

Between Two Kingdoms: The Alienation of Moravia and the Definition of Bohemia
Medieval Workshop, The University of Chicago

Laura Scott
April 18, 2016

Dear Medieval Workshop,

This paper is a combination of two chapters of my dissertation. The first section is the framework with which I begin chapter four. The next section is an excerpt from the background chapter of my dissertation, since much of this is crucial for understanding the stakes of my argument. The rest of the paper forms the first sections of chapter four, “Torn Allegiance: Assemblies and the Alienation of Moravia,” which will continue with a more detailed examination of assemblies in Moravia between 1467 and 1491. Currently, I include a summary of the sources and topics that will feature in this section, but not the section itself. Although this paper is part of two chapters, I welcome suggestions about organization as well, since most papers based on my dissertation will include a background section. I am also very interested in any connections to other polities that workshop attendees can suggest.

My dissertation examines the role political assemblies played in the Czech lands in the fifteenth century, focusing on their overall structure and their function in three distinct contexts between 1436 and the 1510s. It consists of four chapters addressing specific developments in Bohemia, as well as an historiographic introduction, a chapter laying out the little-known background for the period, and a robust conclusion examining the broader understandings my dissertation reveals about these assemblies.

My introduction will have two main aims. The first is to situate my work within the body of scholarship on fifteenth century Bohemia and to explain how my dissertation adds to this conversation. The second is to bring Bohemia into conversation with scholarship on the development of states, nationalism, and institutions in later medieval and early modern Europe. The next chapter lays out the background for the dissertation, because the religious and political movements which underpin the dissertation are not well-explained in English, nor familiar to most American scholars.

The following chapter, “Who Can Make a King? The Estates and Royal Elections,” examines the evolution of membership in the estates in the main provinces of the Kingdom of Bohemia (Bohemia and Moravia), and their involvement in electing kings at assemblies. I argue for a more nuanced and dynamic understanding of the composition of the estates, as well as the mutually-transformative power of the estates and the assemblies on each other, and on the conditions governing the election and succession of kings. This chapter has been completely drafted but is awaiting revisions.

The next chapter, “Divided Decisions: Parties, Disagreement, and Delay at Bohemian Assemblies,” focuses on parties at the assemblies during the eighteen years of the interregnum and regency of Ladislaus Posthumous, between 1439 and 1457. This chapter addresses whether these assemblies properly fit in to any hierarchy, met in an ad hoc manner, a combination of both, or are the product of the upheaval of their time. It also examines who attended these assemblies and what divided them into parties, which created delays, disagreements, a long interregnum, and renewed warfare. This chapter is outlined, but has not been drafted.

This paper is an excerpt of the following chapter, “Torn Allegiance: Assemblies and the Alienation of Moravia,” in which I examine the complicated relationship between the Empire, Bohemia, and Moravia, with an in-depth examination of the role of the assemblies between 1467 and 1491, when rule of the kingdom was contested between the Utraquist King of Bohemia, George of Poděbrad and his successor on the one side, and King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary on the other.

The final chapter focuses on the role of cities and their representatives at assemblies between the 1490s and 1510s. This chapter will focus on Plzeň, Cheb, and Kutná Hora, which were very active in assemblies at this time. My conclusion will draw together the different perspectives I have used to examine assemblies throughout the dissertation and will present a coherent picture of the role of assemblies in fifteenth-century Bohemia, and the relevance of this picture to emerging understandings of developments in other European polities.

I look forward to our discussion.

–Lisa Scott

Moravia was a key component of the Kingdom of Bohemia, yet for this reason it was repeatedly alienated from Bohemia. Examining how this was possible, both legally and practically, requires answering questions concerning the leaders and power structures within and surrounding the kingdom. Throughout the extensive period surveyed in this paper, Moravia serves as a battleground for disputes between Bohemia and Austria, Hungary, and the Empire, as well as internal disputes within the kingdom. These disputes both reflect existing power relationships and modify them. On occasion, we can see official statements concerning these relationships, as well as interactions which do not match these official statements.

This paper follows the changing ways in which the people living in Moravia and its environs defined their relationships, both individually and as a group, to each other and to the individuals and groups around them. One of the conclusions that emerges most clearly from these interactions is that their identities are rarely exclusive, but instead overlap and complement or contrast with each other in a myriad of ways not easily laid out in contemporary documents.

Len Scales examines this issue in the imperial context in *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414*.¹ One of the ways in which imperial, or German, identity was created was through comparison and interaction with neighboring and overlapping sets of identities.² Unlike Scales, I am not concerned with defining or following a language group as such, but rather with examining the relationship of people to the territory they inhabit, and the territories with which it is intimately connected.³

¹ Len Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

² Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 383-446, addresses Germans beyond the traditionally “German” parts of the Empire; Scales, *Shaping of German Identity*, 392-395, 397-398, 410-414, 418-430, specifically addresses German interactions with Bohemians.

³ Scales is by no means alone in this focus. Most scholarship has focused on language as a major identifier of different communities. This can be seen in nineteenth-century scholarship, such as František Palacký's *Geschichte von Böhmen. Grösstentheils nach urkunden und handschriften* (Prague: Kronberger und Řiwnáč, 1844-

I am not concerned with the Czechness or Germanness of the territories and characters I examine. While these “national” questions have dominated discussions since the nineteenth century, they often assume the answer to their own questions. Instead, I operate under the assumption that these language communities overlapped significantly, and that their interactions were defined by linguistic origin only in limited ways.⁴ As I address in another chapter of my dissertation, “German” did not necessarily mean a German-speaker, although language was likely some element of being “German.” In the bohemian context, it could also simply mean a foreigner, a non-Bohemian.⁵ To make these distinctions more clear, I carefully employ “Czech” and “German” only when explicitly discussing languages or when translations require them, and use Bohemian, imperial, Austrian, or similar terms in all other situations.

National concerns have significantly colored the interpretation of the relationship of Moravia to Bohemia, the Empire, and its other neighbors. In his recently-translated book, *Vladislaus Henry*, Martin Wihoda examines the life and times of the second son of the Bohemian

1867) and Bohuslav Rieger, *Zřízení krajské v Čechách* [*Regional Establishment in the Czech Lands*] (Prague: Nákladatelství F. Tempského, 1889); as well as modern scholarship, such as František Šmahel’s two-part, “The Idea of the ‘Nation’ in Hussite Bohemia,” in *Historica: Historical Sciences in Czechoslovakia* 16 (1969): 143-248; František Šmahel, “The National Idea in Hussite Bohemia II” in *Historica: Historical Sciences in Czechoslovakia* 17 (1969): 93-198, which was later expanded into a 1971 edition and a 2000 revised edition, František Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách* (Prague: Argo, 2000).

⁴ I am specifically referring to scholarship examining the emergence of “national” communities in Austria-Hungary in the nineteenth century. Gary Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861-1914*, 2nd edition (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2006); Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002); Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-48* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008); Pieter Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontier of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005). As King puts it succinctly, “ethnic groups are not national antecedents but national products, projected historically yet with history-making effect into the past,” King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans*, 8. In discussing the mid-nineteenth-century beginnings of his examination, he also asserts “but at any time before 1848, had [Palacký] or Jireček visited Budweis/Budějovice, they would have found only a few dozen Czechs with whom to lament a German dominance that existed only in their national imaginations. All national assertions aside, the Czech-German linguistic divide ran through many people, in undivisive fashion,” King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans*, 22.

⁵ See my examination of the conditions set for Emperor Sigismund and King Albrecht before their election to the Bohemian throne, examined in my chapter, “Who Can Make a King? The Estates and Royal Elections.”

ruling family in the late-twelfth century. One of his goals is to identify an independent (political if not ethnic), Moravian “land” community that was emerging by the early thirteenth century.

In summary, before Přemysl Otakar II was granted the title of Margrave, an emancipated community had been formed in Moravia that was able to defend the interests of the land at the royal court even against their Polish, Hungarian and Austrian neighbours without needing special intercession or protection on the part of the sovereign.⁶

While Wihoda attempts to establish this for the limited period he examines in detail, this paper will suggest that this does not hold for periods after 1230. Moravia was instead closely tied to Bohemia, interconnected in innumerable ways, simultaneously alienable and indivisible from Bohemia, and certainly at the mercy of its neighbors.

Scales does suggest one interpretation of identity that I see clearly reflected in the Bohemian situation addressed in this paper. He suggests that “Local and regional solidarities did not so much drain the political substance from ideas of ‘the German’ as, in many ways, enrich and complicate them, and afford standpoints from which to invest them with meaning.”⁷ While I am not concerned with Germanness or Czechness, the overlapping definitions of jurisdiction and identity at work in this paper imbue each other with meaning. It is these overlapping meanings that are most strongly revealed by examining Moravia and its relationship with nearby polities.

The Lay of the Land

The medieval Kingdom of Bohemia lay roughly in the center of Europe. To its northeast was the Kingdom of Poland and to its southeast the Kingdom of Hungary. The rest of its border was formed with the Holy Roman Empire (specifically Austria, Bavaria, Saxony, and Brandenburg), with which it had a very complicated relationship.⁸ Bohemia was both part of the

⁶ Martin Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry: the Formation of Moravian Identity* (Boston: Brill, 2015), 277.

⁷ Scales, *Shaping of German Identity*, 524.

