

*Sermones de pace*¹

Jana Nechutová (Brno)

The concept of peace, expressed by the Latin word “pax“, has appeared often in Christian literature since the patristic period: as an opposite of “bellum“ and its synonyms, for instance, when the author writes about the justification of a war carried on by Christians; as an independent category especially in homiletics (several of Wyclif’s sermons are in that regard particularly interesting for our theme); and – as we shall see from several remarks in the text below – in tractate literature, especially in a pastoral or moralistic context, in our case (Jakoubek’s *Concilium*) in connection with political events. In the history of Utraquism, if we consider the Council of Basel as one of its highlights, it is the significant speech of Heinrich Toke at the beginning of the proceedings in Cheb,² but we leave that one aside in line with our decision to limit our discussion to Hus’s lifetime.

I. *Magistri Iohannis Hus Sermo de pace*

Sermo de pace (A Sermon about Peace) is one of the speeches that Hus prepared prior to his departure for Constance to be delivered before the Council. (They included two others: *De sufficiencia legis Cristi* a *De fidei sue elucidacione*). We know that the Council Fathers did not hear this speech, inasmuch as in the end Hus had little opportunity in Constance to present anything of his own teaching. The very idea that he would be permitted to deliver before the Council a kind of salutatory greeting appears extremely naive. Beforehand, of course, Hus could not anticipate the manner of his reception in Constance or that, within a month of his arrival into the city, he would be deprived of his personal freedom.

Hus wrote *Sermo de pace* in Krakovec during September 1414, shortly before he set out on his journey to Constance with his entourage on 11 October. If we discount Hus’s preparatory draft, included in the Vienna codex ÖNB

¹ This study was written as a part of the project *Magistri Iohannis Hus Opera Omnia*, editorial project in anticipation of Hus’s Anniversary in 2015. GAČR reg N. 13–21620 S

² Ed. with trans. by Jana Nechutová, “Proslov Jindřicha Tokeho ‘Pax vobis’ k zahájení chebských porad 9. května 1432” (The Statement of Jindřich Toke ‘Pax vobis’ at the Opening of the Cheb Consultations on 9 May 1432), *Soudce smluvený v Chebu*. [The ‘Judge’ agreed upon at Cheb] (Cheb, 1982) 141–154.

4902,³ the text of the sermon is extant in seven manuscripts (the location of the eighth one, Prague MS Metropolitan Chapter N 48, has been lost for a long time). The *Sermo* was published first by Flacius Illyricus; in the nineteenth century by Konstantin Höfler; Amedeo Molnár together with F. M. Dobiáš produced a modern edition, which appeared twice with a translation and, for the third time only in a Czech translation in a collection, titled *Husova výzbroj do Kostnice* (Hus's Weaponry for Constance).⁴

Now we can speak only briefly about what editors and the most important Utraquist researchers have stated about Hus's *Sermo*. Václav Novotný⁵ stressed that – among the three compared texts – Wyclif's influence is most pronounced in *Sermo de pace*; Vlastimil Kybal⁶ sees in this text an effort to achieve orthodoxy, and he adopts, towards its contents, a reserved, if not critical, attitude. Amedeo Molnár, in the first edition of the *Sermon about Peace*, begins by noting the contemporary importance of the concept of *pax* and of the demand for unity in the time of the schism, as well as in the conciliar effort at the restoration of ecclesiastical unity, namely at a pacification. In all that, he tries to interpret Hus's concept of peace and the manner of his critique of the "fossilised church". Likewise he maintains that Wyclif was here substantially utilised by Hus. František Holeček offers, a hitherto most detailed content of Hus's sermon about peace. He does so after a relatively extensive disquisition about the situation of the church and the entire society at the start of the fifteenth century, and especially about the search for the instruments of reform. Likewise František Šmahel, in his most recent monograph, briefly presents the contents of Hus's sermon.⁷

Hus's *Sermo de pace* is not titled in the manuscripts, and presumably for political reasons Czech editions before 1989 – instead of *Sermon on Peace* (*Kázání o pokoji*) – called it less accurately *Speech about Peace* (*Řeč o míru*).⁸ The first part of the *Sermo* corresponds to the structure of a so-called "thematic sermon" by the articulation of the exposition – peace is double, then the usual division into three sections, and further triple segments – and also by the repeated introduction of the biblical theme. The second part of the *Sermo* is closer to the form of a "homily." Biblical texts, on which this sermon is based (Jn 20: 19,21,26 parallels Lk 24: 36): *Pax vobis*, the words of Jesus

³ Amedeo Molnár, "Pohled do Husovy literární dílny" [A Glance into Hus's Literary Workshop], LF 82 (1959) 239–245.

