

Antonín Kalous

Whose Bishop/Who's the Bishop?

Papal and Royal Power in the Struggle for the Bishopric of Olomouc in the Late Fifteenth Century

Abstract: In the latter half of the fifteenth century, the Diocese of Olomouc (Moravia) was one of the two (out of four) properly functioning dioceses in Czech territory, alongside the Silesian Diocese of Wrocław. The period between the death of Bishop Tas of Boskovice (1482) and the accession of Bishop Stanislaus Thurzó (1497) was marked by disputes among various candidates. The election of the bishop was complicated by the influence of King Matthias Corvinus, who persuaded the chapter to elect his preferred candidate, Bishop Jan Filipec; however, this election was never ratified by the pope. Subsequent candidates had various reasons to aspire to the position: János Vitéz of Kamarca, another candidate proposed by Matthias Corvinus, sought status and income to support him in his diplomatic role; Bohuslav Hasištejnský viewed the post of bishop of Olomouc as the culmination of his ecclesiastical career, supported by the local nobility and King Wladislas; Cardinals Ardicino della Porta and Juan Borgia (Borja) needed the extra income and were supported by the popes. The dispute reflects the efforts of local rulers as well as local Estates to exert influence over the decisions of the chapter, and the Papacy's attempts to strengthen its authority in church governance, pointing to a dynamic of ecclesiastical and political changes in the region.

Keywords: Bishop, Fifteenth Century, Papacy, Czech Lands, Olomouc

The bishopric of Olomouc always played a fundamental role in the history of the medieval Kingdom of Bohemia. In the fifteenth century it gained even more importance; for a long time, it was one of the only two bishoprics that had a bishop legally elected and confirmed in Rome, with the other at Wrocław in Silesia. However, there was also a period when the position of the Olomouc episcopal see was not clear and when several candidates sought the office. The administration of the Moravian diocese was under both royal and papal influence. The Olomouc cathedral chapter, moreover, was several times influenced or directly ignored and overruled in its decision. In this context of contested elections and

This study was written as part of the EXPRO project of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, no. 20-08389X: Observance Reconsidered. Uses and Abuses of the Reform (Individuals, Institutions, Society) run by Palacký University Olomouc.

Kontakt: Antonín Kalous, antonin.kalous@upol.cz

QFIAB 105 (2025) — DOI 10.1515/qufiab-2025-0012

 Open Access. © 2025 bei den Autorinnen und Autoren, publiziert von De Gruyter.  Dieses Werk ist lizenziert unter der Creative Commons Namensnennung – Nicht-kommerziell – Keine Bearbeitungen 4.0 International Lizenz.

even contested rights to choose a bishop, Olomouc represents one example that might be brought forth in the late fifteenth-century Church. The cathedral chapter wanted to keep the rights that it was granted in 1207 and preserved over time. The king wanted to influence the election of the body of canons, as he desperately needed his men to be put in such positions so that his rule over the territory of Moravia was efficient. The same applied to both kings who were involved, King Matthias Corvinus and King Wladislas. And, of course, the popes needed to confirm their power in the regions of central Europe.¹

In the fifteen years between the death of Prothasius (Tas) of Boskovice and Černá Hora (1482) and the accession of Stanislaus Thurzó (1497), the title of Bishop of Olomouc was granted to several candidates, and several others were refused the appointment. The existing historiography is not entirely clear on this critical period, and it is therefore necessary to uncover the complicated personal and political ties which influenced the preferences of popes, kings, the Olomouc cathedral chapter, and even the Emperor in the context of the exercise of papal and royal power in central Europe.² Also, the lists of bishops (administrators) were not always entirely clear about the succession of bishops as they rotated in Olomouc at this time.³

1 For the episcopal elections and nominations in these contexts, see Dieter Brosius, *Päpstlicher Einfluss auf die Besetzung von Bistümern um die Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, in: *QFIAB* 55/56 (1976), pp. 200–228; Andreas Meyer, *Bischofswahl und päpstliche Provision nach dem Wiener Konkordat*, in: *RQ* 87 (1992), pp. 124–135; Günter Christ, *Bischof und Domkapitel von der Mitte des 15. bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, in: *RQ* 87 (1992), pp. 193–235; Henrike Bolte, *Spätmittelalterliche Bistumsbesetzungen im Spiegel der kurialen Überlieferung. Das Beispiel Livland*, in: Michael Mathews (Ed.), *Friedensnobelpreis und historische Grundlagenforschung. Ludwig Quidde und die Erschließung der kurialen Registerüberlieferung*, Berlin-Boston 2012 (Bibl. des DHI in Rom 124), pp. 191–204. The huge literature on bishops and their elections does not need to be mentioned, for examples from different eras and areas, cf. at least the relatively recent, Sarah E. Thomas (Ed.), *Bishops' Identities, Careers, and Networks in Medieval Europe*, Turnhout 2021 (Medieval Church Studies 44).

2 On the relation of the papacy and Bohemian lands, see Josef Macek, *Prag und Rom am Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts. Zum Verhältnis der päpstlichen Kurie zur böhmischen Reformation*, in: Sabine Weiss (Ed.), *Historische Blickpunkte. Festschrift für Johann Rainer*, Innsbruck 1988 (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 25), pp. 391–403; Antonín Kalous, *The Papacy and the Czech Lands between Reform and Reformation*, in: Tomáš Černušák (Ed.), *The Papacy and the Czech Lands. A History of Mutual Relations*, Rome-Prague 2016, pp. 115–146; on Olomouc and the bishopric Josef Macek, *K dějinám Olomouce na konci 15. století. Spory v olomouckém biskupství* [On the History of Olomouc at the End of the Fifteenth Century. Conflicts in the Olomouc Bishopric], in: *Okresní archiv v Olomouci 1986* [District Archives in Olomouc 1986], Olomouc 1987, pp. 53–63; briefly Peter Wörster, *Humanismus in Olmütz. Landesbeschreibung, Stadtlöb und Geschichtsschreibung in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Marburg 1994, pp. 23–29; Antonín Kalous, *Between Hussitism and Reformation, 1450s–1520s*, in: id. (Ed.), *The Transformation of Confessional Cultures in a Central European City. Olomouc, 1400–1750*, Roma 2015 (Viella Historical Research 2), pp. 41–64. This is a completely rewritten and much updated study, based on Antonín Kalous, *Spor o biskupství olomoucké v letech 1482–1497* [Dispute over the Bishopric of Olomouc, 1482–1497], in: *Český časopis historický* 105 (2007), pp. 1–39.

3 Cf. Vojtěch Jaromír Nováček (Ed.), *Paralipomena de vitis episcoporum Olomucensium ab anno domini 1482 usque ad annum 1571*, in: *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk* 15 (1902), pp. 1–10, at

Matthias Corvinus, who had the patronage rights over the Hungarian church as King of Hungary,⁴ made full use of all his bishoprics and their income as a salary for his diplomats and members of his administration. He could not do this in the Bohemian lands. The reason for this is not only the different legal situation of the bishoprics, but also quite simply the fact that Prothasius of Boskovice was already bishop of Olomouc before Matthias became the king of Bohemia (1469/1479–1490), and of course could not be replaced by anyone else. He became bishop in 1457 and was consecrated two years later. Even though King George of Poděbrady (1458–1471) was an Utraquist, Prothasius respected him as his sovereign and stayed loyal until the end of 1467. After being pressured by papal diplomats,⁵ he joined the Catholic estates who asked Matthias Corvinus for help against George. Prothasius switched sides and stayed in the service of Matthias, participated in diplomatic missions, and supported the king in Moravia. Their close cooperation was lost after 1471, when Prothasius may have been a part of the conspiracy against Matthias, or just lost the king's trust in relation to this. Prothasius could not be pushed out of the role, but the king waited for his chance when the bishop died.⁶

Immediately after Prothasius's death Matthias took advantage of the opportunity. He wanted to decide on the bishop himself, as was common for a king in Hungary, and he wrote to the Olomouc cathedral chapter as early as two days after the bishop's death in Vyškov on 25 August 1482. From the military camp at Hainburg in Lower Austria, Mat-

pp. 3 f.; Franciscus Xaverius Richter (Ed.), *Augustini Olomucensis Episcoporum Olomucensium Series*, Olomouc 1831, pp. 171–176; Olomouc, *Zemský archiv Opava, pobočka Olomouc (= ZAO-O)* [Land Archives Opava, Branch Olomouc], *Sbírka rukopisů metropolitní kapituly Olomouc* [Collection of Manuscripts of the Metropolitan Chapter of Olomouc], CO. 538, Magnoald Ziegelbauer, *Olomucium Sacrum*, tom. 2, Ab anno 1482 ad An. 1745, [pp. 1 f.]; Gregor Wolný, *Kirchliche Topographie von Mähren*, pars 1, *Olmützer Erzdiocese*, vol. 1, Brünn 1855, pp. 60–63; only Conradus Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, vol. 2, Monasterii 1914, p. 206, is based on the Vatican sources, but still it is not entirely clear.

4 For the patronage rights of the Kings of Hungary see, Vilmos Fraknói, *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig* [Hungarian Royal Patronage Right from Saint Stephen to Maria Theresia], Budapest 1895; Elemér Mályusz, *Das Konstanzer Konzil und das königliche Patronatsrecht in Ungarn*, Budapest 1959; Péter Tusor, *The Papal Consistories and Hungary in the 15th–16th Centuries. To the History of the Hungarian Royal Patronage and Supremacy*, Budapest-Roma 2012, esp. pp. 35–60; patronage right of the Kings of Hungary was included in the Hungarian customary law, see István Werbőczy, *Tripartitum opus iuris consuetudinarii incltyi regni Hungariae*, ed. by János M. Bak/Péter Banyó/Martyn Rady, *Idyllwild-Budapest 2006* (*Decreta regni medievalis Hungariae* 5), pp. 58–62.

5 On papal diplomats (legates and nuncios) in the period who are mentioned throughout the paper, see Antonín Kalous, *Plenitudo potestatis in partibus? Papežští legáti a nunciové ve střední Evropě na konci středověku (1450–1526)* [Papal Legates and Nuncios in Late Medieval Central Europe, 1450–1526], Brno 2010; Wolfgang Untergehrer, *Die päpstlichen nuntii und legati im Reich (1447–1484). Zu Personal und Organisation des kurialen Gesandtenwesens*, PhD Diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München 2012 (online: <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/15862/>; 23.01.2025).

6 On Prothasius cf. Antonín Kalous, *Boskovice urai Mátyás király diplomáciai és politikai szolgálatában* [The Lords of Boskovice in the Diplomatic and Political Service of King Matthias], in: *Századok* 141 (2007), pp. 375–389, at pp. 376–387; Kalous, *Spor* (see note 2), pp. 3–8.

thias wrote to Olomouc that news had reached him of the death of the current bishop, which he greatly regretted. He wished for the canons to choose for their new superior a man who was „suitable, as well as experienced, and also prudent, excellent and learned, who by his authority and his wisdom could remedy the distressed and declining state of the Church, restore to it the estates which had been taken away from it, and bring it to glory by his learning and his ability“. The king, however, did not trust the Olomouc canons to find such a person, although they would certainly have been able to select a suitable candidate (for example the Olomouc provost Benedict of Valdštejn,⁷ whose name will appear later). Matthias wished to rectify the state of the Olomouc Church, and therefore asked the canons „not to elect anyone as their pastor and superior without our knowledge and express consent, because we ourselves, with your advice and consent, wish to appoint such a superior who will be able to restore this Church, to rid it of its unfortunate decline, and to recover by his authority and our special grace the estates which have been stolen from it“. If the canons would as he has written (which he has no doubt they will), they would receive Matthias's grace and favour. If they would not, he assures the chapter that he has such powers with the papal see that he can have their eventual election revoked and enforce his own, so that the canons' resistance would be futile. He therefore warns them again not even to attempt to elect a bishop without his knowledge and consent.⁸

The fact that Matthias reacted to the news of the death of Bishop Prothasius with such speed reveals that he took the new opportunity very seriously. The style in which he writes to the Olomouc canons is also telling. The king decided to informally appropriate the patronage rights to the Olomouc bishopric, which was located in a country he controlled, or at least to influence the choice of the chapter. When the death of the incumbent bishop presented him with a chance, he sought to seize it, shielding himself with the authority of the papal see. He had excellent relations with Pope Sixtus IV (1471–1484) and that is why he wrote to the chapter with such a confidence. In this situation, the chapter had no choice but to comply with his requirements.