⁸ Brandenburg had been purchased by Charles IV in 1373 and was attached to Lusatia, one of the Bohemian Crown Lands, from 1373 through 1415, but for the majority of that time it was not ruled closely by the Luxembourgs, and it was eventually granted to the Hohenzollern by Emperor Sigismund. Eva Semotanová,

Empire and essentially autonomous within its own borders. Although the relationship between Bohemia and the Empire had changed substantially over the many centuries of their interaction, by the fifteenth century Bohemia owed only very limited obligations beyond its own borders, was one of the imperial electors, and the investment of new kings and bishops was subject to the Emperor's approval, although not his veto.⁹ The Kingdom of Bohemia consisted of a number of territories which, from the mid-fourteenth century, were collectively known as the Bohemian Crown Lands.¹⁰ The dominant province in the kingdom was Bohemia, roughly the western two-thirds of the present-day Czech Republic. Moravia, the other one-third of the present-day Czech Republic, in 1034.¹¹ From the 1330s until 1740, Silesia was also tied to the Bohemian Crown Lands, and Upper and Lower Lusatia remained attached to Bohemia from the first quarter of the fourteenth century until the Thirty Years' War.

The first recorded Bohemian dynasty, the Přemyslids, ruled from at least the late ninth century until 1306, when the dynasty died out in the male line. Understanding some of the key ways in which the relationships between Bohemia, Moravia, and the Empire developed under the Přemyslids is key to understanding the overlapping jurisdictions and institutions that made alienating Moravia, and the other crown lands, both divisive and untenable.

When the Přemyslid family died out in the male line, the throne was fought over by the husbands of the sisters of the last Přemyslid king, and the two Emperors who were their

"Territorial Development and the Transformation of Landscape," in *A History of the Czech Lands*, Jaroslav Pánek, Oldřich Tůma, et al, eds. (Prague: Karolinum Press, 2009), 29.

⁹ I will address the development of this relationship later in this paper.

¹⁰ Semotánová, "Territorial Development," 30.

¹¹ Semotánová, "Territorial Development," 27-28. Nora Berend, Przemysław Urbáńczyk, and Przemysław Wiszewski, *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 138-143.

relatives.¹² The struggle was settled after John of Luxembourg, son of then Emperor Henry VII, married Eliška Přemyslovna in 1310 and was crowned king of Bohemia in 1311.

John and Eliška's son Charles IV succeeded them. He became an extremely powerful and well-respected king who established himself effectively as Emperor and ruled in both Bohemia and the Empire for over thirty years.¹³ His oldest son, Wenceslas IV, inherited the Kingdom of Bohemia and was elected King of the Romans during his father's lifetime, while the middle son, Sigismund, received Brandenburg and rule of Hungary through his wife, Mary.¹⁴ By his father's will, Charles IV's brother John Henry had received Moravia, while his brother Wenceslas received Luxembourg. John Henry's son Jošt inherited Moravia in 1375, and obtained Brandenburg in pawn from Sigismund in 1388.

During the last years of Charles IV's rule, an influential religious movement arose in Bohemia that would have ramifications for centuries. It began with religious figures such as Conrad Waldhauser, Milíč of Kroměříž, and Matthew of Janov, before becoming centered

12 As the husband of the elder sister, Anne, Henry of Carinthia was the initial choice. However, his right was contested by King of the Romans, Albert I of Habsburg, who declared Bohemia forfeit to the imperial crown and made his son, Rudolf, a contender, before Albert I himself died in 1307. From 1308, Henry VII of the House of Luxembourg was Holy Roman Emperor. Rudolf was rejected by much of the Bohemian nobility and died besieging a castle, opening the door for Emperor Henry VII to marry his son John to the younger sister, Eliška of Bohemia, in 1310. He was crowned in 1311. Jörg Hoensch, *Die Luxemburger: eine Spätmittelalterliche Dynastie gesamt-europäischer Bedeutung, 1308-1407* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000), 37-39; Miloslav Polívka, "The Expansion of the Czech State During the Era of the Luxembourgs" in *A History of the Czech Lands*, Pánek et al, eds., 120-121.

13 Charles IV was elected King of the Romans in 1346, while Louis of Bavaria was still also King of the Romans. The contest ended the next year when Louis died in a hunting accident. Charles IV is a national hero in Bohemia, and this is reflected in the scholarship. During his reign, Charles IV strove to increase Bohemia's status in the Empire and Europe. His efforts in Prague focused on prestige-building activities such as the creation of the Archbishopric of Prague (1346) and the foundation of the University of Prague (1348), the first university in any imperial or central European land north of the Alps, as well as local improvements such as the creation of the New Town in Prague (1348) and the construction of a key bridge in Prague over the river Vltava (1357). For a sample of the literature on Charles IV, see Polívka, "The Expansion of the Czech State," 128-129; Jaroslav Čechura, *České země v letech 1310- 1378: Lucemburkové na českém trůně I* [*The Czech Lands in the Years 1310-1378: The Luxembourgs on the Czech Throne I*] (Prague: Libri, 1999), 65-68; David Mengel, "Emperor Charles IV (1346-1378) as the Architect of Local Religion" in *Austrian History Yearbook* 41 (2010), 15-29; Ferdinand Seibt, *Karl IV: ein Kaiser in Europa, 1346-1378* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1978); Zdeněk Kalista, *Karel IV. Jeho duchovní tvář* [*Charles IV: His Spiritual Face*] (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1971); Karel Čapek, "Karel IV. a nástup české reformace," [*Charles IV and the Start of the Bohemian Reformation*,"] in *Křesťanská revue* 45 (1978), 200-209.

14 The younger son, Jan, inherited the region near Görlitz. Polívka, "The Expansion of the Czech State," 143.

around the University of Prague. During the 1380s and 1390s, exchange between the universities of Oxford and Prague was also encouraged, creating paths for John Wyclif's controversial works to enter the University of Prague.¹⁵ Jan Hus, the Bohemian religious reformer who commanded pan-European attention in the 1410s, was educated in Prague in this environment.¹⁶

Hus was accused of teaching John Wyclif's doctrines, particularly the latter's opposition to transubstantiation, which was deemed heretical in 1410.¹⁷ Church authorities took issue with Hus's doctrines and with his opposition to the indulgence preached that year, and in 1412 he was forced from his post in Bethlehem Chapel and exiled from Prague.¹⁸ When the Council of Constance was called in 1414, Hus was asked to attend so that the question of heresy in Bohemia could be addressed. Critically, Emperor Sigismund issued Hus a safe conduct for his journey, but upon arrival at the Council he was arrested and, after nearly a year in captivity, Hus was burned as a heretic on June 6, 1415.¹⁹

After Hus's execution, the divisions between Hus's followers and more staunch Catholics solidified.²⁰ King Wenceslas died from a stroke barely two weeks after the outbreak of hostilities, leaving a power vacuum at the head of the state in Bohemia, which his brother

15 For more information about these reformers, see Matthew Spinka, *John Hus: A Biography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), 7-8, 12-21; Paul de Vooght, *L'Hérésie de Jean Huss* (Louvain, France: Publication Universitaires de Louvain, 1960), 75-76; Malcolm D. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 272-283; Matthew Spinka, *John Hus: Concept of the Church* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966), 14-21; Howard Kaminsky, *History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 18-24. See Michael van Dussen, *From England to Bohemia: Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012) for an examination of the exchange and communication between England and Bohemia during this period.

16 Jan Hus became a leader of this movement. He was born in southwestern Bohemia in 1369 and began his studies at the University of Prague in the 1380s, where he taught from 1400-1402, before becoming the rector and preacher in Bethlehem Chapel in Prague. František Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution (1419-1471)," in *A History of the Czech Lands*, Pánek et al, eds., 152.

17 Matthew Spinka, *John Hus and the Czech Reform* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1966), 35. See van Dussen, *From England to Bohemia*, 63-65, for an account of the reaction to the 1410 burning of Wyclif's works.

18 Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 152; Spinka, *John Hus and the Czech Reform*, 43-49. It was during this exile that he wrote the majority of his treatises.

19 Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 153.

20 Kaminsky, *History of the Hussite Revolution*, 141, 143; Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 153.

Emperor Sigismund was not immediately able to fill because he was defending the southern border of his Hungarian realm from the Ottomans.²¹ After rebellion broke out, the division of Utraquists into moderate and radical groups became apparent. The most well-known radical group was the Taborites, closely associated with the city of Tábor, which was founded in southern Bohemia in 1420 as a radical Utraquist fortress town.²² The particular theological differences between these groups are not relevant for this paper, but it should suffice to say that by 1420, most Bohemian leaders agreed on the Four Articles of Prague, while the radical groups urged greater reform.²³

The Four Articles of Prague represented the main tenets of Utraquism that were palatable to both moderates and radicals. As laid out by the 1421 Diet of Čáslav, these were 1) the free preaching of Christian priests; 2) the administration of the Eucharist as both bread and wine to children and adults, 3) an end to priestly rule over temporal property “to the detriment of the secular state;” 4) and all deadly sins stopped and the transgressors actually punished.²⁴ The assemblies and estates of the kingdom of Bohemia continually demanded reaffirmation of these articles after their acceptance in the Compacts with the Council of Basel. Utraquism, the non-pajoritive term for Jan Hus’s followers (Hussites), takes its name from the second of these articles, the administration of the Eucharist in both kinds, or *sub utraque*, rather than as just the wafer, *sub una*, as specified by the Fourth Lateran Council.

21 Kaminsky, *The History of the Hussite Revolution*, 295-296; Šmahel, “The Hussite Revolution,” 154.

22 The movement coalesced in the spring and summer of 1419 and was named after their foundation Tábor (camp) on a mountain in southern Bohemia. The town took its name from the word for “camp,” an allusion both to scripture and to the many meetings which took place in 1419, often on hilltops, in which radical doctrines were preached and which began the radical movement. This was also the name of the mountain on which Jesus was expected to return. Kaminsky, *History of the Hussite Revolution*, 278-280, 329-336, 367-369, especially 334-335, for treatment of the foundation of Tábor; Ždeněk David, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 25.