⁴ *Mistr Jan Hus, Řeč o míru*, ed. and trans. František M. Dobiáš and Amedeo Molnár (Prague, 1963).

⁵ Václav Novotný, *M. Jan Hus, Život a učení* [Jan Hus. Life and Work], v. I, *Život a dílo*, part 2 (Prague, 1921) 351.

⁶ Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Jan Hus, Život a učení*. v. II., *Učení, část 2* (Prague, 1926) 505–506.

⁷ František Šmahel, *Jan Hus, život a dílo* (Jan Hus: Life and Work) (Prague, 2013) 177.

⁸ Title "Řeč o míru" presumably appeared politically more appropriate in Czech editions prior to 1989; however it was still retained by the edition of the Česká křesťanská akademie in 1995.

when, after his resurrection, he appears before his disciples and greets them; further Hus points to another saying of Jesus about peace (Mt 10: 12): *Pax huic domui*. This house, given the greeting of peace by Jesus – and following his example and commandment also by Hus – is, in the spirit of Hus’s (and not only his) exegesis, the church, the house of God. Hus is thus concerned about peace and pacification in the hitherto split church, not merely about a calm discussion of peace by the Council. After all, the Council was not identical with the church, the house of God, as Hus had shown several times in his ecclesiastical texts.

The very beginning of the text is characteristic. It reveals Hus’s typical diction, as we know it from another of his very important texts, the appeal from the court of the Pope to the court of Christ. It is a moderately pathetic “exordium” of the higher style. Hus uses it on more solemn occasions or in texts which he deems of special importance. At first, he posits the evangelical example of Jesus Christ and he does it in two steps – first in general terms in relation to Christ’s humanity and divinity, then more concretely; in the case of the *Sermo de pace* he does it so that he speaks about a situation from Jesus’s life, when the Redeemer made a statement referring to peace (Mt 10: 12 – *Pax huic domui*). Thus Jesus himself had used the greeting of peace and also bequeathed this manner of greeting to his disciples. Here Hus declares his intention to follow that example and in obedience to the directive, he greets his listeners “Peace to this house.”⁹

The *Sermo* continues with an exposition of the various types of peace and its properties, articulated according to the scholastic manner. Molnár refers to Wyclif concerning Hus’s distinction “Est autem duplex pax, scilicet pax Dei et pax mundi”, where the key biblical text is Jn 14: 27 (“Non quomodo mundus dat, ego do vobis”). It is, however, a distinction which is not infrequently encountered in earlier theological literature; we often find the reference to the double peace, and usually the two units of this pair are in a positive relationship, for instance, “pax temporis” – “pectoris”, “temporis” – “aeternitatis”. The closest approximation to Hus’s and Wyclif’s exposition is the passage from the treatise of moral theology *Verbum abbreviatum* by Peter Cantor, who likewise distinguishes “pax mundi” and “pax Dei”;¹⁰ also very much like Hugo de Folieto (Hugh of Fouilly) in *De claustro animae*.¹¹ Also the definition of peace by the

⁹ A similar structure marks also the first paragraphs of Grosseteste’s “Memorandum” (more in n.17), perhaps it is a matter of an exordial topos of certain texts of theological literature.

¹⁰ Petrus Cantor, *Verbum abbreviatum*, c. 93 (De duplici pace), PL 205, 0297B: “Est autem pax Dei, et pax mundi: prima duplex, quia pectoris, unde: ‘Pacem relinquo vobis’, et pax aeternitatis, unde Apostolus: ‘Pax Dei, quae exsuperat omnem sensum’. Secunda similiter duplex est. Est enim pax mundi ficta...”