The king sought to strengthen his position in Moravia. Even though peace treaties had already been drawn up, according to which all the inhabitants of the land were to accept Matthias as their rightful and hereditary king, he was still anxious to place his own man in one of the most important offices of Moravia. This was moreover a crucial office not only in the church but also in the land administration – the bishop sat in the Land Court and Land Diet among the lords, and this by virtue of the dignity of his office, and not only (as Prothasius demanded in his lost legal treatise on the land administra-

7 Cf. Antonín Roubíć, Benedikt z Valdštejna, olomoucký probošt a biskup v Pomořanech – Benedictus episcopus Caunicensis in Marchia [Benedict of Valdštejn, an Olomouc Provost and a Bishop in Pomerania], in: *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 44 (1992), pp. 45–57, at p. 48.

8 ZAO-O, Metropolitní kapitula Olomouc (= MCO), Charters, sign. A IV c 24, 27 August 1482, all the quotations in this paragraph.

tion) if he himself came from a lordly family (i. e., aristocratic in opposition to knightly or even burgher family).⁹

In his Olomouc activities, Matthias could have been influenced by the actual patronage rights he exercised over some chapters and other benefices in Bohemian lands. As King of Bohemia, in 1470, he appointed the parish priest of České Budějovice, a royal town in southern Bohemia, which accepted Matthias as their king.¹⁰ He also appointed the provost of the collegiate chapter of Stará Boleslav. In this case, Jan (John) of Rabštejn stated that he himself holds the patronage right to this church (as the provost of Vyšehrad). But, in the confirmation letter by the papal nuncio Lorenzo Roverella, the patronage right is attributed to both, i. e., the provost of Vyšehrad and the king of Bohemia.¹¹ Similarly, Matthias decided on the Collegiate chapter of St Peter in Brno. In January 1484, among other things, he ceded the right to present a canon to Jaroslav of Boskovice, chancellor of the Kingdom of Bohemia. The latter told his brother Ladislav of Boskovice, the provost of the chapter (as well as the provost of the collegiate chapter in Veszprém, Hungary), that he had presented Václav Ortulan of Brno for the vacant canon position.¹² Later, the post of provost for the Brno chapter was also filled by Matthias Corvinus, as evidenced by the appointment of Valentine Farkas, later bishop of Oradea (Várad), to this office after the departure of Ladislav of Boskovice.¹³

However, the situation with the Olomouc bishopric was quite different. The Olomouc cathedral chapter had the right to elect its own bishop from 1207. Many chapters, which had generally acquired this right during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, lost it in the fourteenth century at the expense of papal decision-making and the renewed greater influence of local rulers.¹⁴ In this attempt, Matthias did not deny the patronage right of the chapter, but he wanted to influence it. The candidate proposed for bishop was therefore to be identified as the candidate of the chapter. With this act, however, the king also pointed out what was becoming the practice in Europe; namely, that it was much easier to negotiate with the pope than with canons, who might not be of a single mind. In this

9 František Čáda, *Zlomky ztraceného spisu olomouckého biskupa Tasa* [Fragments of the Lost Writings of Bishop Tas of Olomouc], in: *Studie o rukopisech* 12 (1973), pp. 5–31.

10 František Palacký (Ed.), *Archiv český* [Czech Archive], vol. 6, Praha 1872, p. 46, no. 3, 17 March 1470, a letter to Jan of Rožmberk.

11 Bohumil Ryba, *K biografii humanisty Jana z Rabštejna* [On the Biography of Humanist Jan of Rabštejn], in: *Český časopis historický* 46 (1940), pp. 260–272, at p. 271, note 1, Rabštejn's charter of 11 January 1471 and confirmation letter by Lorenzo on 1 April 1471.

12 ZAO-O, MCO, Charters, sign. A IV c 27, 20 January 1484, Buda.

13 Libor Jan, *Dějiny kapituly* [History of the Chapter], in: i d./Rudolf Procházka/Bohumil Samek, *Sedm set let brněnské kapituly* [Seven Hundred Years of the Brno Chapter], Brno 1996, pp. 41–105, at p. 65.

14 Richard William Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*, London 1970, pp. 156–159; Katherine Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments in England, c. 1214–1344. From Episcopal Election to Papal Provision*, Farnham 2014; Christine Barralis, *The Bishops of Meaux, 1197–1510: From Chapter's Men to King's Men*, in: Thomas (Ed.), *Bishops' Identities* (see note 1), pp. 85–103.

way, therefore, he was able to assert his power in the cathedral chapter and decide on the person of the bishop of Olomouc.

Matthias took a similar approach in the case of the second bishopric then functioning in the Bohemian lands, namely Wrocław in Silesia. He succeeded in promoting Johann Roth, bishop of Lavant, who had defected from the service of Emperor Frederick III to the side of the King of Hungary in the early 1480s, to a *coadiutor* of Rudolf of Rüdesheim, bishop of Wrocław (1468–1482), and successor of the bishop in the episcopal see of Wrocław (1482–1506). When the old bishop died, Matthias acted in Roth's favour, even though copies of letters to the pope and cardinals from 1481 are preserved, in which he supported another candidate, the fourteen-year-old Albert of Münsterberg. This support, however, was only staged, because the king needed loyalty of Albert's father Jindřich (Henry) of Münsterberg, son of George of Poděbrady.¹⁵ Roth's transfer from Lavant to Wrocław was confirmed by Pope Sixtus IV.¹⁶ The king thus influenced elections of both the bishops in the Bohemian lands under his control.

Apparently, who was to become bishop in Olomouc was not so certain at first. Of course, it was to be one of the king's men, one who had some connection with Moravia. The fact that the official language at the Moravian Land Diet, which the bishop attended, was Czech, clearly defined the circle of candidates. It could have been someone from the family of the deceased bishop, as all its members were in the service of Matthias, but this decision was different. The diocese stayed vacant for some time, and a suitable candidate was found in the person of Jan Filipec (1431–1509) a year or two later. Certainly in 1484 (perhaps even a year earlier) it was decided that the experienced and suitable man mentioned by Matthias in his letter of 1482 would be Jan Filipec, bishop of Oradea (Várad). Similarly to the case of Oradea (Jan Filipec became bishop there in 1476), the King of Hungary was looking for someone who would be able to properly administer and uplift the diocese, which was in an economically bad situation.¹⁷ Jan Filipec, who came from Prostějov and appeared in Matthias's Bohemian chancery already in the early 1470s, knew the Moravian situation well. He also had excellent relations with the most important Moravian lords who held land and court offices in the country. As an administrator (or bishop, as he is sometimes called) in Olomouc he was among the Moravian elite, a fact confirmed not only by numerous written sources, but also, for example, by the then reconstruction of Buchlov Castle in Moravia, where the

15 Vilmos Fraknói (Ed.), *Mátyás király levelei, külügyi osztály* [Letters of King Matthias, Foreign Affairs Section], 2 vols., Budapest 1893–1895, vol. 2, pp. 204 f., no. 109; Berthold Kronthal/Heinrich Wendt (Eds.), *Politische Correspondenz Breslaus im Zeitalter des Königs Matthias Corvinus, Abtheilung 2, 1479–1490, Breslau 1894* (*Scriptores rerum silesiacarum* 14), p. 37, no. 353; Brno, Moravská zemská knihovna (= MZK) [Moravian Land Library], shelfmark Mk 9, fol. 242r; 244r–246v.

16 Gustav Bauch, *Analekten zur Biographie des Bischofs Johann IV. Roth*, in: *Studien zur schlesischen Kirchengeschichte, Breslau 1907* (*Darstellungen und Quellen zur schlesischen Geschichte* 3), pp. 19–102, at pp. 38–44, nos. 4–11.

17 Fraknói (Ed.), *Mátyás király levelei* (see note 15), vol. 1, pp. 361 f., no. 247.

coats-of-arms of Ctibor Tovačovský, Vilém (William) of Pernštejn and Jan Filipec appear as keystones in the vault of one hall.¹⁸ The main reason that Matthias's choice fell on Jan Filipec was most likely that he had already had experience in similar positions in Hungary (he was first the provost of the Chapter of St Thomas in Esztergom, later the provost of the Collegiate chapter of the Holy Trinity in Felhévíz, and finally the Bishop of Oradea) and that he was loyal to Matthias and very capable, as the King of Hungary verified many times.

However, the date of his appointment as administrator of the Olomouc diocese is not precisely known. In written and published sources, Jan Filipec first appears as the administrator of the Olomouc church in 1484. Josef Macek mentions August; on 18 August, Filipec confirmed the contract made between Vilém of Pernštejn and the priest Nicholas, canon of Brno, for a salary belonging to the canon position. Jan Filipec, in his new role as „administrator of the church of Olomouc“, wished „that the churches under our administration might be brought into their orders“.¹⁹ Even earlier, however, on 2 August, Jan Filipec issued a charter at Vyškov as „dei et apostolice sedis gratia episcopus Waradiensis ac postulatus ecclesie Olomucensis“, accepting the resignation of Jakub (James) of Jemnice to the provostship at Olbramkostel near Znojmo.²⁰ However, he was apparently inducted into his office even earlier: on Tuesday, St Margaret's Day (13 July), the „priest bishop“ attended the Land Court in Olomouc. He is not directly named, but it is clear that Jan Filipec is meant here. In earlier Land Courts held in Brno and Olomouc, the bishop is not recorded among the participants.²¹ It may be noted that at the meeting of the Land Court in Prostějov on 18 June 1483, the decision of the case concerning the bishop had to be postponed;²² he had not yet been appointed and there is no mention of who might become bishop.

There are still other sources that push Jan Filipec's accession to the bishop's see in Olomouc further into the past. However, the first of these is not entirely clear nor precise. The year 1483 is the date of the tympanum of the south portal of the church of St Wolfgang in Hnanice near Znojmo in southern Moravia, the construction of which began in 1480. The tympanum, depicting the Ecce Homo scene, also contains heraldic decoration. On its right side, there is the coat-of-arms of Jan Filipec with the bishop's

¹⁸ See Stanislav Kasík, *Znakové svorníky na hradě Buchlově* [Heraldic Keystones in the Buchlov Castle], in: *Slovácko* 41 (1999), pp. 215–243.

¹⁹ František Dvorský (Ed.), *Listinář pana Viléma z Pernštejna* [Letters of Lord Vilém of Pernštejn], in: Josef Kalousek (Ed.), *Archiv český* [Czech archive], vol. 16, Praha 1897, pp. 73–560, at pp. 271 f., no. 307; Macek, *K dějinám* (see note 2), p. 54.

²⁰ ZAO-O, MCO, Charters, sign. A IV d 1. *Postulatus* is an elected bishop, who cannot ascend the episcopal throne due to a canonical obstacle.

²¹ Vincentius Brandl (Ed.), *Libri citationum*, vol. 5/1, Bruna 1888, p. 94, cf. also pages before, where the bishop did not take part; sometime between 14 March and 13 July at the meeting of Prostějov it was mentioned that concerning certain rights, the coming of the bishop should be waited for (p. 93, no. 421).

²² Brandl (Ed.), *Libri*, vol. 5/1 (see note 21), p. 76, no. 363.

mitre, which reminds us that the bishopric also participated in the construction of the new pilgrimage church.²³ In this case, the proof is not conclusive, as it could also have been backdated. This source is not a legal document and is not otherwise verifiable; however, it still opens a possibility.

The second reference is contained in a letter from Matthias to the mayor and town council of Brno, dated 6 June 1484. In this letter, among other things the burghers are informed that the dispute over the school at St James's between townsfolk and John, bishop of Oradea, is to be settled by the Bohemian chancellor Jaroslav of Boskovice.²⁴ The fact that the dispute, which was much older (between the town and Bishop Prothasius), was now between the town and Jan Filipec suggests that Filipec must have been administering the bishopric of Olomouc by that time. However, he was still 'only' bishop of Oradea, as when he wrote from Olomouc to Uherské Hradiště in April 1484.²⁵ Nevertheless, these sources could give us a possible timeframe of Filipec's taking over of the office.