23 Kaminsky, *History of the Hussite Revolution*, 478-479.

24 *The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418-1437*, in *Crusade Texts in Translation*, Thomas Fudge, ed. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2002), 118.

A few moments during the Hussite Wars should be highlighted.²⁵ In 1418, military forces solidified into three groups, the Catholics, the moderate Utraquists, and the radical Utraquists. At this time, Emperor Sigismund received the allegiance of Moravia, Silesia, Lusatia, and a number of Bohemian Catholic lords and clerics in Brno, but not of Prague or Bohemia as a whole.²⁶ While briefly at the head of a victorious crusading force in July, 1420, Emperor Sigismund had himself crowned king in St. Vítus Cathedral in Prague in the presence of much of the Bohemian nobility, but this did not stop the revolt and he was soon forced to abandon Prague for Kutná Hora.²⁷

The years of civil war also saw a number of crusades called against Bohemia, in 1420, 1421, 1422, 1427, and 1431.²⁸ In supporting these crusades, Emperor Sigismund was also supporting his own claim to the Czech throne, a position for which he was not the only candidate.²⁹ As part of his effort to obtain and retain control of Bohemia, Emperor Sigismund granted Moravia to his new son-in-law, Albrecht of Habsburg, in 1423. This grant would prove extremely contentious, and both the mechanism by which it was granted and its implications will be examined later in this paper. Civil war between the three groups continued until the Council of Basel, where the Utraquists secured recognition in 1433, and the fighting largely ended after a

25 A few analyses of the era of civil war exist in English. Kaminsky, *History of the Hussite Revolution*, is the only full English-language treatment of the period until 1424. For the period 1424-1437, see F. M. Bartoš, *The Hussite Revolution, 1424-1437*, trans. by Mrs. J. Weir, prepared by John Klassen (New York: East European Monographs, Columbia University Press, 1986), whose text was edited, translated, and abridged for an international audience. Brief overviews of this period may also be found in Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 149-169; and David, *Finding the Middle Way*.

26 Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 154-155.

27 Jörg K. Hoensch, *Kaiser Sigismund: Herrscher an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit, 1368-1437* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1996), 293-294.

28 Fudge, *Crusade Against Heretics*, 4-5; Joachim Böhlke, Winfried Eberhard, Miloslav Polívka, *Handbuch der historischen Stätten: Böhmen und Mähren* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1998), LXXI.

29 One of the most important alternative candidates, supported particularly by the Utraquists, was Prince Korybut of Lithuania, who first fought on behalf of Grand Duke of Lithuania, Vytautas, and in 1424 was himself offered the Czech throne, but could never attain it. Kaminsky, *History of the Hussite Revolution*, 460, 466, 477.

joint Catholic and Utraquist army defeated the radical Taborites at the Battle of Lipany on May 30, 1434.³⁰

As the Council of Constance had held sway on the eve of revolt in Bohemia, so the Council of Basel acted as an important validation for the end of the conflict and a mutually acceptable settlement.³¹ Although multiple delegations were required and the result was tenuous, between 1433 and 1436 an agreement was reached that allowed the Four Articles of Prague to be upheld, while also protecting Catholicism in Bohemia. This treaty paved the way for Sigismund to agree to key Bohemian conditions and for a joint group of moderate Utraquists and Catholics to accept Sigismund as king. Simultaneously, the negotiations for the restitution of a king began. Two of the greatest difficulties of establishing Emperor Sigismund as King of Bohemia were his failure to enforce the safe conduct that he had granted to Jan Hus, and then the alienation of many when he called crusades against Bohemia to attain the throne and wipe out Utraquism.³²

Emperor Sigismund died on December 7, 1437, only sixteen months after he began to rule in Bohemia.³³ His son-in-law, Albrecht, was his chosen successor, but the transition was not smooth.³⁴ King Albrecht had been quickly crowned in Hungary on January 1, 1438, and his election as Holy Roman Emperor followed on March 18, 1438, yet his election in Bohemia took

30 There is significant scholarship on the Bohemian presence and petitions at the Council of Basel, and the ensuing "Basel Compacts" concerning their religious rights: Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 154-161; Frederick Heymann, *George of Bohemia: King of Heretics* (Binghamton, NY: Vail-Baillou Press, 1965), 5-10; František Šmahel, *Basilejská kompaktáta: Příběh deseti listin [Basel Compacts: The Story of Ten Documents]* (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2011).

31 Bartoš, *The Hussite Revolution*, 127-134.

32 For example, see the proclamation of Čeněk of Vartenberk, Oldřich of Rožmberk, and many others against Sigismund in 1420, Fudge, *Crusade Against Heretics*, 60-63.

33 Fudge, *The Crusade Against Heretics*, 397-398.

34 Albrecht was married to Sigismund's only daughter, Elizabeth, and as such was his closest male relative; the proximity of Sigismund's death to his accession made it difficult for any factions to put forward a viable alternative under the threat of renewed war.

far longer.³⁵ Even after the conditions set before him, a substantial group from the estates refused to support him, supporting instead Kazimierz, brother of Polish king Władisław.³⁶

King Albrecht's marriage to Emperor Sigismund's daughter Elizabeth in 1422, and his investment with Moravia the following year, did not ingratiate him with many people in the kingdom. After much debate, and activating a rebellion, King Albrecht took the Bohemian throne in summer 1438. However, he died in October 1439 on campaign against the Ottomans and had no male heir until four months after his death, leading to yet another disputed succession.

During the early 1440s, multiple candidates were considered, and Duke Albrecht of Bavaria-Munich was offered the Bohemian throne, but no king was crowned. The efforts undertaken by the assemblies to elect and enthrone a king both reflected and exasperated existing party tensions.³⁷ These tensions boiled over with George of Poděbrad's replacement of Menhart of Hradec as leader of the Utraquists in 1449 and his subsequent takeover of Prague. In 1451 he became regent for King Albrecht's son Ladislaus Posthumous, and the following year Ladislaus Posthumous came to Bohemia for the first time and was crowned king in Prague in 1453. Following Ladislaus Posthumous's two-year return to Austria, he came to Bohemia at age seventeen to assume personal rule, but died on November 23, 1457, likely of Leukemia.³⁸ George of Poděbrad succeeded him as king in early 1458.³⁹

Because George of Poděbrad was an Utraquist, he was declared a heretic in 1463, and his throne was claimed by Matthias Corvinus of Hungary in 1467. The throne continued to be

35 Petr Čornej, Milena Bartlová, *Velké Dějiny Zemí Koruny České [Great History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown]*, volume 6: 1437-1526 (Prague: Paseka, 2007), 40, 42.

36 Šmahel, "The Hussite Revolution," 163; Heymann, *George of Bohemia*, 12.

37 I examine this process in detail elsewhere in my dissertation.

38 I discuss both these elections and the parties and pistes of the 1430s and 1440s in great detail in two of my dissertation chapters.

39 Otakar Odložilík, *The Hussite King" Bohemia in European Affairs, 1440-1471* (Rahway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1965), 91-95.

disputed beyond George of Poděbrad's death in 1471 and the election of Vladislav Jagiellon of Poland as King of Bohemia that year. Peace was concluded in 1478, one of the results of which was the transfer of the Margraviate of Moravia, along with Silesia and Lusatia, to Matthias Corvinus and the Kingdom of Hungary.

This peace and its negotiations, and particularly the effects of this transfer of Moravia, will be addressed in detail in later parts of this chapter (not included in this paper). Although the treaty made provisions for the restitution of Moravia and the other attached lands to Bohemia, in return for the payment of 400,000 Hungarian gold ducats, to be paid directly to the King of Hungary, the situation was complicated by the election of Vladislav Jagiellon as king by the Hungarian estates.⁴⁰ The fuller version of this chapter will examine the assemblies in Moravia during this period, and how the transfer of Moravia affected them.

A number of words and translations in this paper merit a vocabulary note. [Not all of these terms are prominent in this paper.] The words used to describe the assemblies are key to my dissertation. Generally, the Czech term used is *sněm*, which can be roughly translated as “diet” and is a root word for the modern Czech word for “parliament,” *sněmovna*. I have left this word in the Czech so as not to impose foreign or modern conceptions of a “diet,” “assembly,” or “congress” on this word, and to make clear the times when *sjezd*, roughly translated as “congress,” is used instead. In many cases, these words are interchangeable, although this is not always clear. When *jednání* is found in the sources, I have translated it as “meeting.”

The main components of the assemblies were the estates. While there was a clear and acknowledged difference between the estate of the lords and the estate of the knights, this difference was not clarified with titles.⁴¹ Instead, each estate and individual had been granted

40 Palacký, *Archiv Český*, vol. IV (Prague: U kommissí u Kronberga i Řivnačk, 1848) 489, #22; Marczali Henrik, *Enchiridion Fontium Historiae Hungarorum* (Budapest: Az Athenaeum Trodalmi és Nyomdai R.-T. Kiadása, 1902), 329-333.

41 See Čornej and Bartlová, *Velké Dějiny* vol. 6, 62-63, for an example.

privileges which were recorded in the *zemský deský*, traditionally translated as the Land Tables, the official record of all of the important privileges, rights, grants, decisions, and property distributions made in the kingdom by the king, the land diet, or the land court.⁴² In Bohemia, the estates were the upper nobility, the lower nobility, and the towns, while in Moravia the estates were the upper nobility, the prelates, the lower nobility and the towns.