¹¹ Hugo de Folieto, *De claustro animae*, PL 176, 1160A-B: “Si quaeras quomodo pacem sequi debeas, audi Jesum, qui ad coelos ascendens pacem discipulis reliquit, ut evangelista Joannes de eo attestatur, dicens: ‘Pacem meam do vobis, pacem relinquo vobis. Non quomodo

expression of “*tranquillitas animi*” by medieval theologians is quite customary. We also find in texts a triple division of God’s peace (“*ad Deum*”, “*ad seipsum*”, “*ad proximum*”), for instance, in the canonist and glossator, Rufinus, Bishop of Assisi and Archbishop of Sorrento (late twelfth century) in his treatise *De bono pacis*.¹²

Hus actually cites Wyclif at length without of course naming him explicitly, a discretion for which, of certainly, he had strong and understandable reasons. The longest passages are from Wyclif’s sermon on the theme *Pax vobis* (Jn 20: 21), and two shorter citations from the sermon on Jn 14: 23.¹³ Naturally, Hus utilises those pronouncements of the English reformer, which are in no way conflicted, but rather unambiguously anchored in the orthodox homiletic and exegetic tradition. *Sermo de pace* thus avoids any kind of provocation, not only by references to the general corpus of Catholic orthodoxy, but also – although clearly utilising Wyclif – he carefully avoids citing him as his source. This is hardly surprising, especially when we consider the purpose and the situation for which the *Sermo* was designed. Nevertheless, it is useful to call attention to this caution.¹⁴

Yet, Hus does not miss any opportunity to point out – at times exactly in Wyclif’s words – what it means to be a Christian and what it means to be in Antichrist’s service. After all, if Jesus says that he did not come to bring peace, but rather a sword, and that he came to mutually separate people, he says nothing else, but that he came to disturb the peace of this world, namely, the peace of Antichrist that was, above all, characterised by pride and avarice.

After the scholastic distinctions the *Sermo* continues with a characterisation of God’s peace and then of secular peace; a commented enumeration of the differences between the two follows. Afterwards the author concludes the first part and moves on to the second part, in which in Hus’s own words “*dicendum est, (1) quare domus Dei est tanto inquieta tempore et (2) per que media ipsius pax foret efficacius stabilita.*” It was already mentioned that, while the first part is constructed as a thematic sermon, the second part approximates a homily of the patristic type; after systematic theological analysis of the concept of *pax* in the first part, an exposition via moral theology follows in the

mundus dat, ego do vobis.“ Audis, si attendis, esse duo genera pacis. Unam quam dat Christus, alteram quam dat mundus. Pax mundi est, ut a Deo recedas, et diabolo consentias. Pax vero Christi est, ut expellas diabolum et diligas Deum. Pax mundi est, ut tibi mundus, et tu mundo placeas, ut sic satiatus terrenis voluptatibus inferni cruciatibus in aeternum succumbas. Pax Christi est, ut adversa mundi usque ad mortem patienter toleres, ut sic post mortem futurae vitae felicitatem securius exspectes...”

¹² |Rufinus Episcopus, *De bono pacis*, PL 150, 1604CD: “Ecce de pace, quae est in superioribus, tractavimus; deinceps ad eam quae habetur in inferioribus, id est pacem, quae est hominis ad se et hominis ad hominem, sermonis intentio convertatur.”

¹³ Parallels with Wyclif’s sermon on Jn 20: 21 were found already by Johann Loserth, *Hus und Wyclif, Zur Genesis der hussitischen Lehre* (Leipzig 1884, 1925).

¹⁴ It was also done by previous researchers; see the earlier reference to Vlastimil Kybal in Nr. 6.

second part. Only this part is concerned with the meaning of “pax Dei” and “pax mundi” in contemporary church and society. There is a lack of true peace in the church (in God’s house) because people have abandoned God’s justice (with the citation Bar 4: 12–13).¹⁵ Hus uses the words of Bernard and Jerome to express the church’s lament over the vainglory (*ambicio*), hypocrisy, and disruption of peace. Thereafter Hus, takes advantage of the fact that the vulgate treats the term “justice” (*iusticie*) as a plural word, which enables him to enumerate all the variants, namely, “concordia, humilitas, paupertas benivola, castitas, paciencia, predicacio ewangelii fructuosa” (of course, he also speaks about “partes iusticie”). Aside from short connecting segments in his own words and citations from Scripture, Hus relies largely on other authors to describe these virtues, their practice and, above all, the lack of their practice. Once more, these authorities, above all, include Bernard – much utilised also elsewhere by Hus and in Utraquist critical treatises – then Gregory, Jerome, Alanus ab Insulis (Alain de Lille)¹⁶ and finally, Robert Grosseteste,¹⁷ who was one of Wyclif’s major authorities. Apparently Hus knew him primarily from Wyclif, although we find this text of the Bishop of Lincoln several

¹⁵ Hus places this statement into the mouth of the church: “Nemo gaudeat super me viduam desolatam. A multis derelicta sunt propter peccata filiorum meorum, quia declinaverunt a lege Dei, iustitias autem ipsorum nescierunt....”