Although Matthias wrote to the Olomouc cathedral chapter that he was able to arrange everything in Rome to force the installation of his own candidate, the situation was far more complicated in the case of Jan Filipec than perhaps the king himself had expected. Matthias was on fairly good terms with Pope Sixtus IV, so it is possible that the King of Hungary was already trying to promote Jan Filipec at this time. However, no explicit sources prove this. Only in the papal breve of Sixtus IV to Matthias of 22 March 1483, there is a vague mention of some kind of exemption for John, bishop of Oradea. The latter is said to have brought to Rome Matthias's letter of recommendation for his person, claiming that it was necessary for him to obtain this dispensation in order to continue to serve the King of Hungary. Was it a request for permission for Filipec to stay more often outside his diocese, or was he requesting a dispensation for the possibility to obtain two bishoprics at the same time?²⁶ It is clear from papal sources that this dispensation (although its content is uncertain) caused problems in Hungary and had to be addressed.

23 Bohumil Samek, *Umělecké památky Moravy a Slezska* [Artistic monuments of Moravia and Silesia], vol. 1, A–I, Praha 1994, pp. 486–488; Jan Sedlák, *K některým otázkám pozdně gotické architektury na jižní Moravě* [On Some Questions of the Late Gothic Architecture in South Moravia], in: *Historická Olomouc* 3 (1980), pp. 195–206, at pp. 200–204.

24 Brno, Archiv města Brna (= AMB) [Archives of the City of Brno], *Sbírka listin, mandátů a listů* [Collection of Charters, Mandates and Letters], 6 June 1484, Buda.

25 ZAO-O, MCO, sign. E III 3, kart. no. 145.

26 Augustin Theiner (Ed.), *Vetera Monumenta historica Hungarum Sacram illustrantia*, vol. 2, Roma 1860, p. 483, no. 659; Vilmos Fraknói (Ed.), *Matyás király levelezése a római pápákkal 1458–1490* [The Correspondence of King Matthias with the Roman Popes, 1458–1490], Budapest 1891 (*Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia* I/6), p. 205, no. 158, 22 March 1483, Sixtus IV mentions the exemption for Filipec and his credentials. The text does not specify, when Filipec got the exemption. In another breve, the pope asks bishop of Veszprém, to solve the situation of certain prelates in the kingdom, „*prelati maiores, qui pretextu quarundam exemptionum erga personas suas a sede apostolica hactenus obtentorum, nolentes, quibus alias deberent, superioribus propterea parere, diversarum discordiarum et scismatum in ipso regno causam prebent ...*“. The pope further claims that the kingdom,

Filipec could have stayed in Rome for a longer period between 1482 and 1483, during which time he disappears from Central European sources. On 22 June 1482 Filipec entered his name with his own hand in the registry of the Brotherhood of the Holy Spirit in the *ospedale di Santo Spirito*, even though a personal inscription in the register was not the rule.²⁷ Three days later a papal bull was issued confirming the transfer of the Premonstratensian monastery of St Stephen in *promontorio Varadiensi* and its estates into the hands of the bishop of Oradea and the annexation of this monastery to the church of Oradea for the rest of Jan's life.²⁸ Filipec was looking after the affairs of his Hungarian bishopric in Rome. And when Bishop Prothasius died two months later, he could still have been in Rome. His visit to the papal city is confirmed by the papal nuncio in Hungary, Bartolomeo Maraschi, in one of his reports to the papal curia. On 20 October 1483, he was invited to dine at the royal palace in Buda in the company of the king and queen, the voyvode of Transylvania and also the bishop of Oradea Jan Filipec, who was particularly popular with both the king and the queen. According to the nuncio, the bishop of Oradea kept talking all evening about the *humanitas* he had acquired during his stay in Rome.²⁹ This would suggest, therefore, that his Roman stay was not a momentary one (the direct evidence of his stay in Rome, however, dates only from June 1482, and indirect evidence from March 1483) and that he had perhaps returned to Buda sometime not long before October 1483. He then went to Moravia, in April 1484 at the latest, to take over his new bishopric. Since, as already mentioned, he is referred to as a *postulatus*, there were still canonical obstacles which prevented his full recognition: he certainly did not receive permission to obtain two bishoprics at the same time. Thus, Jan Filipec was never confirmed by the pope as bishop of Olomouc.

There are other administrators of the bishopric of Olomouc *sede vacante*, who took up some of the responsibilities of the bishop and appear in the local sources. Johann Pauswangel of Olomouc, dean of the chapter, and Alexius of Jihlava acted as administrators on multiple occasions concerning erections of altars and related matters between early November 1482 and August 1490. They were not supposed to fill in the position of

which is „antemurale fidelium contra Turchos“, was unified and had no problems in the ecclesiastical matters, cf. Theiner (Ed.), *Vetera Monumenta*, vol. 2, p. 482, no. 658.

27 Vincentius Bunyitay (Ed.), *A római Szentlélek-társulat anyakönyve 1446–1523* [The Register of the Roman Holy Spirit Brotherhood, 1446–1523], Budapest 1889 (*Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia* I/5), p. 8; cf. also Enikő Csukovits, *Középkori magyar zarándokok* [Medieval Hungarian pilgrims], Budapest 2003, p. 173; on the Holy Spirit Hospital see Andreas Rehberg, „Ubi habent maiorem facultatem ... quam papa“. Der Heilig-Geist-Orden und seine Ablasskampagnen um 1500, in: ders., *Ablasskampagnen des Spätmittelalters. Luthers Thesen von 1517 im Kontext*, Berlin-Boston 2017 (*Bibl. des DHI in Rom* 132), pp. 219–270, with bibliography on the hospital in footnote 1.

28 AAV, Reg. Lat. 823, fol. 140r–141v, 25 June 1482.

29 AAV, Misc., Arm. II 56, fol. 355r; „... episcopus Varadiensis, regi et regine gratus et sanctitatis vestre observantissimus, qui humanitatem illam, qua suscepit cum Rome fuit, predicare non cessat“. Cf. Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*, vol. 2: *The Fifteenth Century*, Philadelphia 1978, pp. 377–380.

the bishop, but run the necessities of the diocese in spiritual matters. They expressly published all the letters *sede vacante*.³⁰ Naturally, the conflict for the bishopric was not resolved with these officials, who took care of the church administration of the diocese.

However, the position of the Moravian bishop had not yet been unambiguously entrusted to Jan Filipec, and perhaps thanks to the king and the pope, a dispute between several candidates for this diocese began. From 1487 János (John) Vitéz of Kamarca (d. 1499), bishop of Syrmia (Sremska Mitrovica), began to be involved. As the king's representative in Rome, he must have heard about the case before. Now, he was appointed bishop of Olomouc by Pope Innocent VIII on 4 July 1487. The records of the papal curia explicitly state that the new bishop was appointed to the bishopric vacated by the death of Bishop Prothasius.³¹ Thus, Filipec's efforts in Olomouc were not considered at all. János Vitéz was known to the pope primarily as *orator regis Hungarie*, which he had been since 1477, when he paid the annates to the papal curia for Jan Filipec as bishop of Oradea. At this point, however, he became the counter-candidate of the bishop of Oradea for the office in Olomouc. The pope tried to promote the bishop of Syrmia for several more years until 1489, when Vitéz left Syrmia and without winning recognition in Olomouc became bishop of Veszprém on 3 June 1489.³² Should we believe a note by Bernard, Carthusian monk of Legnica in Silesia, Vitéz's appointment came only after another candidate rejected the offer. According to Bernard, Paul of Moravia, several times provincial vicar of the Franciscan Observant vicariate of Bohemia, declined the nomination suggested by Matthias Corvinus in 1487.³³

It must have been the king who changed his mind and started supporting a new candidate to the bishop's throne in Olomouc, as suggested by Angelo Pecchinoli, papal nuncio at the court of King Matthias. This papal nuncio *cum potestate legati de latere* stayed at the royal court for roughly two years from late autumn of 1488 till the death of Matthias Corvinus and then until the new king Wladislas was crowned in Székesfe-

³⁰ They appear in a number of local sources, usually charters for erecting an altar, which are preserved in local archives (including the charters of the metropolitan chapter) and/or copied in a register of the consistory office of the bishopric, cf. ZAO-O, Arcibiskupská konzistoř Olomouc (= ACO) [Consistory of the Archbishopric of Olomouc], book no. 146, for years 1482–1552, at fol. 1r–22r. Cf. Tomáš Baletka, *Olomoucké biskupství v období sedisvakance* [Bishopric of Olomouc in the Years of Vacancy], in: Pavel Krafel (Ed.), *Sacri canones servandi sunt. Ius canonicum et status ecclesiae saeculis XIII–XV*, Praha 2008, pp. 540–544, at p. 541.

³¹ AAV, Cam. Ap., Oblig. et Sol. 83, fol. 138r. The common services were paid on 24 September 1487, cf. AAV, Cam. Ap., Intr. et Ex. 516, fol. 12r.

³² Eubel, *Hierarchia*, vol. 2 (see note 3), p. 266; Josephus Lukcsics (Ed.), *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis/A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára*, vol. 3, 1416–1492, Budapest 1902, p. 310, no. 461; see also AAV, Arch. Concist., Acta Camerarii 1, fol. 26r. On Vitéz, Vilmos Fraknói, Mátyás király magyar diplomatái [Hungarian Diplomats of King Matthias], Budapest 1898, pp. 90–130.

³³ Benventus Bughetti, *De obitu et miraculis b. Marci Fantutii de Bononia, vicarii gen. observantiae ord. fr. min. († 1479) cum appendice De vicariis generalibus cismontanis observantium (1430–1488)*, in: *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 27 (1934), pp. 95–145, at p. 141.

hérvár on 19 September 1490. He sent many reports back to Rome to the papal court, out of which fourteen have survived and have been edited.³⁴ One of the tasks he was supposed to solve was dealing with the situation of the Olomouc bishopric. Until now, it seemed perfectly simple that the king changed his mind and a new candidate was supposed to be nominated. However, Matthias changed his mind again. When he backed Filipec, Angelo asked him to remember that it was at his request that the bishop of Syrmia had been appointed bishop of Olomouc. The nuncio also recalled that the king of Hungary himself had sent a letter to the papal curia describing Filipec's indiscretion to the pope.³⁵ The papal curia also began to speak of possible heresy, pointing out that Jan Filipec came from a „heretical“ family. Filipec himself was even suspected of belonging among the Hussites, as mentioned in one of Angelo's mandates, which was issued on 1 September 1488 when the nuncio was leaving Rome, and which contained faculties to proceed against the bishop of Oradea and his supporters.³⁶

Matthias seems to have had some disagreements with Filipec. Hungarian scholarship suggested that the Hungarian king feared the growing power of Jan Filipec, whose gain of the bishopric of Olomouc greatly strengthened his influence.³⁷ The exact reason for Matthias's turning away from Filipec is not clear, but the growing influence would obviously be the result of Matthias's favours and trust in his servant. In 1486, Jan was significantly involved in negotiations with Wladislas II Jagiellonian, the King of Bohemia in Prague. He also handled many matters both in Moravia and with King Matthias in Vienna (where the Hungarian-Bohemian royal court moved after the 1485 conquest of the Austrian capital), as evidenced by a number of documents issued by the king in 1486 and signed by Filipec as the chancellor. Whatever the reason, it soon disappeared, for when the papal curia tried to promote János Vitéz as bishop of Olomouc in 1488, Matthias was already supporting the bishop of Oradea again.

The correspondence between the pope and the King of Hungary from 1488 shows that the papal curia was very active in this direction. In a breve from 12 June, Pope Inno-

34 For Angelo Pecchinoli and his legation, see Vilmos Fraknói, *Pecchinoli Angelo pápai legátus Mátyás udvaránál (1488–1490)*, Budapest 1898; for the edition of all the nuncio's reports, instructions, faculties and other correspondence, see Antonín Kalous (Ed.), *The Legation of Angelo Pecchinoli at the Court of the King of Hungary (1488–1490)*, Budapest-Roma 2021 (*Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae* II/8), including a lengthy introduction on Angelo Pecchinoli and his legation, available as open-access publication online: https://institutumfraknoi.hu/en/kiadvany/%09cvh/legation_angelo_pecchinoli_court_king_hungary_1488_1490; 23.01.2025; cf. also *id.*, *The Pope, the King and the Bishops. Papal Nuncio Angelo Pecchinoli and the Limits of Papal Power in the late Fifteenth Century*, in: Andrea Fara (Ed.), *Italia ed Europa centro-orientale tra Medioevo ed Età moderna. Economia, Società, Cultura*, Heidelberg 2022 (*Online-Schriften des DHI Rom, Neue Reihe* 7), pp. 159–178.