A number of the offices in the kingdom also bear explanation. The highest administrative official in the kingdom was the Highest Burgrave of Prague, or *Nejvyšší Purkrabí Prahy*. The position was originally as administrator of Prague castle, but during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the position rose to chief administrator of the kingdom, and eventually to chair of the land court and land diet.⁴³

When the king was absent from Bohemia and Moravia, he would often appoint *hejtmany*, which served as interim or vice-governors. As a term, *hejtman* is extremely difficult to define. It is, as may be clear, related to the German word *hauptmann*, and like *hauptmann* is often translated as captain, but the word can have many other meaning as well. The term can refer to the overseer of a county or the representative of a region, the official *krajské hejtmany* as they are titled today in the Czech Republic. It can also still be used as an archaic term for the military rank of captain, as in German. It often seems to refer to the designated leader or leaders of a region or military group, particularly the field captains of the various Utraquist groups during the Hussite Wars. These men were generally appointed rather than elected, and were drawn from

⁴² Most official documents drew upon information in the Land Tables or were required to be registered therein. Unfortunately, except for a single book that was on loan at the time, the original records of the Land Tables were caught in a fire in Prague Castle in 1541. Jaroslav Pánek, "The Czech Estates in the Habsburg Monarchy (1526-1620)," in *A History of the Czech Lands*, eds. Jaroslav Pánek and Oldřich Tůma, 198. Unlike most other authors writing in English, the *zemský deský* are here translated as the Land Rolls.

⁴³ The title, if not the power, remained until 1848. *Všeobecná encyklopedie*, vol. 3 (Prague: Nákladatelství OP Diderot, 1997), 614; Kubíková, *Oldřich II*, 23-25, 31.

the upper and lower nobility, with advisors from these estates but also often from the key towns in the region.⁴⁴ I have left the word untranslated so as not to impose modern meanings on it.

Moravia, Bohemia, and the Empire

Moravia's position and role is not widely understood outside the Czech Republic, nor indeed do many realize that it is a place whose position and role should be understood. Today, it is the eastern one-third of the Czech Republic, bordered on the north by Poland, specifically Silesia, on the east by Slovakia, and on the south by Austria. To understand Moravia, it is necessary to understand its relationship to Bohemia, and both principalities' relationship to the Empire. Indeed, the status of Moravia, and the many institutions, communities, and individuals whose interests crossed its borders, reveals a great deal about the institutional frameworks in which the Kingdom of Bohemia and its neighbors operated. Bohemia, while in many ways within the Empire, was subject to the Emperor in only a minimum of circumstances. In order to understand whether Moravia could be alienated from Bohemia, and under what circumstances. To do so, this paper will trace the key grants and privileges defining Bohemia, Moravia, and the Empire from the late twelfth century creation of the Margraviate to Vladislav Jagiellon's accession to the Hungarian throne in 1490.

There are a few key documents in this process, each of which reveals a different aspect in the development of the dynamics of these relationships. The first is the December 1197 agreement in which Přemysl Otakar I became Duke of Bohemia, ruling in Prague, and his brother, Vladislaus Henry, became Margrave of Moravia. This agreement stipulated that both were to rule "as one spirit, so as one rule."⁴⁵ The following year, Přemysl Otakar was raised to

44 Čornej and Bartlová, *Velké Dějiny* vol. 6, 62-63.

45 Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 59-60; "sicut unus spiritus, ita et unus principatus."

the rank of king with the support of Philip of Swabia; this elevation was confirmed by Frederick II in the Golden Bull of Sicily in 1212. In spelling out the relationship between the Emperor and the King of Bohemia, the Golden Bull of Sicily reveals how complicated that relationship was. The Emperor laid out the rights and privileges of the King of Bohemia, namely that he and his heirs would remain in possession of the Bohemia kingdom; that the borders of the kingdom would not be disturbed or its lands alienated; that the King of Bohemia could appoint bishops, as long as he preserved their previous freedoms; that the King of Bohemia would be required to attend imperial diets only in a few, specified cities; and a few smaller provisions concerning support for the King of the Romans' coronation as Emperor and escorts for the King of Poland.⁴⁶ Thus, we see that the connection between Bohemia and the Empire was strong, and that the Emperor was in the position to make demands from the King of Bohemia, as he could from any imperial prince. Yet, he abrogated many of those rights in this treaty, if indeed he held the actual power to enforce them at the time.

In the same year, Emperor Frederick II gave Vladislaus Henry the so-called "Mocran et Mocran" grant, which, although open to many different interpretations, adds new dimensions to our understanding of how the relationship between Moravia and the Empire was understood in the following centuries.⁴⁷ Scholarship suggests that "Mocran" could refer to anything from a town in Moravia or Meissen to the Margraviate of Moravia.⁴⁸ Regardless, the purpose of the bull was to confirm Vladislaus Henry in possession of the mysterious "Mocran et Mocran." Wihoda suggests that one likely interpretation is a scribal error in reading "Moran et Moran," referring to the two sections of Moravia that were, at the time, governed separately, and shortly thereafter were not.⁴⁹ Nationalist interpretations shy away from granting the Empire too much, or too little,

46 Martin Wihoda, *Zláta Bula Sicilská* (Prague: Argo, 2005), 225-228.

47 Martin Wihoda discusses the grant "Mocran et Mocran" at length, *Vladislaus Henry*, 105-111.

48 Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 103-112.

49 Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 109.

power in effecting this change, and these concerns are one reason that many alternative theories have been proposed. As it is unlikely that a random, small, unrecorded fief is referred to in this golden bull, we can be safe in assuming that it confirms the Emperor's power to confirm the possession of a key province in the Kingdom of Bohemia.

The next grant, again issued by Emperor Frederick II, confirms the elevation of Wenceslas I as his father's heir to the Kingdom of Bohemia. This document confirms a number of privileges, not least of which is the hereditary nature of the kingship, which it shows by bypassing Wenceslas's uncle Vladislaus Henry, who would have been next in line according to the prior practice of seniority succession. The document also reveals the continuing power of the barons in Bohemia to participate in the choice of the next king.⁵⁰ This elevation and its accompanying privilege were again confirmed by Emperor Frederick II in a golden bull in 1231, the year after Wenceslas I's father (Přemysl Otakar I) died.⁵¹

Wolverton highlights the distinction between the ruler of Bohemia as Duke and the ruler of Bohemia as king. When the first two Bohemian dukes were elevated to the kingship in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, although their titles proved not to be hereditary, they were elevated by coronation and anointment; the Duke of Bohemia, however, was created by the election of the freemen.⁵² The distinction between the Duke and the King of Bohemia blurred as the kingship became established in the thirteenth century. We can see the conscious way in which this was accomplished in the inclusion of Vladislaus Henry, the second-oldest member of the family, and the other "leaders and lords of the Bohemians" in the 1216 elevation of Wenceslas I. The elements that Wolverton identifies as belonging to the title and concept of

50 Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 110-125.

51 Lisa Wolverton, *Hastening Towards Prague: Power and Society in the Medieval Czech Lands* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 255.

52 Wolverton, *Hastening Towards Prague*, 255.

“duke” in Bohemia became part of the ethos of the king as well, and the separate title “duke” eventually disappeared.

In 1262, Richard of Cornwall confirmed Přemysl Otakar II, the son of Wenceslas I, as “the king of the principalities of the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margraviate of Moravia and all the fiefs pertaining to the two principalities.”⁵³ He also adds to this a confirmation of Přemysl Otakar II in Austria and Styria, “those two noble principalities, the vid. Duchy of Austria and the March of Styria ... we grant [them] fully and absolutely in fief.”⁵⁴ This document implies that, despite all of the historiographic debate over whether Moravia was an intrinsic part of Bohemia or a territory that could be gifted by the Emperor, like the Bohemian kingship and bishoprics, like Austria and Styria, Moravia could be confirmed by the Emperor.⁵⁵

Of course, the legitimacy of this charter was an open question as Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile both claimed to have been elected King of the Romans. Yet, the true legal validity of this document is less an issue than the precedent established by it and the perceptions that it reflected. We here see a pattern of distributing Moravia that closely marks its connection to the Bohemia throne. While Wenceslas I never ruled as Margrave of Moravia before taking the Bohemian throne, his brothers did. The death of Wenceslas I’s uncle, Vladislaus Henry, in 1222 led to the reversion of Moravia to the hands of the King of Bohemia (not the Emperor). It was then granted to two of Wenceslas I’s younger brothers in series, neither of whom had children

53 “regem de principatibus regni Bohemiae et marchionatus Moraviae ac omnibus feudis, dictis duobus principatibus attinentibus, quos et quae clarae memoriae pater et progenitores ejusdem juste et rationabiliter ab imperio tenuerunt, auctoritate praesentium investimus, eique dictos principatus et feuda simpliciter auctoritate regia confirmamus.” Hermenegildi Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici, volume I* (Prague: I. L. Kober, 1867), 153. Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 275, mentions this grant.

54 “Those two noble principalities, the vid. Duchy of Austria and the March of Styria having reverted into the hands of the Empire and freely by right to us, with all the fiefs belonging to the two said principalities, we grant [them] fully and absolutely in fief from the obligation of the Empire and to hold by custom.” “Illos duos nobiles principatus, ducatum vid. Austriae et Marchionatum Styriae ad manum imperii et ad nostram de juro libere devolutos, cum omnibus feudis ad dictos duos pertinentibus principatus, ab imperio debito et consuetis teneri, integraliter et simpliciter in feudam concedimus.” Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici vol. I*, 153-154.