¹⁶ Alanus was known in the Czech milieu; a Czech version of his “Anticlaudianus” was produced already in the second half of the fourteenth century, manuscripts of his treatises are held by Czech libraries; they were known and utilised by Jerome of Prague (as shown by F. Šmahel); Czech authors of Hus’s circle were more likely to turn, instead of “Anticlaudianus,” to Alanus’s moralistic prosimetrum “De planctu naturae” and to his collection of proverbns “Parabolae” (“Probleumata”). In Hus, for instance; “Quodlibet”, ed. Bohumil Ryba (Turnhout, 2006²) 59, 116; “Postilla adumbrata”, ed. B. Ryba (Prague, 1975) 81, 96–7, 615; “Lectionarium bipartitum, Pars hiemalis”, ed. Anežka Vidmanová-Schmidtová, (Prague 1988) 273, 305; also in University speeches, ed. A. Vidmanová -Schmidtová, “Iohannes Hus, Positiones, recommendationes, sermones” (Prague 1958).

¹⁷ Robert Grosseteste, “Memorandum” (according to Brown’s early edition *Fasciculus rerum expendarum et fugiendarum II*, (London, 1690) 250–257 “Sermo Roberti Lincolniensis episcopi, propositus coram papa et cardinalibus in concilio Lugdunensi”), critical ed. Servus Gieben, *Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia*, Lyon 1250, Edition of the Documents, *Collectanea Franciscana* 41 (1971), v. 41, 340–393, “Memorandum” 350–369, Hus cites from Gieben’s ed. 353–355 (cap. 7–10). I found Grosseteste’s “Memorandum” among the manuscripts of Czech libraries thanks to *Manuscriptorium*: MS Prague NK IV G 31, ff. 79v–87r, 15th c. (manuscript cited for Grosseteste by A. Molnár in his ed. of “Sermo de pace”), *ibid.* VIII F 3, fol. 65v–79r, 15th c, *ibid.* XIII F 21, fol. 152r–159v, between 1415–1500. The Library of the National Museum in Prague holds on the parchment endpaper of the manuscript XIV C 12 from 1444 a fragment of Grosseteste’s *Memorandum*. In addition, in Czech libraries are preserved manuscripts of other works of Robert Grosseteste (philosophical and theological treatises, letters, and translations). Samuel H. Thomson, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 1235–1253* (Cambridge, 1940), does not note these Prague manuscripts; he knows MS Prague, Metropolitan Chapter 272 (A CLXVI, first half of fifteenth century, ff. 82r–90v), outside the *Memorandum* tradition, he cites Grosseteste’s MS Prague KNM XII E 5 (these are Robert’s *Dicta*). Gieben, *Robert Grosseteste*, 344–346 lists only manuscripts, which he used for his critical edition – generally of English provenance and location, and largely from the fourteenth century.

times also in Prague codices. The text, the so-called *Memorandum*, involved Grosseteste's participation in the First Council of Lyon, which was convoked by Pope Innocent IV at the beginning of 1245 to consider, among other things, the correction of conditions in the church. Dissatisfied with the result of the Council's reformist efforts, Grosseteste set out once more for Lyon, where he was granted a solemn audience by the Pope on 13 May 1250, in the presence of the college of cardinals. In his speech – which he not only read but also distributed in several copies to the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries – he sharply criticised the abuses in the English Church and assigned responsibility for them to the papal curia. Hus cites from this text aside from the *Sermon on Peace* also in his *Responses to Paleč's Articles* from Constance.¹⁸ Another of Grosseteste's letters¹⁹ from 1253, in which Robert addresses the Pope on the matter of a nepotistic appointment to the see of Lincoln, and in which he explicitly refuses to obey the Pope, is cited by Hus in *De ecclesia* and in the polemic *Contra octo doctores*.²⁰ Hus's closeness to this Wyclifite authority is further confirmed by his reference to Robert's alleged appeal to Christ.²¹

Considering that Hus in preparing his *Sermon on Peace* clearly used several of Wyclif's sermons, it is apropos to ask whether the Bohemian reformer did not also adopt other authorities from his English paragon; this would particularly concern the second part of the *Sermon*, in which Hus frequently cites Bernard and Jerome. While probing in Wyclif's published volumes (containing sermons utilised by Hus), I did not discover such a secondary dependence, i.e., from Hus to Wyclif to Bernard. On the contrary, I discovered that Wyclif uses Bernard in different contexts than Hus – he is primarily concerned with dogmatic problems, and neither with moralistic ones nor with criticism of ecclesiastical conditions.