35 Kalous (Ed.), *The Legation* (see note 34), pp. 87 f., no. 24.

36 *Ibid.*, pp. 53 f., no. 13.

37 Fraknói, *Mátyás király magyar diplomatái* (see note 32), p. 121; Lukcsics (Ed.), *Monumenta*, vol. 3 (see note 32), pp. XXVIII–XXIX. It is true that several top prelates of Hungary had troubles with the king, e. g. János Vitéz of Zredna, Janus Pannonius, Johann Beckensloer, and Péter Váradi.

cent VIII urged Matthias to see to the transfer of the bishopric to János Vitéz, as it was necessary for the diocese of Olomouc to obtain a suitable bishop. It is not possible for the Church „inter suspectos hereticos“ to be without proper leadership for so long.³⁸ On the same day, Pope Innocent wrote to Orbán (Urban) Nagylucsei, bishop of Eger, to arrange for the handing over of the Olomouc bishopric and its possessions to the bishop of Syrmia, or his representatives; this is to be done within one month of the issuance of this breve. Should this not be done („quod absit“), the bishop of Eger is to pronounce interdict and excommunication over Jan Filipec in the diocese of Oradea.³⁹ Another breve of that day was addressed to the bishop of Oradea himself. The pope threatens Filipec with excommunication and interdict if he does not hand over the bishopric and its possessions to Vitéz within a month.⁴⁰ As far as the diocese of Oradea was concerned, Jan Filipec was considered by the papal curia to be the rightful bishop. Still in June, a papal breve is dated announcing to bishops Orbán Nagylucsei (of Eger), Zsigmond Ernuszt (of Pécs) and John (of Oradea) that the Franciscans of the province of Hungary had elected them as protectors of their rights granted to them by the papal see.⁴¹ It is clear from this breve that only the bishopric of Olomouc was problematic for Jan Filipec. It seemed that the pope, or rather the papal chancery, had absolutely no objections to his position as bishop of Oradea, even though one of the accusations was related to possible heresy of the bishop.

Jan Filipec, who in 1486 prepared the meeting of the two kings of Bohemia Matthias and Wladislas in Jihlava and took care of the matters of the bishopric in Moravia and in 1487 undertook a long diplomatic trip to Italy and France, with a limited success only, lost at this point the support of Matthias, but regained it in the following year.⁴² Matthias tried to stand up for Jan Filipec. According to Queen Beatrix, he knew what to do and shared his mind with the pontiff.⁴³ He even sent Miklós (Nicholas) Bacsikai to Rome, whom the queen also referred to and who was to negotiate with the pope in the affairs of the Olomouc bishopric,⁴⁴ but his mission was only partially successful.

In Rome, however, the bishop of Oradea had more intercessors. As evidenced by a breve from early August 1488, the cardinal-bishop Rodrigo Borja, who later became

38 Fraknói (Ed.), Mátyás király levelezése (see note 26), p. 237, no. 185 (= Theiner [Ed.], *Vetera Monumenta*, vol. 2 [see note 26], p. 513, no. 706).

39 Theiner (Ed.), *Vetera Monumenta*, vol. 2 (see note 26), p. 513, no. 707.

40 AAV, Arm. XXXIX 20, fol. 169v–170r.

41 Caesar Cenci (Ed.), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, n. s. 4/1 (1481–1489), Grottaferrata (Roma) 1989, p. 446, no. 1145, 18 June 1488.

42 Cf. Antonín Kalous, Jan Filipec v diplomatických službách Matyáše Korvína [Jan Filipec in the Diplomatic Service of Matthias Corvinus], in: *Časopis Matice moravské* 125 (2006), pp. 3–32; i.d., Itinerář Jana Filipce (1431–1509) [Itinerary of Jan Filipec, 1431–1509], in: *Sborník prací historických* XXII, Olomouc 2008 (*Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Facultas philosophica. Historica* 34), pp. 17–43.

43 Albert Berzeviczy (Ed.), *Aragoniai Beatrix Magyar királyné életére vonatkozó okiratok* [Documents Relating to the Life of Beatrix of Aragon, Queen of Hungary], Budapest 1914 (*Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Diplomataria* 39), pp. 117 f., no. 77, 17 June 1488.

44 Fraknói (Ed.), Mátyás király levelei (see note 15), vol. 2, pp. 347 f., no. 213, 15 July 1488.

Pope Alexander VI (1492–1503) and had a significant say in the situation of the Olomouc bishopric, asked Pope Innocent VIII to immediately abolish Filipec's sentences. However, the pope kept the penalties in force and only extended the one-month period three times. The pope also informed Matthias that these problems would be dealt with by the nuncio, who would soon be on his way.⁴⁵ Similarly, Pope Innocent wrote to Matthias again five days later. In the text of the following breve he, moreover, mentions that a request to postpone the ecclesiastical censures for six months had been made in Rome by Matthias's envoy Miklós Bacsikai together with Cardinal Rodrigo. This time, however, they did not succeed, and the period during which Filipec was to resign the bishopric of Olomouc remained set to three months.⁴⁶ As already mentioned, other matters were to be dealt with by Angelo Pecchinoli, the papal nuncio *cum potestate legati de latere*, to whom Innocent had already written about the matter at the end of August 1488. In the breve to Angelo, it appears for the first time that the bishop of Oradea decided to enter a religious order and to renounce all offices and positions. Jan Filipec was to choose the order he wished to join and to surrender all offices and possessions to the nuncio. Only then could Angelo allow him to enter the order (after a year's time).⁴⁷

On 1 September 1488 the actual bulls with mandates and faculties for Pecchinoli were issued. Two of them contain specific instructions for dealing with the case of Jan Filipec.⁴⁸ One concerns the investigation into whether Filipec had anything to do with heretics (since, supposedly, his parents were heretics), the other is directly addressing the issue of the bishopric of Olomouc. According to the pope, Filipec was not elected by the canons, and he only intruded in the administration of the Olomouc church by his own presumption; essentially, he illegally occupied the diocese, turning its revenues to his own reprehensible purposes. Angelo was charged with the task of inducing Filipec to relinquish the bishopric and hand it and its possessions over to Vitéz.⁴⁹ Also the nuncio's instructions repeated that Filipec lacked any canonical election to become the bishop of Olomouc.⁵⁰ Thus the same demand appeared again, but its fulfilment was not easy and never came to pass. In this case, Angelo had ecclesiastical interdict and excommunication in his arsenal, which he could impose not only on the bishop of Oradea but also on all his partisans, as one can read in the same instructions.⁵¹ These texts show a theory

45 Kalous (Ed.), *The Legation* (see note 34), pp. 3–5, no. 1; if not indicated otherwise, the paraphrases in the text are based on the original reports and other documentation related to the legation of Angelo Pecchinoli, as edited in the volume cited.

46 *Ibid.*, pp. 5–7, no. 2.

47 *Ibid.*, pp. 12 f., no. 6, 26 August 1488; breve signed by *Aleriensis* (like most of these from 1488), i. e. Ardicino della Porta.

48 All bulls with mandates and faculties for the nuncio *cum potestate legati de latere* are preserved in AAV, Reg. Vat. 734, fol. 228v–242r; edited in *ibid.*, pp. 44–75, nos. 10–22.

49 *Ibid.*, pp. 53 f., no. 13; pp. 57–59, no. 15.

50 *Ibid.*, pp. 31 f., no. 9.

51 *Ibid.*, p. 32.

of action against a bishop who, according to the papal curia, had unjustly usurped the diocese and its associated possessions. The actual actions against the uninvited guest in the Moravian diocese are described in Angelo's reports sent to the pope in Rome.

Pecchinoli took up the problem directly at the court of King Matthias, where he arrived in late 1488; the exact date of his arrival is not known, but he certainly left Rome sometime after 1 September. His first lengthy report was dated on 30 January 1489 in Vienna. He described all his activities on his journey so far and devoted several pages to the Olomouc dispute, recording his conversation with the king and later conversation with Jan Filipec.⁵² As already mentioned, the nuncio reminded the king that it was mainly at his instigation that János Vitéz was appointed bishop of Olomouc; Filipec was said to have been responsible for the revolt of the Silesian princes. The conversation, however, continued with Matthias's request that Angelo extend the deadline for handing over the bishopric's possessions. At the same time, Matthias desperately needed Jan Filipec, since he was the only one who could negotiate with the rebellious Silesian princes and was therefore existentially important to Matthias. Although the nuncio pointed out the contradiction in the king's words, Matthias insisted. However, he proposed to the papal representative that the ecclesiastical punishments should be postponed for three months, and after the Silesian affairs were settled the nuncio was to take the bishop of Oradea to Rome and deal with him as he saw fit.

Another conversation recorded by the nuncio followed, this time with Filipec himself. He was very confident at first, but when he understood what the Holy Father's will was, he wanted to hand the bishopric back to the chapter. However, he also asked Pecchinoli to be patient with this, as he had great expenses in repairing and redeeming the bishopric's property. Angelo reminded Filipec that the patronage of Olomouc did not belong to the king (not being part of Hungary), but to the pope, who entrusted the chapter with the exercise of these rights; and also that having obtained the diocese of Oradea, he could not be elected or installed in another one. The nuncio added, moreover, that Filipec would hardly escape ecclesiastical punishment if he gave the bishopric of Olomouc back to the chapter and not to him. Angelo also responded to Filipec's demand that his expenditures be remunerated: only after investigation whether the claims are legitimate. Jan Filipec was not even afraid of an investigation into his heresy – he was sure that no heresy could be proved in his case. Filipec then also defended his activities in the Olomouc bishopric; all expenditures were legitimate and beneficial to the bishop's estates. He further complained, however, that the bishop of Syrmia, who had been appointed in his place, „also has another bride“ (i. e., another diocese). To this, however, Angelo replied that this was a decision of the pope, the reasons for which he could not inquire.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 77–120, no. 24 (the following paragraphs are summarising Pecchinoli's report on Olomouc and Jan Filipec, pp. 86–94).

Filipec also asked for permission to join a religious order at that time. The nuncio responded that one should enter an order with a calm mind and not out of desperation; but if the bishop surrendered all his ecclesiastical offices to the nuncio, he would be allowed to enter the order. Jan Filipec wished to enter the order, as he believed he could not serve the king better with honour – presumably after Matthias had grown to distrust him. He wished to renounce his property and offices, but would only surrender them to the king, from whom he had received them; from the nuncio he wished only permission to enter the order. He said literally: „I will accept the order, and since I have no more than one stomach, I will be able to fill it with pulses, as from the ten plates of the Oradea church. I submit, but I will not deliver the property into your hands, but into the hands of the king from whom I received it, only give me licence to enter [the order].“⁵³ The nuncio then again urged Jan Filipec to obedience, since he was sent to Hungary armed only with the authority of the Apostolic See. So far, however, he had not succeeded with the bishop of Oradea, who left „with a turned up nose and a quivering throat“. Angelo asked the pope to allow him to take no action against Filipec, as the King of Hungary wished him to wait. At the same time, however, he demanded that the pope should not extend the time limit.

Angelo Pecchinoli's first report contains a description of several further events at the Hungarian court concerning Jan Filipec. After his return from Silesia, he was „preparing to sing festive vespers before the king“, which was reported to the nuncio by Tamás (Thomas) Bakóc, the then royal secretary and bishop of Győr. Angelo, however, took no action against Filipec, but only marvelled at his obstinacy and the courage with which he held the service, knowing that he was still not exonerated and cleared of the ecclesiastical censures that rested upon him. When the nuncio informed the king, he replied that Filipec had declared himself to be free from any ecclesiastical restrictions. The king wanted Pecchinoli to relieve Filipec of these restrictions. The nuncio, however, had no power to do so. Angelo's account on the settlement of the dispute over the bishopric of Olomouc ends in his first report with a compromise agreed with both parties. After a suspension of fifteen days, the representative of the bishop of Syrmia (who was in Rome), the bishop of Oradea and the bishop of Győr, who was the king's representative, showed up for negotiations. The king asked that Filipec be freed of the censures at least for January and February, as he was essential to him in dealing with the critical situation in Silesia. Angelo, as he himself wrote, could not refuse this.⁵⁴

In 1489 the settlement of the dispute was not yet complete. It was still Pecchinoli's task to promote János Vitéz to the bishopric of Olomouc, even though he had already been appointed bishop of Veszprém (interestingly, it was Cardinal Rodrigo again who was involved in the transfer of János Vitéz to Veszprém in June 1489).⁵⁵ In his further

⁵³ Ibid., p. 91.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 94.