55 Wihoda discusses the literature on this topic, *Vladislaus Henry*, 105-111.

and both of whom died young, as did Wenceslas I's oldest son, who himself held the title for one year before his death.⁵⁶

During this period, despite Wihoda's claims for the emergence of a Moravian land community in the early thirteenth century, Moravia only occasionally had a ruling government separate from that in Prague. The practice that can be observed was much more in keeping with Břetislav's mid-eleventh century designation of Moravia as the base for younger sons of the ruling family as they waited their turn to inherit.⁵⁷ Unlike in the generations following Břetislav, however, the thirteenth century Přemyslid's rarely had more than one son live to adulthood or produce heirs. Thus, Moravia became the province in which sons and brothers honed the administrative skills that they rarely had the opportunity to exercise as kings.

The relationship between the two provinces thus seems simple. The ruling king in Prague had the right to dispose of Moravia by granting it to a relative or to retain it for himself, as he saw fit. Yet, examination of the grants made in this period, as edited in the *Codex Diplomaticus Moraviae*, shows that the king was frequently invoked even when a Margrave existed, often alongside the mother of the Margrave of Moravia.⁵⁸ Even the attempted revolts of Wenceslas I's brother Přemysl in 1233 and 1237 did not effectively change the subordinate relationship of Moravia to Bohemia.

King Přemysl Otakar II, some of Wenceslas I, ruled Bohemia during the Empire's "interregnum." He ascended to the throne following his father's death in 1253, and at the death of Conrad II the following year he attempted to have himself elected Emperor, but lost to William of Holland.⁵⁹ He had become Duke of Austria when his father sent him to accept the

⁵⁶ Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 297.

⁵⁷ Wolverton, *Hastening Toward Prague*, 187.

⁵⁸ For examples, see Antonius Boczek, *Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolaris Moraviae, volume II* (Olomouc, 1839), and Antonius Boczek, *Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolaris Moraviae, volume III* (Olomouc, 1841).

⁵⁹ Josef Zemlička, *Přemysld Otakar II: Král na Rozhraní věků* (Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny, 2011), 47-48, 181.

offer of the title in 1251, following which he was accepted by Styria and he married Gertrude of Babenberg, the sister of the last Babenberg Duke of Austria.⁶⁰ He ruled Austria, Styria, Bohemia, and Moravia, for a generation. As his son was only seven-years-old at the time of his death in 1278, the title Margrave of Moravia was not bestowed on anyone until Charles IV received it in 1333.

During the eighty-one years in which the title Margrave of Moravia was held by the King of Bohemia, we can see an evolution in the relationship between the provinces. With no separate ruler, Moravia was not used as the power base for revolts against the king. Additionally, with no surviving younger sons of either Přemysl Otakar II or Wenceslas II, and Wenceslas III's assassination at seventeen in 1306, the traditional dynastic source of revolts and rival kings was absent.⁶¹ This period also shows an evolution in the relationship between Bohemia and the Empire.

After a generation of disputed kingship in the Empire, Rudolf I of Habsburg became Emperor in 1273 and immediately disputed Přemysl Otakar II's claim to Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. After defeating and killing him at the Battle of Marchfield in 1278, Emperor Rudolf I invested his sons with Austria and the other disputed provinces.⁶² He also marched on Bohemia, and on October 16, 1278, made an agreement with Přemysl Otakar II's widow Kunhuta that Bohemia and Moravia would be separated for five years, with Rudolf I getting the revenue from Moravia as compensation for his losses, and Otto V of Brandenburg serving as Wenceslas II's guardian. A set of double marriage alliances between Wenceslas II and Rudolf I was also arranged.⁶³

60 Josef Zemlička, "The Czech State in the Era of the Přemyslid Princes and Kings (from the Beginning of the 11th Century to 1306)," in *A History of the Czech Lands*, Pánek et al, eds., 108; Zemlička, *Přemysld Otakar II*, 45-46, 117-118.

61 Polívka, "The Expansion of the Czech State," 119-121.

62 Kateřina Charvátová, *Václav II: Král český a polský* (Vyšehrad, 2007), 48-49.

63 Charvátová, *Václav II*, 48-49.

At the end of the five-year treaty, in the summer of 1283 when Wenceslas II was twelve years old, negotiations were completed for him to come to Prague and to assume control of both Bohemia and Moravia.⁶⁴ In 1289, after Wenceslas II had fully attained his majority, Rudolf I again negotiated with him, this time for his son Albert's (initially unsuccessful) succession as King of the Romans. At this time, Rudolf I and Wenceslas II reached two agreements defining the relationship between their two polities.⁶⁵

These agreements confirm the King of Bohemia as Imperial Cupbearer and as an elector of the Emperor.⁶⁶ According to its editor, Jireček, the first of these letters was written in March of 1289.⁶⁷ This document and the one written on September 26, 1290, when Wenceslas II's wife and Rudolf I's daughter Judith was pregnant yet again, are remarkably similar, although the second elevators on the first. These documents warn of the problems caused by a lack of clarity concerning the rights, privileges, and possessions of the King of Bohemia. They seek to clarify "what and how the authority of the famous King Wenceslas of Bohemia, our prince and dearest son, and of his heirs, belongs within the law of the Romans, and in the election of the King of the Romans, the future Emperor."⁶⁸ The documents further assert that they were derived from a wide investigation, and that the descriptions of the rights of the King of Bohemia conformed to tradition.

⁶⁴ Charvátova, *Václav II*, 74.

⁶⁵ Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 241-242, 246. It should also be noted that it was Albert was the father of Wenceslas II's wife Judith, who bore her first children at this time.

⁶⁶ Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 241-242, 246. One of the goals of these letters may have been to end the confusion concerning the role of the King of Bohemia as an imperial elector.

⁶⁷ This date is after the death of Wenceslas II's first son (May 1288-November 1288), but when his wife would have been barely pregnant with twins, Agnes and the future Wenceslas III, who were born on October 6, 1289. The motivation for the letter would be more clear if it had been written the following year, after Wenceslas III had survived his first winter. Since Judith's first son had already died by March 1289, the timing again is suspect. As printed, the letter indicates with the words "Indictione secunda" that it is dating the new year as beginning on January 1 as opposed to at Easter. Yet, by March 1290, Wenceslas III and Agnes had survived their first winter.

⁶⁸ The differences between the two versions are set in italics. "Quid quantumve juris in Romanorum competat imperio inlyto regi Boemiae Wenceslas, principi nostro et filio carissimo, *nec non* suis heredibus." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 242. "Quid quantumve juris in Romano competat Imperio *et in electione Romanorum regis, futuri Imperatoris*, inlyto regi Boemiae (Wenceslas), principi et filio nostro carissimo, *et* heredibus ipsius." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 246.

While these two documents include different emphases, they both confirm the King of Bohemia as the imperial cupbearer and an elector of the King of the Romans.⁶⁹ Both documents also confirm these rights not only for the King of Bohemia, but also for his heirs. Rudolf I specified that the King of Bohemia held the same rights as the other electors, asserting that he was a voting elector in every election. This point was particularly important because Přemysl Otakar II, Wenceslas II's father, had abstained from voting in the election of Rudolf I in order to promote his own candidacy.⁷⁰

Shortly after Rudolf I's 1290 letter, Wenceslas II and the other electors won concessions from Adolf of Nassau in return for their electoral votes. Two documents from May 1292 appear to be a simple confirmation of privileges and holdings, but also allude to the concessions that Wenceslas II wrung from Adolf upon his election.⁷¹ Yet, despite his initial support of Adolf of Nassau, by the mid-1290s Wenceslas II turned his support of Albert of Habsburg.⁷² Wenceslas II and the other electors orchestrated the deposition of Adolf of Nassau and the elevation of Albert of Habsburg in his place in 1298.

69 The first two points of each letter are nearly identical. In the 1289 letter, they state:

I. That the above-mentioned king and his heirs maintain the right and office equal to the Cupbearer in the Roman Empire. "Quod rex supradictus jus ac officium pincernatus pariter et ejus heredes in Romano obtineat imperio." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 242.

II. And also in the election of the King of the Romans, to the extent of the other princes, in this election having the right and vote, as far as the same right and vote of the electors, [the Kings of Bohemia] has command of equal authority." "Nec non in Romanorum regis electione instar aliorum principum, in ipsa electione habentium jus et vocem, quoad idem jus et vocem eligendi, potestate pari poriantur". Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 242.

The second letter is more detailed in its prescriptions, but follows essentially the same pattern:

I. This King of Bohemia owes to the Empire being Cupbearer, and the right and office of Cupbearer resides with him and also with his heirs by hereditary law. "Ipsium regem Boemiae Imperii debere incernam existere et jus ac officium pincernatus apud eum necnon ejus heredes jure hereditario residere." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 246.

II. Furthermore, it clearly has been the declaration, that the above-mentioned King of Bohemia and his heirs are to be in full right and vote, similar to the other electors in voting in the election of the King of the Romans, of the future Emperor, with certain other electors. "Extitit etiam dilucide declaratum, praedictum regem Boemiae et suos heredes in electione regis Romanorum, futuri Imperatoris, cum ceteris electoribus habere debere ad similitudinem aliorum electorum eligendi plenarium jus et vocem." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 246.

70 The Duke of Bavaria had been made an elector in his stead. As Rudolf I hoped that the election of his son would be the first since his own, he wanted to ensure Wenceslas II's legitimate support of Albert I of Habsburg.

71 Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 248.

72 This change may have been related to the death of his daughter, Agnes, in 1296; Agnes had been betrothed to Adolf of Nassau's son.