Because of its critical and admonitory content, the second part of Hus's *Sermo de pace* was often copied independently, as we can see from extant manuscripts: two Prague university codices (II G 8 and III G 18) contain exactly the second part. This text is very critical of the existing conditions among both the lower and the higher clergy, but here also Hus chooses a cautious tactic to avoid possible clashes. He employs, as instruments of his critique, authoritative canonised texts so that he can respond to accusations of improper radicalism by showing that he does not make statements in his own words, but by citing others, for instance, St. Bernard.

¹⁸ *Documenta*, 219, art. 34.

¹⁹ Robertus Grosseteste, *Epistolae*, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London, 1861, 25) 432–433, ep. 128.

²⁰ *De ecclesia*, ed. S. H. Thomson, (Prague, 1958) 166; *Contra octo doctores, Polemica*², ed. J. Eršil, (Turnhout, 2010) 434 (see also Iohannis Wycliffe, *Tractatus de civili dominio* I, ed. Reginald Lane Poole, (London, 1885) 384–390.

²¹ Novotný 131, č. 46, Jiří Kejíř, *Husovo odvolání od soudu papežova k soudu Kristovu* [Hus's Appeal from the Papal Court to the Court of Christ] (Ústí nad Labem, 1999), 28–29; idem, *Husův proces* [The Trial of Hus] (Prague, 2000) 100.

It is evident that Hus wishes to preach within the parameters of the Council of Constance, those of “*reformatio ecclesiae*”. The entire text definitely does not contain anything provocative. The author avoided any actual questions of systematic theology that could be perceived in a controversial manner. There are no mentions of ecclesiology, of the eucharist, or of clergy. Nothing is said about obedience (Grosseteste dares to speak about its conditionality in his *Memorandum*), nor about tithes or indulgences; and we find only one inconspicuous mention of the crusades. It appears as though there had been no recent – in fact contemporary – stirring events in Prague.

II. *Consilium M. Iacobelli de pacificando regno*

In the preface to his edition of Hus’s *Sermon about Peace*,²² Amedeo Molnár called attention to Jakoubek’s expert opinion *Consilium M. Iacobelli de pacificando regno*. The impetus for its writing, as well as the circumstances of the origin of this statement have been described in historical literature.²³ The royal proclamation²⁴ of January 1413 convoked a Bohemian clerical synod in order to achieve a reconciliation within the priesthood. Originally, the synod was to have met in Český Brod, but it actually met in the Archbishop’s Palace in Prague on 6 February. Among the documents prepared for this assembly was Jakoubek’s expert opinion,²⁵ written in response to the king’s request for the University’s view. As far as I know, the *Consilium* to this day has not attracted significant attention and was not subjected to a thorough analysis, although it has always been mentioned by scholarly literature in the relevant places and variously evaluated.²⁶ The opinion of Paul De Vooght in his monograph on Jakoubek is, in many respects, characteristic:

En 1413, au synode de février, il se fait remarquer par un *consilium pacis* d’une rare élévation d’esprit. Refusant d’entrer dans la lutte partisane qui se livrait autour de Huss, il ne voit de solution et de paix

²² 1st ed. p. 23.

²³ Jan Sedlák, *M. Jan Hus* (Prague 1915, reprint Olomouc 1996) 271–280; Novotný, I,2, 229, 242–257; František M. Bartoš, *Čechy v době Husově* [Bohemia in the Time of Hus] (Prague, 1947) 364–55, lastly Šmahel, *Jan Hus*, 139–140.

²⁴ *Documenta*, 472–3, N.51 A.