⁵⁵ AAV, Arch. Concist., Acta Camerarii 1, fol. 26r; 3 June 1489.

reports, Angelo described that he could not achieve much, as even the procurators of the bishop of Syrmia were asking for a prorogation of suspension of the ecclesiastical censures.⁵⁶ After almost no information on the matter in several of his letters, the nuncio reported on Jan Filipec on 18 September 1489. First, the king wanted to send Jan Filipec to Rome. He would deal with the matters concerning Ancona, which wanted to desert the papal states and recognise the sovereignty of King Matthias, but he would also exonerate himself in front of the Holy Father.⁵⁷

The king, however, wanted to dismiss the Olomouc issue claiming he had a breve from the pope which said nothing was to be done in that matter or against Jan Filipec. He never showed it to the nuncio, but was surprised that Pecchinoli put a vicar to the bishopric (whom local sources do not know). Even though the nuncio wanted to proceed according to the original plan, the king still used the services of Filipec in the matters concerning Silesia and Bohemia and could not spare him. Thus, Angelo did not pursue the matter with force. The king even claimed that he intended to resolve the whole conflict over the Olomouc bishopric himself, and told the nuncio that he had already reconciled the two bishops.⁵⁸

In October, Pecchinoli reported of Jan Filipec's involvement in the negotiations in Austria. The king even instructed the bishop of Oradea not to talk to Raymund Peraudi, the papal nuncio at the imperial court, as the king believed he was mistreated by Peraudi.⁵⁹ In his next report, Angelo described the recurrent wish of the king to send the bishop of Oradea to Rome to deal with the Ancona matter, even though the nuncio encouraged him to change his mind and send someone else immediately and not wait for the end of the talks in Austria.⁶⁰ The Olomouc case was resting until December, when the papal nuncio was pressing the king again. He wrote to Rome that he would appoint a general vicar to the bishopric of Olomouc, but the king objected with the same reasoning that he had a breve which said that Pecchinoli was not supposed to do anything against the Olomouc church. Jan Filipec, reportedly, even made the king promise to grant the possession of the bishopric of Veszprém to János Vitéz only after the Olomouc bishopric's possession is confirmed to him. The nuncio, however, was sure that if the pope persisted in his decision, the king would do nothing and would not further promote the bishop of Oradea in Olomouc.⁶¹ This was the last information Angelo Pecchinoli sent back to Rome about the case of the Olomouc bishopric.

The dispute between the two protagonists, which lasted for several years, was thus brought to an end in 1489, even though it was no conclusive solution. János Vitéz became bishop of Veszprém and the king fully supported Jan Filipec in the question of the bish-

⁵⁶ Kalous (Ed.), *The Legation* (see note 34), p. 147, no. 33, 17 April 1489.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 204, 206, no. 36.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 210 f., no. 36.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 218, no. 38, 15 October 1489.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 220, no. 38; pp. 226 f., no. 40, 27 November 1489.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 236 f., no. 41, 26 December 1489.

opric of Olomouc. The conflict between Filipec and Vitéz was, of course, well known in court circles and thus referred to even in non-papal diplomatic correspondence in Italy. Still on 8 May 1490, Bartolomeo Calco, the Milanese secretary, summarising Hungarian information for Ludovico il Moro described János Vitéz with notes on the clash over the bishopric of Olomouc and even stated that János was the „archenemy of the bishop of Oradea“.⁶² However, the end of the dispute between Filipec and Vitéz, which was still reflected abroad, did not bring resolution to the situation in Olomouc.

In March 1490, Ardicino della Porta the Younger (1434–1493),⁶³ cardinal-presbyter of Sts John and Paul, was mentioned as the future bishop of Olomouc, as the pope informed the king and urged him at the same time not to approach him any more on that matter, but rather accept his decision.⁶⁴ In February 1475, Ardicino became bishop of Aleria in Corsica, and as such acted as papal nuncio in central Europe. In 1477, he came as a papal diplomat to the courts of both Frederick III and Matthias Corvinus. According to his instructions from 20 September 1477, he was to bring about peace, or at least a truce, between the two because of the Turkish threat. In his activities he joined other papal diplomats who were trying to calm the situation in Central Europe at that time (Baldassare Turini of Pescia, Alexander Numai of Forlì, etc.). It was in the interest of the papal see that both these rulers should focus on the defence of Christianity rather than on mutual conflicts. However, these papal nuncios were not only active in peace negotiations, but also dealt with the problems of various imperial bishoprics, such as Constance and Cologne.⁶⁵ Ardicino may have met Jan Filipec at this time, who was negotiating with the imperial side as a representative of the King of Hungary.⁶⁶ Ardicino also had to deal with other Hungarian matters, especially the situation on the archdiocese of Esztergom (Archbishop of Esztergom Johann Beckensloer had gone over to the side of Frederick III and opposed Corvinus) or the king's relationship with the Teutonic Knights.⁶⁷ As evidenced by the instructions to Orso Orsini – the bishop of Teano and papal nuncio who attempted to pacify the Central European monarchs in 1480 – the conclusion of peace

62 Iván Nagy/Albert B. Nyáry (Eds.), *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek Mátyás király korából 1458–1490* [Hungarian diplomatic documents from the time of King Matthias, 1458–1490], vol. 4, Budapest 1878 (Monumenta Hungariae Historica IV/4), p. 194, no. 137.

63 On Ardicino, cf. Franca Petrucci, Della Porta, Ardicino (Adriano, Arduino), in: DBI, vol. 37, Roma 1989, pp. 148–150; Thomas Frenz, *Die Kanzlei der Päpste der Hochrenaissance (1471–1527)*, Tübingen 1986, p. 290, no. 250; Philipp Stenzig, *Botschafterzeremoniell am Papsthof der Renaissance. Der Tractatus de oratoribus des Paris de Grassi – Edition und Kommentar*, Frankfurt a. M. 2013, vol. 2, p. 1192.

64 Fraknói (Ed.), *Mátyás király levelezése* (see note 26), pp. 244 f., no. 192, 22 March 1490 (correction of the date to 1490, see Fraknói, *Mátyás király magyar diplomatái* [see note 32], p. 125).

65 AAV, Misc., Arm. II 30, fol. 54r–55r (instructions for Ardicino) (cf. Theiner [Ed.], *Vetera Monumenta*, vol. 2 [see note 26], pp. 454 f., no. 639); fol. 57r–58r (instructions for Ardicino and Alexander, 18 April 1478) (cf. Adolf Bachmann [Ed.], *Urkundliche Nachträge zur österreichisch-deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter Kaiser Friedrich III.*, Wien 1892, pp. 436 f., no. 427, in German).

66 Cf. Kalous, Jan Filipec (see note 42), pp. 16 f.

67 Fraknói (Ed.), *Mátyás király levelei* (see note 15), vol. 1, pp. 395 f., no. 270.

three years earlier was attributed to the activities of Ardicino.⁶⁸ Perhaps the bishop of Aleria left Central Europe in 1478 and only appeared in Central European context twelve years later thanks to his appointment as bishop of Olomouc.

In Rome, Ardicino acted as *referendarius* (on 24 November 1488 he even obtained the right to sign the granting of benefices and supplications during the pope's illness) and *datarius*, and he often appeared in the pope's proximity, especially during the liturgy on the occasion of various church festivals. On 9 March 1489, he was created cardinal in the consistory on the only occasion when Pope Innocent VIII created cardinals. Not long after this act, Ardicino was appointed bishop (administrator) of Olomouc. He held the office in March 1490, as we learn from a papal letter to King Matthias. However, it was only on 5 November 1490 that Pope Innocent VIII called the vassals and the people of the city and diocese of Olomouc to obedience to the new bishop Ardicino.⁶⁹

In the bull addressed to Ardicino himself, the whole situation of the Olomouc bishopric is described from the legal point of view; the bishopric, to whose administration „in spiritualibus et temporalibus“ the bishop of Syrmia János Vitéz was appointed, had been vacant since the death of Bishop Prothasius. The administration of Vitéz ended with his transfer to the bishopric of Veszprém, and it is therefore possible to appoint a new administrator, who is to be Ardicino. He is praised for his good work with the papal curia and in the spiritual administration and he is to retain all his existing offices.⁷⁰ However, Ardicino – like other Roman prelates who obtained benefices in distant bishoprics – never took up his office in person and never arrived in Olomouc. On the other hand, he apparently appointed his deputy, who is referred to as *vicegerens* in the papal breve of 23 December 1491.⁷¹ Jan Filipec was still the *de facto* administrator of the Olomouc bishopric for several months after Ardicino's appointment, as a later bull of Pope Alexander VI issued in April 1493 mentioned Filipec's intrusion in the bishopric, which continued „in the times of Ardicino“.⁷²

Sometime after the death of Matthias Corvinus and after the accession of Wladislas II Jagiellonian to the Hungarian royal throne and his coronation, which Jan Filipec himself attended, he resigned from all his secular and ecclesiastical offices.⁷³ Filipec

68 Edgár Artner (Ed.), „Magyarország mint a nyugati keresztény művelődés védőbástyája“. A Vatikáni Levéltárnak azok az okiratai, melyek őseinknek a Keletről Európát fenyegető veszedelmek ellen kifejtett erőfeszítéseire vonatkoznak (cca 1214–1606) [„Hungary as a Bulwark of Western Christian Culture. Documents from the Vatican Archives Relating to the Efforts of our Ancestors to Counter the Threats to Europe from the East, c. 1214–1606], Budapest-Roma 2004 (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae I/1), p. 125, no. 107.

69 ZAO-O, AO, Parchments, sign. A I a 21, A I a 22; Lateran registers keep the nomination bull and other five bulls to the Olomouc chapter, clergy, people, vassals of the bishopric as well as Wladislas, the king of Bohemia, cf. AAV, Reg. Lat. 875, fol. 63r–65v, 5 November 1490.

70 AAV, Reg. Lat. 875, fol. 63r–64r.

71 ZAO-O, MCO, Charters, sign. A IV d 9.

72 Cf. AAV, Reg. Vat. 879, fol. 155r, 3 April 1493.

73 The resignation to the bishopric of Oradea appeared in the registers only on 3 September 1492, AAV, Arch. Concist., Acta Camerarii 1, fol. 48r, „Eadem die et consistorio prefatus sanctissimus dominus noster

finally did what he had tried to do earlier, as was evident from his conversations with the papal nuncio, and entered a religious order. His choice were the Franciscan Observants. He participated in the Bohemian provincial chapter in Nysa in August 1491, where he brought a sufficient supply of wine as well as lavish alms in the form of various cloths, held the service on the Assumption, and gave a „most pleasing“ sermon to the clergy. At the same time, he changed the situation in the Olomouc friary, where he introduced a Czech preacher (in addition to the German one). Finally, he sponsored the foundation of the friary in Uherské Hradiště. The following year, he took part in the provincial chapter in Olomouc, which he very generously sponsored. After the chapter he entered the Franciscan Observant friary of St Bernardine in Wrocław on 10 June 1492.⁷⁴ Jan Filipec became a friar and lived in the order until 1509.

Interestingly, some sources refer to an agreement between Jan Filipec and Tamás Bakóc, bishop of Győr and royal secretary, just after Matthias's death. Tamás was one of the most influential personalities at the court of Matthias Corvinus in the second half of the 1480s, as royal secretary, he gradually took over various functions originally belonging to the chancellor or other dignitaries. Bakóc probably agreed to support Wladislas in his candidacy for the Hungarian throne in return for the promise of the post of royal chancellor, which he received from Jan Filipec (probably in agreement with Wladislas). Bakóc had already assumed the chancellorship in autumn 1490.⁷⁵ On 29 September 1490, soon after the coronation of King Wladislas, Filipec bequeathed his house in Felhévíz to Osvát Szentlászlói (Túz), bishop of Zagreb, who also succeeded Filipec in the position of the provost of the collegiate chapter of Felhévíz.⁷⁶ Jan Filipec thus relinquished his

ad relationem eiusdem reverendissimi domini cardinalis de Ursinis admisit resignationem ecclesie Varadiensis in manibus sue sanctitatis factam per reverendum patrem dominum Iohannem de opido Prostani illius ultimum possessore, per ingressum religionis factam. Et illi de persona domini Valentini ... [sic] providit.“ Cf. Antonius de Bonfinis, *Rerum ungaricarum decades*, vol. 4/1, ed. by I. Főgel/B. Iványi/L. Juhász, Budapest 1941, p. 203.

