skizze,” *Florensia* 15 (2001) 109–141; Gian Luca Potestà, “Roma nella profezia (secoli XI–XIII),” in *Roma antica nel Medioevo. Mito, rappresentazioni, sopravvivenze nella “Respublica Christiana” dei secoli XI–XIII*, (Milan, 2001) 365–398.

In the Bohemian milieu – and outside the context of the writings of the Spiritual Franciscans – for instance, Matěj of Janov in his *Regulae* (V,3) opened the introduction to the treatise about preachers (*in spiritu Helie*) with formulations saturated with the theme of light – now without any reference to a monastic community. First of all, he cited the words of the Psalm [103: 19] *Lunam fecit in tempore, sol cognovit occasum suum*.<sup>51</sup> Then he explained that the preachers in the spirit of Elijah and Enoch were two apocalyptic witnesses, two candelabra (Rev 11: 3–4), who had disrupted the silence about Antichrist and struggled against the beast from chapter 13. According to Matěj's interpretation, the two horns of the beast were to represent the two gates – namely, the secular and the spiritual power of the church – through which Antichrist entered into Christendom. Matěj's lore about preachers of Elijah's spirit in agreement with Joachimite texts – however, rid of the identification with the religious orders – was taken over also by Jakoubek of Strěbro. He connected the function of the preachers of Elijah's spirit with the priests of his own church stressing communion sub utraque, when the torch of those preachers was taken over by all good Christians.

It makes sense to discern a similarity of Rupert's utilisation of the two great lights, bearing a renewal, with the Joachimite model – elaborated in the writings of the Spiritual Franciscans – especially as far as their incorporation into the apocalyptic historical context is concerned. Although it is not possible to determine, whether Rupert was a member of a monastic community, it is not possible to exclude his proximity to the Spiritual Franciscans. In one place in his treatise Rupert refers to Jeremiah's complaint about the absence of prophets. Perhaps he modified the formulations about the two lights from *Super Hieremiam*, or leaned on the apocalyptic explication of Alexander Minorita, which otherwise was widely available in Bohemia.

A partial solution of this unknown question can be found in the hitherto unpublished treatise *Postilla de tempore et de sanctis* of Jakoubek of Strěbro from 1416–1417, in which he interpreted Matthew 24 and the Book of Job. Thereby he attests that there were discussions in Prague about the identification of spiritual and secular power with the papacy and the empire.<sup>52</sup> In his treatise, Jakoubek dealt first of all with the deposition of John XXIII.<sup>53</sup> Afterwards, he stated that the papal savants – claiming for themselves a God-given duty of interpreting the Scripture – maintained: “Fecit Deus duo luminaria magna.”<sup>54</sup> Further, Jakoubek noted that the Council Fathers were mistaken when they designated the pope as the sun and the king as the moon,

<sup>51</sup> *Regulae* III, 351.

<sup>52</sup> *Postilla de tempore et de sanctis super Mt 24 et Iob*, MS Prague, KMK, O 29, ff. 258r–314v. On the manuscript, see Spunar, I, 239–240.

<sup>53</sup> MS Prague, KMK, O 29, f. 264r.

<sup>54</sup> MS Prague, KMK, O 29, f. 266r: “Pape doctores habent modum totam scripturam de deo debitam et sibi attributam ipsi pape attribuunt dicentes: Fecit Deus duo luminaria magna”.

because: “Hoc bene patuit in Anticristo presenti Baltasaro de Coxa, prius pro vero sole habito, nunc universaliter propter eius maleficia condempnato.”<sup>55</sup>

This important notation of Jakoubek’s on a conciliar discussion naturally leads to the question, which treatise or whose authority stimulated the conciliar Fathers to a wider discussion of *duo luminaria magna*, which found echoes also in Bohemia. If we search Hardt’s edition of the documents of the Council of Constance, we come upon several speeches of French theologian, Cardinal Pierre d’Ailly in v. 6. He was, among others, chancellor of the Parisian Sorbonne; a determined champion of terminating the papal schism; an expert in many prophetic writings, not excluding the Joachimite ones; and, not least, an author of astrological treatises.<sup>56</sup>