The pair of letters issued by Albert of Habsburg in 1298 codified both previous privileges and new concessions.⁷³ He made three important concessions, couched in the language of a confirmation. The first was that “we absolve and release this king and his heirs by special grace, in perpetuity, from all burdens of service.”⁷⁴ This concession made Bohemia an autonomous polity, not bound but still allowed to voluntarily serve the Emperor or the Empire. He also exempted the King of Bohemia from further duties, specifically that “the aforementioned king and his successors are not in any way bound to personally come or to send nuncios or any other men” to the imperial court.⁷⁵ This concession was frequently invoked thereafter, as it made the King of Bohemia independent not only from its service obligations to the Empire, but also from judgements by the Emperor. This grant allowed the King of Bohemia to continue to attend the Imperial Diet, but exempted him from all requirements.

The last grant ensured that the first two could not be read as a complete abrogation of the ties between the Empire and Bohemia.

Also, we hold sound and acceptable and we confirm this by special grace all above privileges from gifts, liberties, and graces whichsoever, given or granted by our predecessors in written memory, if from the King of the Roman Empire, in whichsoever form or by the conception of words, to the aforementioned king and his ancestors.⁷⁶

⁷³ If one follows the dating in the *Codex Juris Bohemici*, the first document was issued on March 14, 1298, four months before Albert's July 27 election as Emperor. The editor does not attempt to solve this problem, although his source, Johann Peter von Ludewig, suggests that this letter was “the promise of Duke Albert of Austria, that, when he will become King of the Romans, on account of this Wenceslas, King of Bohemia, will be exempt from owing the burden of service and of the convocation of the Imperial Diet, in the year 1298.” Although Albert was not yet elected Emperor, in the letter he styles himself as if he were: “Albert, by the grace of God ever august King of the Romans. To each and every faithful member of the Holy Roman Empire.” While the deposition of Adolf was not sudden, it does not seem likely that Albert would have the presumption to present himself in this way if he were not yet crowned or anticipated as king. This document was issued before Easter, which fell on April 6 of that year. “*Promissio ducis Alberti Austriae, quod, quando erit rex Romanorum, Wenceslaum regem Boemiae, eam ob causam, onere seruitiorum & conuocationum curiarum imperialium esse debere exemptum anno CIOCCXCVIII.*” *Reliquiae Manuscriptorum Omnis Aevi Diplomatum ac Monumentorum Ineditorum adhuc*, ed. Johann Peter von Ludewig, volume 5 (Frankfurt, 1723), 439. “Alberus Dei gratia Romanorum rex semper augustus. Universis et singulis sacri imperii Romani fidelibus.” Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 257.

⁷⁴ “Eundem regem ac successores ipsius ab omni seruitiorum onere ... de speciali gratia in perpetuum absolvimus et eximimus.” Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 257.

⁷⁵ “Ut antedictus rex et heredes ac successores ipsius ad nullam nostram vel successorum nostrorum, regum seu imperatorum Romanorum.” Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 257.

Albert of Habsburg confirmed the King of Bohemia as his near equal and devolved a great deal of power upon him and his heirs. In 1305, Albert also confirmed Wenceslas II's son Wenceslas III, the new King of Bohemia, in all of the rights and privileges held by his father.⁷⁷ This confirmation suggests that Albert's concessions were not only a temporary measure to secure support from Wenceslas II in the imperial election, but that they remained in perpetuity.

These documents show that despite the struggles between Přemysl Otakar II and Rudolf I, between 1289 and 1305 the relationship between Bohemia and the Empire became more clearly defined. Despite the humiliating position he had forced Wenceslas II into as a child, Rudolf I's letters effectively established the King of Bohemia as the leading imperial prince after the Emperor. They also confirmed him as a sovereign king, in the management of whose lands the Emperor could not interfere. The Kingdom of Bohemia was elevated from a semi-autonomous to completely autonomous polity which retained historical privileges within the Empire.

[The chapter may include analysis here of a 1306 document in which the Bohemian barons define their rights and privileges.]

76 "Privilegia quoque omnia super donationibus, libertatibus et gratiis quibuscunque, praedicto regi et progenitoribus ejus a divae memoriae Romanorum imperatoribus seu regibus, praedecessoribus nostris, data seu concessa sub quacunque forma vel conceptione verborum, rata et grata habemus et ea de speciali gratia confirmamus." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 257-258.

77 "To the illustrious Wenceslas, King of Bohemia and Poland, our most dear uncle (sic) and prince, with greater goodwill and desiring to honor above all others, we approve, renew and ratify all privileges, fiefs, rights, liberties, and graces ceded from our aforementioned Empire and by the King of the Romans, [which were held by] his father, a certain Wenceslas, King of Bohemia, and for him and his heirs, for the aforementioned kings of Bohemia, we confirm these concessions with the support of the present document." "Illustrem Wenceslaum Bohemiae et Poloniae regem, avunculum et principem nostrum carissimum, ampliori benevolentia et gratiosiori affectu prae alteris prosequi cupientes, omnia privilegia, feuda, jura, libertates et gratias illustri quondam Wenceslao regi Bohemiae genitori suo, ac sibi et ipsorum heredibus, praedictis regibus Bohemiae, a nobis et nostris praedictis imperatoribus et regibus Romanis concessa et concessas approbamus, innovamus, ratificamus et praesentis scripti patrocinio confirmamus." Jireček, *Codex Juris Bohemici*, 446-447.

Moravia and Luxembourgs

Following the assassination of Wenceslas III in 1306, a short interregnum led to the accession of John of Luxembourg to the Bohemian throne. His death in 1346 made his son Charles IV, already Margrave of Moravia, his heir and soon King of Bohemia. He was also quickly elected King of the Romans as a rival king of Louis IV.⁷⁸ After the death of Louis IV on April 7, 1348, Charles IV confirmed the key charters previously granted to Bohemia. The earliest such charter was Frederick Barbarossa's 1158 elevation of Vladislav to the royal title in Bohemia, followed by many of the documents previously addressed in this paper: Frederick II's 1212 golden bull and his 1216 confirmation of Wenceslas I as Přemysl Otokar's heir; the confirmation of Richard of Cornwall's 1262 grant; and the confirmation of many of the grants of Rudolf I and Albert I.⁷⁹

Charles IV then granted a series of new privileges further clarifying the rights of the kingdom.⁸⁰ As he himself had been Margrave of Moravia before becoming King of Bohemia, these documents reflected both his experience and his vision. In these documents and his Golden Bull of 1356, he defined the relationship between Bohemia and the Empire.⁸¹ We can also see this clarification process in Charles IV's bestowal of the Margraviate of Moravia on his brother John Henry at the time of his marriage to Margaret, Countess of Tyrol the following year.⁸² Charles IV provided an extensive list of the subjects, properties, and rights to which John Henry was ascending.⁸³ He also described the manner in which his brother would hold the province.⁸⁴

78 An abstract of John of Luxembourg's grant of Moravia to Charles IV is in Hermenegild Jirček, *Korunní Archiv Český: Sbírka Státních Listin Koruny České z Doby od r. 1306 do r. 1378* (Prague: 1896), 117, #105.

79 Jirček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 281-297.

80 Jirček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 297-308.

81 E. F. Henderson, *Select Historical Documents* (London: George Bell, 1894), in "Charles IV: The Golden Bull," in *Readings in Medieval History*, 3rd ed., ed. by Patrick J. Geary (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2003), 663-685.

82 Jirček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 329, #296.

83 Jirček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 329-330, #296.

84 Jirček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 330, #296.

In a further attempt to clarify these relationships, he reconfirmed the golden bulls of Frederick II, “in which the same [Emperor] in the manner of the other Emperors and Roman kings invested the noble Otakar II, once Bohemian King, for himself, [his] heirs and successors, as Bohemian kings, with the above-mentioned principalities of the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margraviate of Moravia as dependent fiefs from himself.”⁸⁵ The description here complicates the relationships we might expect, and which Wihoda and others have argued for in the early thirteenth century context.⁸⁶ While Moravia is clearly directly subordinate to the kings of Bohemia, as we can see when it reverted to him rather than the Empire, Charles IV here asserts that both Bohemia and Moravia were held from the Emperor.

This document was witnessed by many of the key lords of the Empire, Bohemia, and Moravia, many of whom held territories in both provinces, and whose presence illustrates the connections between the provinces in the kingdom.⁸⁷ John Henry accepted his brother’s grant in an accompanying document given the same day and witnessed by the same men. Yet, despite the witnesses being the same men, they were described slightly differently. These differences help clarify the relationship between Bohemia and Moravia. In Charles IV’s grant, the end of the list of imperial princes witnessing the document is marked by “the princes,” immediately followed by “and the nobles,” and then a list of names, and “of the kingdom of Bohemia.”⁸⁸ The document from John Henry does not include “the princes” to describe the imperial princes, but does surround the list of Bohemian nobles with “and by the noble men ... barons of the Kingdom

85 “In quibus idem ad instal aliorum Imperatorum et Romanorum degum illustrem Ottakarum secundum, quondam B. Regem, pro se, heredibus et successoribus, B. Regibus, de praedicti regni B. Et marchionaru M. Principatibus et feuds ab ipsis dependentibus investivit.” Jireček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 331, #296.

86 Wihoda, *Vladislaus Henry*, 100-112.

87 “Marchionatus Moraviae barones, fidelibus nostris, testibus ad praemissa.” Jireček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 337, #286. I will examine the families in greater detail in the fuller version of this chapter.