⁷⁴ Franciscan Observant chronicles: Eberhard Ablass de Rheno, *Cronica de novella plantatione provincie Austrie, Bohemie et Polonie quoad fratres Minores de Observantia*, ed. by Antonín Kalous/Jana Svobodová, Roma 2024 (*Franciscans and Europe: History, Identity, Memory 1*), pp. 68–70; *Chronica fratrum Minorum de Observantia provinciae Bohemiae*, vol. 1: *Medieval Observant Chronicle, 1440s–1553*, ed. by Antonín Kalous/Kateřina Ptáčková, Roma 2025 (*Franciscans and Europe: History, Identity, Memory 2*). Eberhard called him „Iohannes episcopus Olomucensis et Waradiensis“, whereas the other chronicle called him „Iohannes olim episcopus Waradiensis“. Cf. also Klement Minařík, *Príspevek k životopisu Jana Filipece* [A Contribution on the Biography of Jan Filipec], in: *Sborník Historického kroužku* 28 (1927), pp. 61–67, 127–134, at pp. 63 f., 128 f.

⁷⁵ Berzeviczy (Ed.), *Aragoniai Beatrix* (see note 43), p. 318, no. 213; cf. Vilmos Fraknói, II. Ulászló királyválasztása [The Election of King Wladislas II], in: *Századok* 19 (1885), pp. 1–20, 97–115, 193–211, at p. 18; György Bónis, *A jogtudó értelmiség a Mohács előtti Magyarországon* [Legal Intelligentsia in Pre-Mohács Hungary], Budapest 1971, p. 311.

⁷⁶ Cf. Budapest, Magyar nemzeti levéltár, Diplomatikai fényképgyűjtemény [Hungarian National Archives, Diplomatic Photographic Collection], DF 252017, 29 September 1490 (a copy from Zagreb, Nadbiskupski arhiv [Archbishopric Archives]); for Osvát, see Zoltán Czövek, *Szentlászlói Osvát zágrábi*

offices gradually between 1490 and 1492. Perhaps he followed a similar procedure in the case of his Moravian diocese, which he must have handed over to other administrators.

What is important for the Olomouc bishopric and the whole of Moravia in all these disputes is that Jan Filipec was unambiguously accepted as administrator (or bishop, as he often appears in the sources) in the 1480s. This is confirmed by many diplomatic and non-diplomatic sources from that time. As bishop of Olomouc, Filipec participated in and even presided over Land Diets and Land Courts. As bishop of Olomouc, he looked after the diocese's assets, as he mentioned in his conversation with papal nuncio Angelo Pecchinoli. The tradition recorded by the humanists and canons of the Olomouc chapter Augustine Käsenbrot of Olomouc (d. 1513) and Martin Gerstmann (d. 1585) states that Filipec repaired the episcopal castles of Vyškov and Mírov, redeemed the town of Mohelnice, and supported the construction of the canonry of Augustinian canons at the Church of All Saints in Předhradí (in German: Vorburg), a neighbourhood in the town of Olomouc.⁷⁷ The transfer of the church to the Augustinians was confirmed in 1492 by King Wladislas,⁷⁸ and appreciated by Pope Innocent VIII.⁷⁹ In fact, Filipec's activities in Moravia were much more extensive. He founded the Franciscan Observant friary in Uherské Hradiště, where he is also buried. His other intention was to restore the liturgical books used in the diocese. Therefore, in 1488, he had the „Missale Olomucense“ printed in Bamberg, a missal to replace the existing old or inaccurate books due to the scribes' errors and mistakes. Thus, in 1488, at a time when the dispute over the Olomouc bishopric was already in full swing, Jan Filipec took proper care of its improvement and transformation. Earlier, Filipec already had the „Breviarium Olomucense“ printed in Venice (1484) and the „Agenda Olomucensis“ in Brno (1486).⁸⁰ During his time in office, Filipec made a complete renewal of liturgical books possible, which, according to his own pastoral letter in the introduction to the missal, were already inadequate and outdated.⁸¹ Filipec also consecrated the Chapel of St Jerome in the town hall of Olomouc

püspök családi és politikai kapcsolatai 1499. évi végrendeletének tükrében [Family and Political Relations of Osvát of Szentlázsló, Bishop of Zagreb, in the Light of his Testament of 1499], in: FONS 20 (2013), pp. 455–499.

77 Richter (Ed.), Augustini (see note 3), pp. 171 f.; Nováček (Ed.), Paralipomena (see note 3), p. 3; Josef Vítězslav Šimák, „Series“ Augustina Olomouckého [„Series“ of Augustine of Olomouc], in: Český časopis historický 37 (1931), pp. 584–593, at p. 593.

78 Olomouc, Státní okresní archiv (= SOKA Olomouc) [State District Archives], Archiv města Olomouc (= AMO) [Archives of the City of Olomouc], Zlomky registratur [Fragments of Registers], no. 4407, 24 April 1492, Buda; SOKA Olomouc, AMO, Sbírka listin [Collection of Charters], inv. no. 339, 24 April 1492, Buda.

79 AAV, Reg. Lat. 919, fol. 160v, 13 April 1492, by then Filipec was called „venerabilis frater noster Johannes in universali ecclesia, tunc Varadiensis episcopus“.

80 Vladislav Dokoupil, Počátky brněnského knihtisku. Prvotisky [The Beginnings of Printing in Brno. Incunabula], Brno 1974, pp. 34 f.; the establishment of the Brno printers' shop could have been inspired by Jan Filipec, who had the Chronicle of János Thuróczy printed there in 1488.

81 Missale Olomucense, Bamberg 1488, [fol. 1r], 31 March 1488; he entitled himself there „Iohannes dei et apostolice sedis gracia episcopus ecclesie Olomucensis“.

on 8 May 1491, which must have been a very important event for the town,⁸² and on 5 June 1492 made a request to the papal curia that on Saturdays and vigils of the feasts of certain saints the „Salve regina“ be sung in the parish church of St Maurice in Olomouc, and that all who attend either by singing or coming only to listen receive a hundred-day indulgence.⁸³ Filipec must have been accepted as bishop in Moravia, who certainly cared about the diocese and even if not properly confirmed by the pope, he utilised all his powers and resources to improve the state of the church.

It is only fair to remark, that Angelo Pecchinoli recorded both praise and slander. He noted in his first report that Konrad Altheimer, an Olomouc canon, sent him a letter about the tyrannous behaviour of Jan Filipec and, similarly in December 1489, Angelo Pecchinoli wrote that the Olomouc clergy was suffering under him like under „alter Totila, flagellum Dei“. ⁸⁴ On the other hand, Pecchinoli reported to Rome that he had received letters from the Church of Olomouc and from the Olomouc chapter, which show the bishop's loyalty and obedience to the Holy See.⁸⁵ From contemporary and later local sources, however, we get only the positive impression.

The conflict in the Olomouc bishopric did not end with Jan Filipec's retirement to a Silesian friary of Jawor and the appointment of Ardicino della Porta. The above-mentioned Olomouc consistory registers of the erection of altars list a number of charters issued by further administrators *sede vacante* until 1497. After Johann Pauswangel of Olomouc and Alexius of Jihlava in 1482–1490, there were others for the following years: Hynek of Zvole and Konrad Altheimer in October 1490, Hynek of Zvole and Daniel of Kostelec in March 1491, Konrad Altheimer and Daniel of Kostelec from April to August 1491 and then Jan of Jemnice and Konrad Altheimer from November 1491 to July 1497.⁸⁶ Only in November 1498 did the dean of the chapter, Konrad Altheimer, appear as a vicar „in spiritualibus“ and „officialis“ of the Olomouc episcopal curia.⁸⁷ It is clear that the dispute over the bishopric went on and even though there was a bishop of Olomouc in Rome, the vacancy continued.

The canons of the Olomouc cathedral chapter were not satisfied with the appointment of the Roman prelate and elected Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovice (1460/1461–1510) instead and persistently supported him. According to his own words, Bohuslav learned about his election in Venice.⁸⁸ He belonged to an eminent noble family; his

⁸² Olomouc, Vlastivědné muzeum, no. O–2520, here named only as bishop of Oradea.

⁸³ AAV, Reg. Suppl. 957, fol. 10v, 5 June 1492.

⁸⁴ Kalous (Ed.), *The Legation* (see note 34), pp. 94, 236.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 148, 169.

⁸⁶ ZAO–O, ACO, book no. 146, fol. 23r–51v, 61r–63r; cf. Baletka, *Olomoucké biskupství* (see note 30), pp. 541–543.

⁸⁷ ZAO–O, ACO, book no. 146, fol. 63v.

⁸⁸ Augustinus Potuček, *Introductio*, in: Bohuslav Hassensteinius baro a Lobkowicz, *Epistolae*, ed. by A. Potuček, Budapest 1946 (*Bibliotheca scriptorum medii recentisque aevorum*), p. VII; Jan Martínek/Dana Martínková (Eds.), *Bohuslai Hassensteinii a Lobkowicz epistulae*, vol. 2, Leipzig 1980

brother Jan took part in the important deputation of King Wladislas II to Pope Innocent VIII in 1487, which achieved final papal recognition of Wladislas as King of Bohemia. This was also recalled by the Tridentine bishop Ulrich of Friendsberg, who knew Bohuslav from their studies in Ferrara, in his letter of recommendation of 8 December 1490 to Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere (later Pope Julius II). He stressed that Bohuslav would be an excellent prelate in the Kingdom of Bohemia where Agostino Luciani, the run-away Italian bishop who served the Utraquists, still resided. Bohuslav was educated in Latin and Greek, a rhetorician, a philosopher, and skilled in law and divine books. With his brilliant qualities and good character, he was the perfect candidate for a bishopric among heretics, Ulrich claimed.⁸⁹ The attempt of the Olomouc cathedral chapter to elect their own candidate, however, failed and Bohuslav was not recognized by the pope.

However, Bohuslav was not the only local candidate. Another well-educated Bohemian nobleman, Benedict of Valdštejn, searched for a benefice. He had been active in other ecclesiastical positions before, in 1455 became the provost of the Litoměřice collegiate chapter, probably in 1461 he became a canon in Olomouc, and three years later a provost in the cathedral chapter (second in position after the dean). In December 1485, Pope Innocent VIII appointed him bishop of Kamień Pomorski (in German: Cammin or Kammin). Benedict was inducted in his office in May 1486, but from the beginning he had many problems concerning the financial situation of the bishopric and his office, including troubles with paying for the confirmation as bishop in Rome.⁹⁰ After the conflicts the bishop went to Rome and on his way in Pordenone received support from the Emperor. On 30 July 1489, Friedrich III ordered the Kamień cathedral chapter to hand over the money for the annates they withheld.⁹¹ The Emperor gave Benedict even greater support when he recommended his name for the bishopric of Olomouc.

(*Bibliotheca Teubneriana*), pp. 24 f., no. 23. On Bohuslav and his life see the introductions to the editions of his letters, and also *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě* [A Handbook of the Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia], vol. 3, founded by Antonín Truhlář/Karel Hrdina, continued by Josef Hejnic/Jan Martínek, Praha 1969, pp. 170–176; Jan Martínek, *Quaestiones ad Bohuslai Hassensteinii vitam pertinentes*, in: *Listy filologické* 90 (1967), pp. 317–321; Ivana Kyzourová (Ed.), *Básník a král. Bohuslav Hasištejnský z Lobkovic v zrcadle jagellonské doby* [The Poet and the King. Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovic in the Mirror of the Jagiellonian Age], Praha 2007, *passim*; Kamil Boldan/Emma Urbánková, *Rekonstrukce knihovny Bohuslava Hasištejnského z Lobkovic. Katalog inkunabulí roudnické lobkovické knihovny* [Reconstruction of the Library of Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovic. Catalogue of Incunabula of the Lobkovic Library of Roudnice], Praha 2009.

⁸⁹ Josef Truhlář (Ed.), *Listář Bohuslava Hasištejnského z Lobkovic* [The Letters of Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovic], Praha 1893, p. 31, no. 26.