²⁵ *Documenta*, 493–494, (the only extant) manuscript is: MS Prague NK III G 6, ff. 10v–11r; in the list of František M. Bartoš and Pavel Spunar, *Soupis pramenů k literární činnosti M. Jana Husa a M. Jeronýma Pražského* [List of Sources for the Literary Activity of M. Jan Hus and M. Jerome of Prague] (Prague, 1965) 225, N. 602.

²⁶ The contents are given in Sedlák, *Jan Hus*, 272 who concludes that “the counsel was thorough and worthy of Jakoubek, but not practical...”; similarly, Novotný, I,2, 268: “... the opinions...do not dishonour their author”; Šmahel, *Jan Hus*, 139 states: “Jakoubek’s theologically speculative solution could not contribute to the pacification of the situation, and only poured oil onto the fire”.

que par un retour à l'Évangile. Cet homme pacifique, humble et effacé, n'avait qu'un amour: l'Évangile de Jésus-Christ. Là était sa force qui lui permettra en de rares occasions de rassembler toute la famille hussite. Là aussi était sa faiblesse qui l'isolera des partis et des factions et le laissera finalement solitaire et rejeté de tous.²⁷

In my opinion, Jakoubek, however, showed much theological courage in his *Concilium*, because he in fact declared that the road toward pacification and peace did not lead any way other than through the recognition of Hus's and Wyclif's programme. It is true that Hus's name figures in the *Concilium*, but only toward the end, and in the place which I consider relevant, Jakoubek avoids referring to Hus and particularly to Wyclif. In short, he imputes the entire programme of Hus and Wyclif to the king himself. It might seem politically adroit, even though in the final analysis one might agree with Šmahel's stricture about pouring oil onto the fire. Jakoubek first of all – on the whole conventionally and in harmony with the exegetical tradition – distinguishes two kinds of peace: the secular or pagan one, and the peace proper to Christians. He is not really concerned with the first kind, although his characterisation of it is interesting.²⁸ Everyone – from the king to the last subject – has a duty to maintain Christian peace and solidarity, and therefore the king does so. Jakoubek entirely posits the king on the side of Hus's adherents, when he says about him:

Cum ergo ista sancta pax et concordia in clero et in populo sit nimis dirupta ac per hoc honor dei sit contemptus, videtur, quod dominus rex cum ceteris regnicolis diligentissime instent ad reformationem huius pacis et concordiae, simoniacam haeresim, adulteria, fornicationes, concubinatus, superabundantiam temporalium et secularia dominia in clero destruendo ad liberius explendum in eis sacerdotale officium, et quod vivant secundum regulam evangelicam, et consequenter quod reliquum vulgus christianum digne etiam ambulet vocatione, qua vocatum est, secundum ordinationem evangelicam omnesque consuetudines patenter contra legem Christi in christianam plebem introductae evellantur, incipiendo a primo rege usque ad ultimum laicum.

[Hence, because this holy peace and concord are fundamentally disturbed among both the clergy and the people and so the respect for God is neglected, it is evident that the Lord King, together with the other inhabitants of the realm, insists on the restoration of that peace and concord by means of a suppression of heretical simony, adultery,

²⁷ Paul De Vooght, *Jacobellus de Strýbro* (†1429), *premier théologien du husitisme* (Louvain, 1972) 3.

²⁸ *Documenta*, 393: "Quod est quaedam pax et concordia mundana et gentilis, quae consistit in prosperitas mundana et quieti superhabundancia temporalium;"

fornication, concubinage, excess of worldly goods, and the secular dominion of clergy, so that the clergy might freely exercise its priestly office and so that priests might live according to the evangelical rules, and that consequently the Christian people properly “might walk according to their calling, to which they were called” according to the exhortation of the Apostle (Eph 4: 1), so that – beginning with the king and ending with last layman – all the bad habits might be uprooted, which were introduced among the Christian people clearly against Christ’s law.]

The subject of this relatively long series of run-on sentences is the king. Let us note that it is he, who for the preservation of Christian peace and concord recommends the liquidation of simony, of public sins against sexual morality, the removal of the surplus of priests’ properties, and of the secular dominion of priests. Hence it is not simply a matter of what De Vooght grasped, namely, that Jakoubek’s only instrument was a return to the Gospels. If De Vooght states that Jakoubek rejects participation in the guerilla warfare around Hus, I believe that it is not so; with this text, Jakoubek enters energetically, intentionally, and skilfully into this struggle. Just to be sure, let us add that such instruments of correction are not at all mentioned in the royal mandate of 3 January²⁹ which calls upon the Bohemian clergy for the restoration of peace and concord. Finally, Jakoubek continues with a statement that, if peace together with unity among the clergy and the people were thus restored, then the secular or material peace would be likewise restored, according to a pronouncement in the Gospels (*Querite primum regnum Dei*, Mt 6: 33). (It is exactly Jan Hus – as we read in Jakoubek further on – who, together with his adherents in his sermons tries to introduce such an evangelical order).