88 Jireček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 337, #296.

of Bohemia, of the said lord and our loyal brother.”⁸⁹ The distinction clearly delineates some of the boundaries between Bohemia and Moravia. Charles IV’s men held territories in the Empire as well as Bohemia, and both John Henry and Charles IV recognized that the Bohemian noblemen belonged to Charles IV.

In Charles IV’s grant, the list continues to include Moravian nobles without marking them as such until the end, “the barons of the Margraviate of Moravia, our loyal men, witnesses to this *praemissa*.”⁹⁰ This description makes it clear that while the final group of witnesses were Moravian nobles, they were also Charles IV’s men. Indeed, John Henry identifies the Bohemian nobles as “the faithful men of our said lord and brother,” while describing his own men at the end of his document as “the barons and our beloved loyal men, witnesses to this *praemissa*.”⁹¹ He too noted the distinction, marking only the Moravian and not the Bohemia nobles as his men, while the Moravian nobles were simultaneously his brother’s men.

We can see here very clearly the many overlapping jurisdictions that functioned in this environment. Until this document, Charles IV was simultaneously Holy Roman Emperor, King of Bohemia, and Margrave of Moravia. He gave that last honor to his brother John Henry, but retained the other two. The language used to describe the witnesses shows that while giving up the immediate title over the “Moravian barons,” these barons were still his men by virtue of his role as King of Bohemia. This tells us that the king of Bohemia retained his lordship over Moravia, and that granting the title to a subordinate lord did not disconnect him from the nobles in Moravia.

89 “necnon illustribus et magnificis principibus et dominis ... et nobilibus viris ... regni Boemiae baronibus, dicti domini et fratris nostri fidelibus, et demum nobilibus ... baronibus et fidelibus nostri dilecti, testibus ad praemissa.” Jireček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 346, #297.

90 “marchionatus Moraviae baroniis, fidelibus nostris, testibus ad praemissa.” Jireček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 337, #296.

91 “barones et fidelibus nostri dialects, testibus ad praemissa.” Jireček, *Korunní Archiv Český, 1306-1378*, 337, #296; 346, #297.

Although the relationship between the descendants of John Henry and Charles IV was by no means perfect, they continued to hold Moravia until the early fifteenth century. John Henry's son Jošt, holding also the electorate of Brandenburg, ran against his cousin Sigismund of Hungary (Charles IV's middle son) for the imperial title in 1410 and won, due to the tie-breaking vote of his cousin Wenceslas IV, who had himself been deposed as Emperor in 1400. Yet, Jošt died a few months later, and with no heirs in his branch of the family, his title reverted to his cousin Wenceslas IV as King of Bohemia. Thus, when Wenceslas IV died and the Hussite Wars broke out in 1419, Emperor Sigismund was his heir in Moravia as well as Bohemia. Yet, both of these titles were contested.

Although succession laws favored electing Emperor Sigismund, also King of Hungary, as King of Bohemia, his reaction to Utraquism alienated many and kept him from attaining broad consent to his rule until 1436. Yet, after his brother's death in 1419, Emperor Sigismund continually claimed to be the ruler of Bohemia and the provinces attached to it, namely Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia. Supporting this claim required repeated assaults on Bohemian and Moravian territory. In 1422, after two failed crusades against the Utraquists in the Kingdom of Bohemia, Emperor Sigismund married his only-daughter, thirteen-year-old Elizabeth to King Albrecht of Habsburg.⁹² The following year, Emperor Sigismund invested his new son-in-law with Moravia to reward King Albrecht for his help in Emperor Sigismund's wars to attain the Kingdom of Bohemia. This bestowal was also as acknowledgement of King Albrecht as his heir.

The grant of Moravia to Albrecht of Habsburg, who had already ruled Austria since 1404, represented a departure from previous practice. King Albrecht was not from the same house as Emperor Sigismund, and while Moravia was often the property of the heir-presumptive, the king

⁹² I refer to Albrecht of Habsburg as King Albrecht throughout this paper, although he acquired that dignity in the Empire, Bohemia, and Hungary only after Emperor Sigismund's death.

had generally kept Moravia in his own hands in situations in which he lacked adult sons who needed titles. As King Albrecht already held Austria, he did not need the province. Rather, the grant of Moravia to King Albrecht was intended to both buy his loyalty and to assert Emperor Sigismund's power over the kingdom. Although Emperor Sigismund undoubtedly hoped he and King Albrecht would both be able to exercise their authority over Moravia, the honor was essentially titular until the end of the Hussite Wars.

Emperor Sigismund's grant of Moravia to King Albrecht is extant in two complementary German documents in the Národní Archiv in Prague.⁹³ Although both were given the same day, one shows Emperor Sigismund's actions as King of Bohemia, and the other his actions as King of the Romans. Both are sealed with the same single, bees-wax-colored seal of Emperor Sigismund, attached with black and yellow cord. The first, longer document focuses on the grant of the "principality and Margraviate of Moravia" with a long list of corresponding rights, honors, and privileges, given as a "princely fief" by Sigismund as "King of Bohemia."⁹⁴

In both documents, Emperor Sigismund emphasizes King Albrecht's status as Duke of Austria and his son-in-law. The first document focuses on his legal right to give Moravia to King Albrecht.⁹⁵ He reiterates his power as King of Bohemia to grant Moravia, but also the good advice that encouraged him to do so.

The second document has a slightly different focus. Although it bears the same seal as the first, it was clearly issued by Emperor Sigismund as King of the Romans. Although it still includes a description of the rights and privileges within the principality, he separates his roles as

93 Národní Archiv, Archiv České korunní (1158-1935), #1504.

94 "fürstentum und Marggraffschaft zu Merhern," "fürstenlichen lehen." "kunig zu Behem." Národní Archiv, Archiv České korunní (1158-1935), #1504.

95 "und sollen in kufftugen czeiten und haben In dorumb mit wolbedachtem mute gutem Rate und rechter wissen das egenem fürstentum und Marggraffschaft zu Merhern mit allen borgen zu gehorungen als eyn kunig zu Behem." Národní Archiv, Archiv České korunní (1158-1935), #1504.

King of Bohemia and King of the Romans very clearly.⁹⁶ He references his action in the first document, asserting that “as a king of Bohemia [he] had given” Moravia, but with this second document he was confirming the grant of the King of Bohemia “as a Roman King.”⁹⁷

Interestingly, in this document he specifies that he makes this confirmation “with the good advice of ours and of the lord princes of the holy Empire.”⁹⁸ While he does mention advice in the document issued as King of Bohemia, he does not specify exactly who from. The second document reveals that while the action was taken as King of Bohemia, the advice that prompted it was given by imperial princes, not the Bohemian or Moravian estates. This grant establishes that, unlike in his father’s youth, Emperor Sigismund had no power as King of the Romans to grant Moravia, but it also reveals a disconnect between Emperor Sigismund and the provinces over which he was claiming lordship.

Moravia After the Luxembourgs

These documents clearly indicated the direct subordination of Moravia to Bohemia, but also the Emperor’s right to confirm the appointment or inheritance of the Margrave, as he could with the accession of bishops and kings. What these documents leave unclear is the extent to which Bohemia and Moravia were thereafter separate. King Albrecht was also Duke of Austria, and Emperor Sigismund and King Albrecht’s mutual dependence had very little to do with their possessions in Bohemia and Moravia, but rather their imperial and familial relations. Their mutual dependence only pertained to Bohemia in as much as Emperor Sigismund needed King Albrecht’s military forces to assert his position. Indeed, as Emperor Sigismund was not

96 Národní Archiv, Archiv České korunní (1158-1935), #1505.

97 Národní Archiv, Archiv České korunní (1158-1935), #1505, “als ein kunig zu Behem getan haben ... als ein Romischer kunig.”

98 “mitt gutem rat unsr und des heiligen Richs fursten herren.” Národní Archiv, Archiv České korunní (1158-1935), #1505.

recognized as King of Bohemia until 1436, his 1423 grant of Moravia to King Albrecht is of questionable legitimacy.

The documents associated with Emperor Sigismund's election as King of Bohemia, and later with King Albrecht's election, clarify how these documents were subsequently interpreted. When electing Emperor Sigismund as King of Bohemia in 1435, the estates presented him with a list of conditions. One of these was that "Moravia should be restored to the Kingdom of Bohemia."⁹⁹ This indicates that while Moravia was nominally granted to the heir to the Kingdom of Bohemia and still part of the kingdom in practice the estates understood it to have been alienated and the traditional connections to have been interrupted. Emperor Sigismund did not address this condition, instead passively asserting his authority over both Bohemia and Moravia.¹⁰⁰

The conditions sent to King Albrecht for his election three years later show that at Emperor Sigismund's death in December 1437, Moravia's status was still unresolved. The estates asked King Albrecht that "[concerning] Moravia, that it be released to the Bohemian crown and the documents and obligations which [Your Grace] has for Moravia be returned and that these be given again [to the Bohemian Crown]."¹⁰¹ The estates felt that even if Moravia were held by the King of Bohemia, unless it was formally returned to the crown, it was still alienated. Union under the personal rule of a single monarch was not full union. We see no similar set of conditions sent to King Albrecht for his assumption of Moravia in 1435, and the de facto alienation of Moravia from Bohemia was evidently sufficient for the Bohemian estates to demand its return.

⁹⁹ Fudge, *The Crusade Against Heretics*, 384.

¹⁰⁰ Fudge, *The Crusade Against Heretics*, 385-387.

¹⁰¹ František Palacký, *Archiv Český, volume III* (Prague: V Kommissí u Kronberga i Řivnáče, 1844), #30, 459-460.