⁹⁰ Roubic, Benedikt (see note 7), pp. 50 f. Only an early-twentieth-century handwritten inventory of the charters of the bishopric was preserved in *Archiwum państwowe w Szczecinie* [State Archives in Szczecin] in a collection of old inventories, entitled *Regesten zu den Urkunden des Bistums Kammin*, vol. 2, 1481–1790, nos. 787–1568. Roubic had used this register with only some small inconsistencies. The inventory is available in a digitised version online (URL: https://www.digitale-bibliothek-mv.de/viewer/fullscreen/PPNAPSzczecinie_65_78_0_3_1_1127; 23.01.2025).

⁹¹ *Regesten* (see note 90), p. 31, no. 867.

This was mentioned and reiterated by King of the Romans Maximilian on 12 November 1490.⁹²

In reaction to these recommendations, the pope reaffirmed his bulls with a breve sent directly to the Olomouc chapter. On 21 December 1490, Pope Innocent then reiterated that János Vitéz had resigned the bishopric of Olomouc and that Ardicino had been appointed in his place. Under threat of excommunication, the Olomouc canons were not allowed to elect anyone else.⁹³ Even though the King of Bohemia and Hungary, Wladislas II Jagiellonian, promised the chapter that he would use his envoys in Rome to promote Bohuslav to the episcopal see, the decision was not changed.⁹⁴ Even though neither of these candidates were successful, the interest in the bishopric of Olomouc must have been quite wide, concerning both possible bishops and their patrons.

Still, the dispute over the bishopric of Olomouc was not over. It flared up again in 1493. Ardicino della Porta was one of the most prominent cardinals in Rome and was even a favourite candidate to be elected pope after the death of Innocent VIII. However, this position was won in August 1492 by Cardinal Rodrigo, vice-chancellor of the Roman Church, as Pope Alexander VI (1492–1503). The new pope intervened in the disputes over the bishopric of Olomouc once again after Ardicino died on 4 February 1493.⁹⁵ János Vitéz had already left the Olomouc affair: in addition to his bishopric of Veszprém, he was granted the administration of the bishopric of Vienna on 8 February 1493.⁹⁶ On the same day, the episcopal see of Olomouc also received its new ordinary and again the story got complicated; on the one hand, the cathedral chapter elected its candidate, and on the other, the pope had someone else in mind. The chapter sided with its earlier candidate of 1490, Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovice, although the bishop of Cammin Benedict of Valdštejn, at that time dwelling in Bohemia, could also have been a possible candidate again.⁹⁷ However, the efforts of the Olomouc canons were again in vain.

Ardicino was succeeded on the Olomouc episcopal see by another Roman cardinal, Juan Borgia (Borja) (1453–1503), a nephew of Pope Alexander VI. According to papal records, he was granted the bishopric on 8 February.⁹⁸ No intercessors succeeded in changing this papal decision and Bohuslav Hasištejnský did not become bishop,

92 Venezia, Archivio di Stato (= AS Venezia), Collezione Podocataro, busta 6, no. 318.

93 ZAO-O, MCO, Charters, sign. A IV d 4.

94 Ibid., sign. A IV d 8, 2 December 1491, Buda.

95 Petrucci, Della Porta (see note 63).

96 Josephus Lukcsics (Ed.), *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis/A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára*, vol. 4, 1492–1526, Budapest 1907, p. 10, no. 8; Fraknói, Mátyás király magyar diplomatái (see note 32), p. 130; Eubel, *Hierarchia*, vol. 2 (see note 3), p. 268.

97 Roubic, Benedikt (see note 7), p. 52.

98 AAV, Arch. Concist., Acta Camerarii 1, fol. 53r, „Eadem die et consistorio prefatus sanctissimus dominus noster motu proprio commendavit reverendissimo domino cardinali Montis regalis Olomucensem ecclesiam per obitum bone memorie reverendissimi domini cardinalis Aleriensis apud sedem apostolicam defuncti vacantem.” The payment for the provision should be 3500 fl.; discussed on 23 February 1493, see AAV, Cam. Ap., Oblig. Comm. 11, fol. 24v.

although the Olomouc question fills his correspondence of the two years 1493–1494.⁹⁹ Interestingly enough, the Olomouc canons knew about the death of Ardicino, but did not know or did not want to know about the new papal nomination of Cardinal Juan, as they proceeded to the election sometime in early May. Jan of Šelmberk, Bohuslav's friend and royal chancellor, wrote to him in April about the Olomouc matter (still before the election) and Bohuslav promised to Jan he would not regret his efforts after Bohuslav becomes bishop.¹⁰⁰

Still in May, Bohuslav wrote to the Olomouc cathedral chapter thanking the canons for electing him bishop.¹⁰¹ The king was again involved, as the chapter even asked Bohuslav to turn to his royal advocate and remind him of his duty to defend the church immunities.¹⁰² He wrote to his friend Jan of Šelmberk again to ask him for further support, but also expressed his thanks that the king gave him all his backing.¹⁰³ One of his letters was addressed to Pavel Štěpánův (called Pouček), Prague provost and visitor (and thus the administrator of the Prague archbishopric), who participated in the royal embassy to Rome in 1487. Bohuslav praised him for protection of church laws and liberties and reminded him of the case in Olomouc.¹⁰⁴ However, this did not help either.

A remarkable letter was written by Bohuslav in the name of the Moravian lords and addressed to the pope. Here, Bohuslav summarised and offered all the reasons and arguments against the bishop being an Italian prelate, who never enters his diocese. The lords explained about the dangers the land was facing and even though the king reported to Rome, in the meantime they were like „sheep without a shepherd“ and „exposed to lurking wolves“. The chapter elected Bohuslav, the king briskly agreed and throughout the country there is a general agreement and will to have him named bishop. The pope, however, nominated a different candidate, the cardinal of Monreale (i. e. Juan Borgia, see below), who was surely an excellent man. The lords, though, asked about his utility. Should he preside the bishopric against general will? How would he judge from Rome? How would he influence the manners when he does not know the language and the habits? How would he fight the heresy, when he knows it only from hearsay? These questions perfectly express the situation and rhetorically prepare the ground for the argumentation in favour of Bohuslav, who was local and well-educated and thus perfect candidate for the bishopric. Finally, they criticise the decision of the pope, which must have been influenced by unjust people who long for profit and for whom „gold is more than Christian faith“. They ask the pope to confirm Bohuslav (rea-

⁹⁹ Martínek/Martínková (Eds.), *Bohuslav*, vol. 2 (see note 88), pp. 29–42, nos. 30, 32–38, 40–42; pp. 170–172, nos. 174, 176, 177.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 31, no. 32.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 31 f., no. 33.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 32, no. 34.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 33, no. 35; pp. 33 f., no. 36.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 34, no. 37.

soning with King Wladislas and even Emperor Frederick III, who had suggested his own candidate before, possibly they mean Benedict of Valdštejn), as they are in dire need of a bishop who would administer the diocese. Their souls would be safe, if he agreed, the letter states; if not, they do not want to bear any responsibility for what could happen.¹⁰⁵

Also King Wladislas strongly supported Bohuslav and made the matter one of the tasks of his envoy in Rome in Spring 1493. Antony of Šankovce (or Antal Sankfalvi), bishop of Nitra, approached the pope with three main topics: the Ottoman Turks, the king's matrimony, and the bishopric of Olomouc. In the last case, his argumentation again utilised the danger of heresy and the well-being of Moravians.¹⁰⁶ Even though the Moravian lords addressed the strongly-worded letter to the pope, even though the king, as well as the chapter, tried to change the pontiff's mind, and even though Bohuslav was called „designatus episcopus Olomucensis“ by the Olomouc humanist canon Augustin Käsénbrot, the curia did not succumb to pressure and the envoys of the chapter returned from Rome empty-handed in late summer 1494.¹⁰⁷ The unsuccessful candidate could only try to secure some other bishopric and write epigrams denigrating the Borgia pope.¹⁰⁸ It should be emphasized, however, that if Ardicino della Porta were accepted as bishop of Olomouc, the pope had every right to choose a new bishop himself, since Ardicino died „apud sedem apostolicam“ (as evidenced by the record in the acts of the papal chamber), thus enabling the pope to appoint a new bishop.¹⁰⁹

Juan Borgia was the eldest son of Juana, sister of Rodrigo, Pope Alexander VI. He was one of the Olomouc administrators who never visited Olomouc. Juan was the only cardinal (of St Susanna) whom the new pope created in the very first consistory after his election, on 31 August 1492.¹¹⁰ He was the archbishop of Monreale in Sicily, but neither this archdiocese was ever visited by him. At the papal court he held rather diplo-

105 Ibid., pp. 38 f., no. 41, all quotations in this paragraph; cf. also Jan Martínek/Dana Martínková, *Žádost moravské šlechty papeži Alexandru VI. o potvrzení Bohuslava z Lobkovic olomouckým biskupem* [Petition of the Moravian Nobility to Pope Alexander VI to Confirm Bohuslav of Lobkovic as Bishop of Olomouc], in: *Listy filologické* 102 (1979), pp. 145–147.

106 Venezia, Biblioteca nazionale Marciana (= BNM), ms. Lat. X 175 (= 3622), fol. 149r, undated, but royal letters to the pope narrow down the possible date of his negotiations to March and April 1493, cf. AS Venezia, Collezione Podocataro, busta 8, nos. 607, 608. On Antony, cf. Miriam Hlavačková, *A Diplomat in the Service of the Kings of Hungary. The Activity of the Bishop of Nitra Antony of Šankovce at the End of the Middle Ages*, in: *Historický časopis* 59 (2011), Supplement, pp. 3–24, at pp. 17 f.

107 Martínek/Martínková (Eds.), *Bohuslav*, vol. 2 (see note 88), pp. 39–42, no. 41; pp. 170–172, nos. 174, 176, 177.

108 For the attempts to get the bishopric of Wrocław, see Potuček, *Introductio* (see note 88), pp. VIII–IX; Rukověť, vol. 3 (see note 88), pp. 173 f.; epigrams on Pope Alexander, see Bohuslav Hasištejnský z Lobkovic, *Carmina selecta*, ed. by Jan Martínek/Dana Martínková/Helena Busínská, Praha 1996, pp. 14, 30–32.

109 See also the bull for Juan Borgia, AAV, Reg. Vat. 879, fol. 155r, 3 April 1493.

110 Gaspare De Caro, Borgia, Giovanni, in: DBI, vol. 12, Roma 1970, pp. 713–715.

matic posts, his most remembered act being the coronation of King Alfonso II of Naples in 1494, where he arrived as papal legate *de latere*.¹¹¹ Pope Alexander's nephew was also appointed bishop of Ferrara in 1494 (he did not take over the diocese until June 1497). Later he became vice-chancellor of the Church (1500), i. e., he was given the office previously held by his papal uncle, and finally in 1503, not long before his death, he became Latin Patriarch of Constantinople.¹¹² Juan thus collected vacant benefices like other members of the extended papal family.

However, his engagement at the Olomouc bishopric did not belong among the more successful recorded. Apparently, he did not receive any substantial profit from Olomouc, for he was not reluctant to get rid of his bishopric quite soon thereafter. It was certainly more profitable for him to devote himself to the closer bishopric of Ferrara, where, moreover, his cousin Lucrezia Borgia married in 1501. The administration of the bishopric of Olomouc was entrusted to him, as already mentioned, in February 1493, but the bull confirming the whole act was not issued until two months later, on 3 April 1493. In this bull, administration is fully granted to the Cardinal of St Susanna after the death of Cardinal Ardicino, and the charter mentions the fact that the bishopric was illegitimately held for a long time (also during the administration of Ardicino) by Bishop of Oradea, Jan Filipec. The administration of the diocese and its revenues are to be handed over entirely to „Cardinal Juan or his procurators“ and no one is to usurp the rule of the diocese or to oppose Juan and his procurators. „Excommunication, interdict and anathema“, deprivation of all ecclesiastical offices and benefices, or their public designation and prohibition from participating in public festivities – these are the penalties that will befall all who would interfere in any way with the cardinal's assumption of the episcopate. The bull containing his appointment was to be copied by notaries public and published in churches, at sermons, and other public places, so that the news of his appointment might spread throughout the diocese.¹¹³ A bull issued two years later, in which Juan Borgia is described as cardinal of St Susanna and of Monreale, and administrator of the dioceses of Olomouc and Ferrara, mentions the dispensation he received for all these offices, and also further permission to obtain canonries and similar benefices in cathedral and collegiate chapters.¹¹⁴

The bishopric, which was located beyond the Alps, apparently did not bring the expected benefits and Cardinal Juan soon agreed with another candidate for the bishop's seat, namely Stanislaus Thurzó (as King Wladislas informed the chapter). Other members of his family also found themselves on episcopal sees of Central Europe, but

¹¹¹ Setton, *The Papacy* (see note 29), pp. 449 f.; David Abulafia, *Introduction*. From Ferrante I to Charles VIII, in: id. (Ed.), *The French Descent into Renaissance Italy, 1494–95. Antecedents and Effects*, Aldershot 1995, pp. 1–25, at p. 14.