III. *Notae de pace* (MS. Prague NK IV G 6)

As mentioned in the introduction, this study is limited to three texts. We find many sermons and expositions concerning the evangelical loci *Pax huic domui* and *Pax vobis* in the homiletic and exegetical writings of both the patristic and scholastic periods. Homiletical statements, treating the concept *pax*, are found also in Wyclif, whose two sermons – as we saw – Hus utilised in *Sermo de pace*. From now on, I shall pay attention to only one text, which is found in the University of Prague’s codex IV G 6, where on ff. 60r-62r, it follows after the text (ff. 53r-60r) of Hus’s *Sermo de pace*. Truhlář’s catalogue omits this item in the description of the codex,³⁰ the codicological description in *Manuscriptorium* refers to it merely as *Notae*

²⁹ *Documenta*, 472–473, N. 51 A.

³⁰ Josephus Truhlář, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Latinorum, quae in Bibliotheca publica atque Universitatis Pragensis asservantur*, I, Nr. 738, p. 739.

de pace.³¹ Greetings in the incipit are addressed to the academic community of the University of Prague, on the basis of which we may assume that the text is a University sermon apparently by an academic dignitary: “Sit pax michi, pax alme matri nostre universitati et per omnia pax nobis omnibus et singulis personis suppositis et membris eius”. The concept of peace is then articulated in a scholastic manner (“sed notate, carissimi mei, diversam atque adversam esse pacem. Est namque quadruplex pax...”) into “pax temporis, pectoris, eternitatis, iniquitatis”. The author of the text explicates these distinctions, but he makes only one currently relevant: “Quam pacem varii varie perturbant istis heu gemebundis temporibus diversa interponentes bella... Huic adversantur, heu, tam extranei, de quibus nichil nunc ad nos, quam intranei, dicentes bonum malum et malum bonum, cupientes semper extolli” [This peace is disturbed in different ways by various people in current regrettable times... It is challenged by both foreigners – who, however, do not interest us at this moment – and by local people, who constantly yearn to excel ...]. The conclusion of the entire statement introduces into the discussion a responsible – as though governmental – care for peace:

...quoniam secundum Cassiodorum decet regalis apicis curam generaliter custodire concordiam, quoniam ad laudem regnantis trahitur, si ab omnibus pax ametur. Quid enim est, quod principem melius predicet, quam quietus populus, concors senatus et tota respublica mox honestate vestita?³² Me autem in loco principatus licet inmeritum constitutum considerans insufficientem paccare tantam multitudinem, ut pax terna in nomine sancte Trinitatis conservari valeat illesa pace iniquitatis a suppositis nostre alme universitatis in longe lateque relegata et expulsa, adiungite, queso, michi viros gnaros, arte expertos, moribus maturos, fama conspicuos, auctoritate prepotentes, in quibus sit sciencia, pax, sapientia prudentiaque ad regendum, quod eorum consilio Deo auspice pacifice coronari valeamus prestante Domino nostro Iesu Cristo.

[According to Cassiodorus’s twenty-second letter, it belongs to the care of his royal highness to guard a general concord, because it contributes to a ruler’s reputation, if all love peace; what then honours us more than people living in peace, a concordant senate, and the entire state, if it is clad by our virtuous morals? And because I know that, although I am – rather undeservingly – posted in the leading place, I am unable

³¹ Description according to Manuscriptorium (European Digital Library of Manuscripts, Národní knihovna, Prague): “60r-62r. Titul: Notae de pace. Incipit: Pax vobis in nomine crucifixi domini. Sit pax mihi, pax alme matri nostre universitati et per omnia pax nobis omnibus et singulis personis suppositis. Explicit: et temeritatem, que sunt extrema fortitudinis et tamen (correctly tantum) de illo Language of the text: Latin.”