The estates also sent conditions to King Albrecht when the throne was vacated after Emperor Sigismund's death in 1437. King Albrecht's response shows that he considered his ownership of Moravia to be the best surety for his accession to the Bohemian throne. He responded that

our answer, [concerning] this land, that although we made howsoever many great and measureless expenses for the preservation of these lands and lost a good many people, and for honor and for entreaty and for their request we want to take with us the chief document and edict which we have for this land; upon our coronation we willingly allow [it to pass] into the power of the Bohemians, to accept [the document] itself into the other documents and privileges of the Bohemian kingdom, so that in this way they may experience our love and affection which we have for this crown.¹⁰²

In this response, he revealed his immediate concern for a swift coronation, but he also defended the legality, however unpopular, of Sigismund's grant of Moravia. He affirmed that Moravia could and indeed was alienated from Bohemia, and promised to return it to the Bohemians.

Upon King Albrecht's death on campaign against the Ottomans in 1439, after he had been crowned King of Bohemia, Bohemia and Moravia were reunited. There existed neither a King of Bohemia nor a Margrave of Moravia, and in such absence Moravia reverted to the Bohemian crown. Lands, privileges, and families frequently crossed the porous border between Bohemia and Moravia, and the key men in the kingdom in the 1430s and 1440s came from both Bohemia and Moravia. Together, leading men from both principalities negotiated for the election of a king throughout the 1440s, eventually electing King Ladislaus Posthumous, the son who was born four months after King Albrecht's death, to the Bohemian throne.¹⁰³

102 "Odpověď naše, že zemi té ke cti a ku prosbě a žádosti jich, ač sme koliwěk weliké a nesmierné náklady pro zachowáné té země učinili a mnoho dobrých lidí ztratili, chceme list hlawní a majestát, kterýž máme na tu zemi, s sebu wzieti, a při korunowání našem k jiným listóm a privilegiím králowství Českého dobrowolne w moc Českú položiti, aby tudy naši lásku a příchylnost, kterúz máme k té koruně, poznati mohli." Palacký, *Archiv Český III*, 460-461, #31.

103 I address this topic in great detail in my chapter, "Divided Decisions: Parties, Disagreement, and Delay at Bohemian Assemblies."

The two principalities remained united throughout Ladislaus Posthumous's rule, and also after his death at age seventeen in 1457. His regent George of Poděbrad was elected king next, and ruled in both Bohemia and Moravia, even though his title was challenged by King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary in 1467. In 1462, twenty-six years after the agreement with the Council of Basel had allowed Utraquism in Bohemia, Pope Pius II declared the Compacts of Basel invalid, making George of Poděbrad and all the other Bohemian Utraquists heretics.¹⁰⁴ He called George of Poděbrad before an ecclesiastical court, but died in 1464 before the matter could be resolved. Later that year, George of Poděbrad issued a document confirming that Moravia could not be alienated from Bohemia.¹⁰⁵

In this document, George of Poděbrad does not spend a great deal of time introducing himself or his action. Rather, after listing his titles, he immediately explains the purpose of his grant:

Some time ago, he had raised the illustrious margraviate of Moravia, incorporated and attached to our glorious kingdom of Bohemia ... however, in the interval, it happened that the same Margraviate had been detached and separated from our aforementioned kingdom, from which not inconsiderable damage was endured.¹⁰⁶

Therefore, he issued this document in which "we declare to reunite and to attach the said Margraviate to the aforementioned kingdom of Bohemia once more and to incorporate [it] forever."¹⁰⁷ The rest of the grant elaborates on this action. George of Poděbrad acknowledges that Moravia had in fact been separated from Bohemia in the past, and implicitly acknowledges that it could happen again. The threat that instigated the issuance of this grant was the rejection

104 He refused to confirm them and then said that the Papacy only ever recognized them for a small group. He refused to recognize George of Poděbrad until and unless he became Catholic. Jörg K. Hoensch, *Matthias Corvinus: Diplomat, Feldherr und Mäzen* (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1998), 97.

105 Moravský Zemský Archiv in Brno, Stavovský Listiny #369.

106 "Insignis Marchionatus Moravie olim inclito Regno nostro Bohemie incorporatus et annexus extiterat ... autem temporis accidit eundem Marchionatum fuisse a prefato Regno nostro duusum et seperatum exquo non mediocre dampnum paciebat." Moravský Zemský Archiv in Brno, Stavovský Listiny #369.

107 "indicavimus dictum Marchionatum Moravie predicto Regno Boheme reunire et denuo annectare ac imperpetuum incorporare." MZA Brno, Stavovský Listiny #369.

of the Basel Compacts by Pope Pius II, and the threat of renewed crusades against Bohemia that it entailed.

Indeed, the threat was real. In 1465, the next year, some Catholic nobles gathered in Plzeň began to reach out to the French and Polish royal families as alternatives to George of Poděbrad.¹⁰⁸ The same summer Pope Paul II sanctioned any action Matthias Corvinus took to attack Bohemia. Shortly thereafter, Matthias Corvinus himself issued a manifesto against George of Poděbrad, and by 1467 fighting had broken out. When George of Poděbrad died in 1471, arrangements for the succession of Vladislav Jagiellon, nephew of Ladislaus Posthumous, were nearly complete, but the war continued. The fifteen-year-old Vladislav Jagiellon was Catholic, but he refused to reject the Basel Compacts and so was also considered a heretic.

The fighting formally ended in 1478, although truces to allow for its negotiation had existed for some time. The treaty that was reached unquestionably favored Matthias Corvinus. He obtained the title King of Bohemia, although Vladislav Jagiellon was also allowed to keep it, as well as control of Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia, although Vladislav Jagiellon was allowed to retain Bohemia. A provision was included in the treaty by which Vladislav Jagiellon could regain his lost territories, but the demand for 400,000 Hungarian gold ducats was so steep that it was unlikely to be paid. Notably, the document specified that “[the King of Bohemia] should give first to the Hungarian King 400,000 gold ducats or good Hungarian gold [pieces] and it [would] revert to him.”¹⁰⁹

The lands of Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia are repeatedly referred to as belonging to the king rather than the kingdom of Hungary. The document also required the set amount to be paid to the King of Hungary himself, or his heirs or successors. Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia do not

¹⁰⁸ Hoensch, *Matthias Corvinus*, 97.

¹⁰⁹ Marczali, *Enchiridion Fontium Historiae Hungarorum*, 329-333.

seem by this treaty to become parts of the Hungarian kingdom, but rather to be separate properties united to Hungary only by the personal rule of the king. [As will be further examined in the complete chapter, even though this separation was technically secured by this treaty, it was not always observed or observable.]

King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary died on April 6, 1490, and as he had no legitimate heirs, the Hungarian estates were free to elect a new king. On July 26, 1490, they sent a list of conditions to Vladislav Jagiellon, offering to elect him. These conditions primarily concerned matters within the kingdom of Hungary, but the fifth condition directly addressed Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia. The Hungarian estates expanded on the 1478 treaty, requesting that in order to become King of Hungary, Vladislav Jagiellon must attach the lands to the Hungarian Kingdom, not just to himself.¹¹⁰ They also required that he still pay the 400,000 ducats “to the hand of the defender of the crown at Visegrád,” now adding the condition that this be paid to the crown and not to the king.

¹¹⁰ František Palacký, *Archiv Český, volume V* (Prague: V Kommissí u Knihkupce Fridricha Tempského, 1862), 436-438.

Moravian Assemblies and the Nobility

Vladislav Jagiellon was crowned King of Hungary on September 18, 1490, and he immediately moved his court to Buda. Yet, the conditions under which he had written to the Moravian estates following Matthias Corvinus's death, on an unknown date, do match those which the Hungarians imposed. In this document, he expresses the desire "that we would love to again attach this Margraviate of Moravia and the other lands belonging to the Bohemian crown." Thus, the obligations of his two crowns forced him into a conflicted situation, as the separate demands of Bohemia and Moravia had done to many between 1467 and 1491.

[The chapter will continue here with an in-depth examination of the assemblies and noble families in Moravia, and particularly those that crossed the border between Bohemia and Moravia, in this period. The main documents that I will use come from the Zemský Archiv in Opava the Státní Okresní Archiv in Znojmo, and the Státní Okresní Archiv in Jihlava.

I plan to briefly trace two key noble families which were prominent throughout the fifteenth century, participated in the assemblies of this period, and had members who held lands or positions in both Bohemia and Moravia. Both of these families were identified in Charles IV's grant of Moravia to his brother John Henry. These families are:

Šternberk: The Šternberk family divided into two main branches in the later thirteenth century. Members of these two branches are mentioned both as Moravian and as Bohemian nobles in Charles IV's grant to his brother John Henry. During the fifteenth century, members of the family served in both Catholic and Utraquist parties and held the position of both Highest Burgrave of Prague and Bohemian *hejtman* (in Moravia).¹¹¹

Cimburk: The Moravian branch of this family died out in the male line in the early sixteenth century, and the Czech branch died out in the female line in the seventeenth

¹¹¹ Pavel Juřík, *Šternberkové: Panský Rod v Čechách a na Moravě* (Prague: Universum, 2013), 49-59.

century. The family was centered around three castles, each bearing the family name, two of which were in Moravia and one (the oldest) was in Bohemia. The key fifteenth century members of this family were Utraquists, and both father (Jan Tovačov) and son (Ctibor Tovačov) served as Moravian *hetmany*, the son working to mediate the disputes between George of Poděbrad, Vladislav Jagiellon, and Matthias Corvinus.]