¹¹² Eubel, *Hierarchia*, vol. 2 (see note 3), pp. 21, 135, 153.

¹¹³ AAV, Reg. Vat. 879, fol. 155r–157v.

¹¹⁴ AAV, Reg. Vat. 873, fol. 291v–292v, 1 October 1495.

it was Stanislaus who became bishop for forty-three years, ending a problematic period of vacancy in the Olomouc episcopate. Juan Borgia essentially agreed on an indemnity payment and Stanislaus received the diocese from him in early 1497. King Wladislas wrote to the canons of the Olomouc cathedral chapter as early as 10 January of that year to ask for an accounting of the income of the bishopric in the period between the accession of the new bishop and the resignation of Jan Filipec, which again shows that Jan Filipec was the only candidate who actually managed the episcopal estates (and he was also acknowledged by the king).¹¹⁵

Stanislaus Thurzó was inducted to the bishopric at the secret consistory on 30 January 1497 and simultaneously he was granted a dispensation *de defectu etatis* as he was only twenty-six years old.¹¹⁶ This could happen after Cardinal Juan resigned from the Olomouc bishopric, handed it over to the pope and also ceded the right to receive 500 florins a year from the revenues of the bishopric.¹¹⁷ Stanislaus's procurator and famous Polish humanist Mikołaj Czepiel (Nicholas Czepele or Zeppel)¹¹⁸ negotiated in Rome on 20 March 1497 concerning the services to be paid by the new bishop.¹¹⁹ It is clear there was money. Stanislaus's father János Thurzó of Bethlenfalva (today Betlanovce, Slovakia) wrote to the administrators of the bishopric, Konrad Altheimer, dean of the chapter, and Jan of Jemnice archdeacon that they should provide for the needs of his son and prepare everything for his coming.¹²⁰ As mentioned above, they appeared as administrators *sede vacante* until 26 July. Only six days before, Pope Alexander issued a breve by which he granted plenary indulgence to all who would be present at the bishop's first pontifical mass in the cathedral of Olomouc, „which he was soon to be

¹¹⁵ ZAO-O, MCO, Charters, sign. A IV d 38.

¹¹⁶ ZAO-O, Arcibiskupství Olomouc (= AO) [Archbishopric of Olomouc], Parchments, sign. A I a 24, nomination bull; cf. also AAV, Arch. Concist., Acta Camerarii 1, fol. 74v. The new bishop was announced by three bulls to the clergy, vassals and people of the diocese, ZAO-O, AO, Parchments, sign. A I a 25–27; cf. AAV, Reg. Lat. 1014, fol. 15r–17v, bulls to the bishop, chapter, clergy, people, vassals, bishop of Mainz, and King Wladislas. Stanislaus even got a general absolution from any possible ecclesiastical censure or sentence he might have been connected with, fol. 17v–18r.

¹¹⁷ ZAO-O, AO, Parchments, sign. C I b 14, notarial instrument, 30 January 1497.

¹¹⁸ Mikołaj Czepiel stayed in Rome in 1475–1493 and visited Italy several times later, namely 1497, 1500, 1504–1505, cf. Marian Biskup, Die polnische Diplomatie in der zweiten Hälfte des 15. und in den Anfängen des 16. Jahrhunderts, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas 26 (1978), pp. 161–178, at p. 172; Anna Lewicka-Kamińska, Renesansowy księgozbiór Mikołaja Czepla w Bibliotece Jagiellońskiej [Mikołaj Czepiel Renaissance Book Collection in the Jagiellonian Library], Wrocław 1956, pp. 3–16; on his studies in Rome and activity at the papal court, see Marek Daniel Kowalski, Polnische Studenten im Rom der frühen Renaissance (1450–1500), in: Michael Matheus/Rainer Christoph Schwinges (Eds.), Studieren im Rom der Renaissance, Zürich 2020, pp. 163–189, at pp. 174, 184.

¹¹⁹ The common services 3.500 fl., the payments for the bulls and petty services of 400 fl., paid in two instalments of 190 fl. (7 March) and 228 fl. (7 April), cf. AAV, Cam. Ap., Oblig. Comm. 11, fol. 171v; AAV, Cam. Ap., Div. Cam. 51, fol. 178v–179r; AAV, Cam. Ap., Intr. et Ex. 529, fol. 44r, 53v; and a quitance for 190 fl. in ZAO-O, AO, Parchments, sign. A I a 28.

¹²⁰ ZAO-O, MCO, Charters, sign. A IV d 33, 11 April 1497.

celebrating“.¹²¹ The new bishop Stanislaus finally entered his bishopric and held it for further forty-three years.

Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovice again reacted to this success of Stanislaus: disgusted that he had not won this important ecclesiastical post himself, he wrote to his friend about the episcopal rank. He tried to justify his position when he finally resigned himself to reopening the dispute. He then pointed in particular to the many cases in history where prominent Church figures and saints have resisted accepting the episcopal office: Mark the Evangelist, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Paulinus of Nola, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Bernardine of Siena. They all refused the episcopal (or priestly) rank. In the end it was Jan Filipec who „preferred the quiet of a monastery“ to the bishopric of Oradea. Bohuslav compared himself with all these men, and added the threat of those unworthy of becoming bishops. Strachkvas was an example of this, known to him from the chronicle of Cosmas of Prague, who ended his life just before his planned episcopal consecration. Towards the end of his letter, he also gave a more optimistic version of episcopal dignity (also referring to St Paul), and even rejoiced that Olomouc had gained a suitable ecclesiastical leader. Yet he added bitterly: „I wish posterity would wonder why Bohuslav did not become bishop, rather than why most did.“¹²² In any case, after a complicated fifteen years, the last long period of controversy over the Olomouc bishopric ended and its administration was fully restored. Soon, it was forced to contend with the onset of the German Reformation both throughout the diocese and in the residential city itself. From the point of view of the Roman Church, the Olomouc church was once again a „rose among thorns“ and a „light in darkness“ as during the Hussite and Utraquist conflicts in Moravia, as it was called by King Matthias in the confirmation of its privileges in 1469.¹²³

It is evident that during the whole dispute over the Olomouc Church, Jan Filipec was the only properly functioning administrator managing the diocese, even though not confirmed by the papacy. As mentioned above, he was appointed by King Matthias Corvinus, who – as king of Bohemia – tried to influence the episcopal elections both in Wrocław and in Olomouc. By this intervention, he may have been attempting to enforce the principles and privileges established in his Hungarian kingdom, where he had patronage rights as king of Hungary over the whole church. It is, however, crucial, that Jan Filipec in Olomouc was accepted not only by the chapter (even though there are hints some canons did not particularly like him), but also by the Moravian estates. He participated in Land Diets and Land Courts, where he sat among the nobility; although Bishop Prothasius required the bishop had this right only when he actually came from the higher nobility families. The

121 ZAO-O, AO, Parchments, sign. A I a 29, 20 July 1497.

122 Martínek/Martínková (Eds.), Bohuslav, vol. 2 (see note 88), pp. 62–66, no. 53; cf. also Bohuslav's epigram on Jan Filipec and his entering the friary, *Illustris ac generosi d. Bohuslai Hasisteynii a Lobkovitz & c., baronis Bohemici, poetae oratorisque clarissimi Farrago poematum in ordinem digestorum ac editorum per Thomam Mitem Nymburgenum*, Pragae 1570, p. 114.

123 ZAO-O, AO, Parchments, sign. C I b 11, 21 July 1469.

case of Jan Filipec, who came from a burgher family of Prostějov, however, proved otherwise. The bishopric functioned very well under his guidance and he brought renewal to the Moravian Church before the accession of Stanislaus Thurzů, another bishop of burgher origin. He also became a suitable representative of his king in Moravia. It was a priority interest of Matthias Corvinus to place one of his own men in the vacant bishopric, so that he might better control the distant and little-visited Bohemian lands.

There were several candidates for the Olomouc bishop's seat. For locals, the bishopric of Olomouc definitely meant an advance in their career; for the curial candidates it was a nice income. Candidates could also reach the bishop's position through a different path, which would be the election by the cathedral chapter or appointment by the king or by the pope. In Olomouc's case, a nomination by the king should not be possible and thus appointment was done by influencing the decision of the chapter itself. The conflict over the Moravian Church therefore falls into a crucial transitional period. The fifteenth century is the time of the restoration and transition of the papal monarchy after the long periods of Avignon papacy and the papal schism to the restoration of papal centralism. In order to govern his dominions effectively and to participate fully in the political upheavals of the Italian League in the second half of the century, the pope urgently needed to expand his revenues. Such resources could include the distant benefices that were granted to the curial prelates representing diplomats and members of the administration, and the government of the papal state.¹²⁴

However, as seen in the reports of Angelo Pecchinoli, papal authority could not always celebrate its triumph over lands and dioceses that were under the control of strong local rulers. King Matthias Corvinus, even though he always tried to collaborate with the papacy (as it was extremely useful and profitable for him in the central-European politics, in relation both to the Hussites and to the Ottoman Turks) did not need to respect the pope's every wish. Simultaneously, papal authority started wavering in the context of areas with an unorthodox relation to the papacy, as was post-Hussite Bohemia.¹²⁵ Even though the Concordat of Vienna (1448) was not really in place in the Bohemian lands and no reference can be found in the whole history of the conflict for the bishopric of Olomouc in the late-fifteenth century, it seems the tendency was the same. The local church wanted to keep its rights, as it was specified in the Concordat, and the papal curia desired to intrude, holding the right to decide and confirm.¹²⁶ This seems to be a common tendency in the later Middle Ages.

¹²⁴ Cf. Charles L. Stinger, *The Renaissance in Rome*, Bloomington-Indianapolis 1998, esp. pp. 83–155; Southern, *Western Society* (see note 14), pp. 151–169; Francis Rapp, *Das Wiedererstarken des Papsttums. Ein unvollständiger und kostspieliger Sieg*, in: Marc Venard (Ed.), *Von der Reform zur Reformation (1450–1530)*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1995, pp. 69–141.

¹²⁵ As seen in the bishops Péter Váradi and Jan Filipec in the case of King Matthias, and bishop Agostino Luciani in the case of Bohemia, cf. Kalous, *The Pope, the King and the Bishops* (see note 34).

¹²⁶ Cf. Meyer, *Bischofswahl* (see note 1), pp. 13 f.; Angelo Mercati, *Raccolta di concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le autorità civili*, Roma 1919, p. 179.

Three concepts clashed: the local church and its self-administration, the royal power, and the papal authority. First, the traditional canonical election of the bishop in the cathedral chapter of a given diocese, which was born in an effort to remove episcopal election from the decision-making of secular rulers. Second, a renewed effort by the monarch who saw an opportunity to raise his associates in the episcopal offices, whom he himself had chosen and whom he could thus better provide with a substantial financial income, and an opportunity to strengthen the central government in a developing territorial state. And finally, it is the effort of a reborn papacy to rule more decisively over the whole Church, when the possibility of universal rule over entire western Christendom had long been lost. From this point of view, the disputes over the bishopric of Olomouc and the election of the bishop of Wrocław in 1482 certainly fit into the general tendencies of European development, which (along with the advent of the Franciscan movement or Humanism) affected Olomouc and Wrocław mainly due to the relaxation of international isolation after the Hussite wars much earlier than the centre of the Bohemian lands. While Bohemia, with its vacant archbishopric, remained in this isolation, condemned to separation from these wide European currents and to marginalisation (following, however, the newer tendencies of radical reform way before Luther Germany), Moravia partially and Silesia fully accepted these trends and tended to follow the general developments of essential social and religious changes from a different source.