³² Cassiodorus, “Variarum libri XII” – *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Auctores antiquissimi 12, Lib. I, 23, p. 27, lin. 3

to lead such a multitude of people to a peaceful coexistence; nor achieve that the triple peace might be fully preserved in the name of the Holy Trinity; nor accomplish that, on the contrary, an unjust peace, may remain distant from the members of our glorious university, (for all this) I beg of you: recommend to me knowledgeable and erudite men, men morally ripened and of blameless reputation, who enjoy respect and who have knowledge, peaceful spirit, and governmental wisdom so that, thanks to their advice, and with divine help we might be crowned in peace from the mercy of Our Lord Jesus Christ.]

If we took Cassiodorus's statement literally, especially the expressions "in loco principatus" and "coronari" we could perhaps bring our text into connection with the Prague events of early 1413: King Wenceslaus – as we noted in the discussion of Jakoubek's *Concilium* – convoked in January of that year by a royal mandate the clergy of the Bohemian Kingdom to a synod in Český Brod. The mandate mentioned doctors and masters of theology, that is, members of the University ("...assumptis sibi doctoribus et magistris..."), and we know that the standpoints, published in that matter, originated in the University milieu.³³ As far as we know, however, the king had not approached the University with a specific request in that matter. The idea that our text could have played the role of a royal request to the academic community, or even perhaps that the king himself would have presented his request in person before the University gathering; such an idea seems absurd. Therefore, I offer another hypothesis. The one, who speaks, might be one of the leading representatives of the University, which would confirm the impression given already by the earlier mentioned incipit. The term "in loco principatus" need not refer to a secular ruler, but only a high University functionary; the verb "coronari" need not refer to a real, that is royal, coronation, nor even to an introduction into a high function, whether spiritual or secular, but might simply denote the existing office. As for the meaning of words, as I have determined by research in the relevant reference works, such synonyms are quite possible.³⁴

That it is a speech of an academic dignitary, most likely an inaugural address of a newly elected Rector, is confirmed by coincidences with the address

³³ *Documenta*, 475nn.

³⁴ *Latinitatis medii aevi lexicon Bohemorum* 1 (Prague, 1977) 943–944 "corono" mentions, beside the actual coronation also master's, bachelor's or other University graduations, and in a metaphorical sense also "honorare"; "laudibus ornare", "gloria afficere". Other dictionaries (for instance, *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*; Forcellini *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*; A. Blaise *Lexicon Latinitatis medii aevi* allow also the meaning of decorate, decorate with garlands, glorify. Similarly, lemma "principatus" (in these dictionaries, except for *Lexicon Bohemorum*): need not refer to a governmental position, but also to any kind of distinguished position in a secular or spiritual sphere. However, I did not find a specific meaning, referring to university functions.

“Multi sunt vocati”³⁵ by Master Jan Hus after his election as Rector, between 20 and 24 October 1409. In this address as well as in our text – aside from the different biblical texts (Mt 10: 12 – Mt 22: 14) – there appear two central motifs. First of all, it is a more or less extended and concretised topos of humility and, in the second place, an appeal to the academic community to provide the speaker with appropriate councilors (although the term “conciliarius” is not used). Hus’s *positio* as well as our *Notae de pace* are here reminiscent of Moses’ statement to the Israelites in Transjordan on the way to the Promised Land in Deut. 1: 15. Moreover, in both cases – in Hus overtly, in our text through an allusion – the words of v.13 of this chapter are used, namely, “Date e vobis viros sapientes et gnaros et quorum conversatio sit probata...” It is, therefore, my opinion that in the case of the text, usually designated as *Notae de pace*, we are actually dealing with a Rector’s inaugural address, which is, of course, considerably abbreviated in transcription. I cannot give a definite answer to the question, who was this Rector? However, if we again recall the pressing need for pacification and the attempt to achieve it in the Kingdom of Bohemia during 1412–1413, we might think of one of the professors, who were elected to the Rector’s office during this period – Marek of Hradec, Christian of Prachatice, and Michal of Malenice.

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

³⁵ F. M. Bartoš and P. Spunar, *Soupis pramenů k literární činnosti M. Jana Husa a M. Jeronýma Pražského*, (Prague, 1965), Nr. 42, 95–96; A. Schmidtová (Vidmanová), (ed.), *Iohannes Hus, Positiones, recommendationes, sermones* (Prague, 1958) 21–25.