At the Council of Constance, Pierre d’Ailly made a speech in 1417 – that is in the year of the earlier-mentioned Jakoubek’s polemic – with the title *De officio imperatoris, papae, reliquorumque membrorum concilii Constatiensis pro emendatione ecclesiae*.<sup>57</sup> His starting point was the eschatological passage in Luke 21: 25, announcing the approaching Second Coming of Christ, which states: “There will be signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars.” These words of the Scripture about the signs of the Last Judgment were interpreted by d’Ailly in a spiritual sense in that those signs referred to an ecumenical council, which in a way would resemble a court of the Last Judgment, especially after the experience of a long and negatively perceived church schism in the very head of the church. It is understandable that this court could be nothing other than the concurrent Council in Constance, representing a gathering of the sun, the moon, and the stars, in other words, papal power, imperial power, and other members of the universal church.

In connection with the formulation of Rupert’s treatise, it is important to adduce that d’Ailly, immediately after the introduction about the spiritual interpretation of the eschatological passage of Luke’s Gospel, recited the words of *Genesis*: “Fecit Dominus duo luminaria magna” (Gen 1: 16). Afterwards there followed a long exposition with numerous description explaining that the sun represented papal power and the moon imperial power; only a bond between the two powers would newly realise the unity of the church.<sup>58</sup> For

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> On this important French Cardinal, see Bernhard Meller, *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peter von Ailly* (Freiburg, 1954); A. Gomez Moriana, “El pensamiento eclesiológico de Pierre d’Ailly,” *Anales de la catedra Fr. Suarez* 3 (1963) 1–43; Bernard Guenée, *Entre l’Église et l’État: quatre vies de prélats français de la fin du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1987); Laura Ackerman Smoller, *History, Prophecy, and the Stars: The Christian Astrology of Pierre d’Ailly* (Princeton 1994); Christopher M. Bellitto, “Per viam rationis...per legem vite. Pierre d’Ailly and the Last of the Fathers,” *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 44 (2009) 65–76.

<sup>57</sup> Petrus de Alliaco, *De officio imperatoris, papae, reliquorumque membrorum concilii Constatiensis pro emendatione ecclesiae*, Hardt VI, 436–450.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 437: “In principio libri Genesis scriptum est: Fecit Dominus duo luminaria magna. Luminare majus, ut praeset diei, et luminare minus, ut praeset nocti, et stellas. Habet igitur Ecclesia duo luminaria magna. Solem et lunam, habet et stellas varias. In sole papalis



Rupert's line of prophecy about the two great lights, d'Ailly's speech presents inexhaustible inspirational material. It is not without importance that d'Ailly stressed the contemporary imperial power of Sigismund of Luxembourg for his effort to assemble a council. Likewise, with the same power and hope, he expected the use of the power entrusted to the emperor when, like Judas Maccabeus, he would raise the sword and fight for achieving unity.<sup>59</sup>

D'Ailly's speech to a considerable extent also helps to answer the question of the influence of Joachimite formulations on Rupert's treatise. Thus, in the conclusion of his speech, the French Cardinal focused on the need for church reform and on the character of this reform. Here he noted that the church was replete with many abuses; subject to persecution and schisms; and tormented by disobedience and other scandals. All this should have been foretold earlier and d'Ailly appealed to what derived "ex scriptis venerabilis Abbatis Joachim et Sancta Hildegardis, quorum non est autoritas contemnenda," hence to authorities, among whom Hildegard was explicitly mentioned in Rupert's treatise.<sup>60</sup> It is, therefore, possible to assume that Rupert very likely based his passage about the advent of the two reforming lights on the suggestive treatise of the French theologian Pierre d'Ailly. The latter started the discussion of the conciliar fathers about the pope as the sun and the emperor as the moon, and this discussion found a polemical echo in the interpretation of Jakoubek of Střibro. In as much as d'Ailly made his speech in 1417, it is further possible to assume that Rupert's treatise was not written prior to that year.

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

---

Majestas, quae praeest diei, id est, spiritualibus; in luna Imperialis potestas, quae praeest nocti, id est, temporalibus. In stellis vero diversorum statuum Ecclesiarum varietas, quae suis subest majoribus, congrue designatur, sicut plenius patebit ex his, quae inferius dicenda sunt."

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 442.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 445.