

INTRODUCTION

The office of Corrector for the City and Diocese of Prague, or as the complete title was known – *corrector cleri civitatis et diocesis Pragensis* – was an administrative office within the late medieval Prague archdiocese. Its existence was justified by the reduced application of archdeacon rights in the Czech lands. It began forming under the Episcopate of Arnošt of Pardubice (1343–1364), whose initiative led to the installment of the first correctors. Future generations saw the office as significantly important enough to be included on the list of the archbishop’s activities on his bust in the Prague cathedral in the 1390s – “*primus officium correctoris ad reprimendam insolenciam clericorum instituit*”.¹

The originally one-off corrector delegations were time-limited until the end of the 14th century when the office of the corrector took over some of the powers traditionally belonging to archdeacons. The corrector thus headed an independent office that was separate from the Office of the General Vicarage. The office at the time kept records – *acta correctoria* – a single volume of which has survived and is the subject of this work.

The clerical corrector was to oversee the lives and morals of priests using both inspections and proclamations. The accused were called before the office where they were questioned and could be incarcerated. After the trial, the corrector ordered matters be put into order (both in detail and in general), demanded the guilty promise submission to the corrector’s ruling, and announced punishments to be handed down if the orders were not fulfilled, which included stripping of beneficium and even excommunication. In exceptionally serious cases, the corrector could issue a verdict after immediately after the interrogation, which was sometimes repeated, and that was followed by the imprisonment of the defendant and other penalties.²

The corrector files, as an important primary historical source, have been studied before. The first to do so was Eminent Bishop Antonín Podlaha, who published them in the form of commentaries.³ This small book included an index, which has remained the main tool for researchers. Though the work was important, it could not serve as a substitute for a regular publication, so the corrector files were little used and cited.

Zdeňka Hledíková covered the entire creation, development, and standing of the office of the corrector within the church administration in her important work from several

1) A text last published in the collected works of *Petr Parlář. St. Vítus Cathedral 1356–1399*, Prague 1999, s. 156.

2) The broad powers granted to correctors can be seen in the commission of Pavel of Choceň, who held the office at the end of the 1360s and beginning of the 1370s. The text was published by Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Korektoři* (see note 4), p. 108.

3) Antonín PODLAHA (ed.), *akta korektorů duchovenstva diecése pražské z let 1407–1410*, Prague 1921 (= Editiones Archivii et bibliothecae S. F. Metropolitanii capituli Pragensis XVI).

years ago. It was partially based on a detailed study of the manuscripts of the corrector files and have lost nothing in their significance to this day.⁴

The corrector files are stored in the Prague Castle Archive in the Metropolitan Chapter Archive of St. Vitus Cathedral under Cod. XX. The manuscript is made of paper measuring 30 x 22 x 3 cm. The volume is made up of 12 files with various numbers of folios.⁵ The papers have the same filigree throughout: a lengthened shape with three handles and an elongated heart (drawing p. VIII). The filigree most closely corresponds to one used in Würzburg dated to 1403.⁶

Currently, the file includes 135 folia with fragments. Some are partially or completely missing. Most of folio 18 has been cut off, so only about the uppermost 1/5 remains and it was followed three folios that have to survived to the present day. Folio 34 lacks the bottom half. Another folio was left out between folio 48 and 49. Folio 69 is almost completely gone except for a small remainder of the bottom close to the spine, with the beginning of about three lines of text. Folios 76-79 are almost completely cut out, with only small fragments at the top near the spine surviving. Folio 128 has been mostly cut out as only text near the spine at the top and bottom remain with several lines of text. It was never edited because it's the template text for a verdict and provides no definite information. It appears that another folio followed and is now missing. Some of the folios show remnants of sealing red wax on their edges and corners, which was used to glue these folios – see pgs. 44v – 45r and 47v – 48r.

The files were contemporarily foliated using Roman numerals except for the index, which led to the usual errors – doubling, skipping, and omissions.⁷ The manuscript was also paginated later with a pencil, probably in connection with the work of Antonín Podlaha, and this foliation isn't labelled in the edition.⁸

The manuscript is outfitted with a soft outer binding with the covers made of parchment that has turned a deep brown. The front cover measures 28.5cm x 21cm and the rear 28.5cm × 22.5cm including a clasp about 1.5cm wide, which is no longer closed.

The spine is made up of 3cm-thick swath of dark brown leather underlain with parchment and sown together with the folios and covers included chain stitching. The

4) Zdeňka HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Korektoři kléru pražské diecéze*, Právněhistorické studie 16, 1971, p. 71–111.

5) It was impossible to work with the volume in a way that would allow for the determination of the number of folios in each file.

6) See Charles Moise BRIQUET, *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, Genève 1907, vol. 2, p. 250, num. 3976. It's also close to a type from Udine dated to 1406 (num. 3977).

7) The original pagination is included in the volume so there are no notices of mistakes.

8) The editor performed a new pagination after an agreement with former archive director PhDr. Marie Kostílková that includes folios in their entirety, partial folios, and skips folios cut out to the spine.

spine is grooved and decorated with engravings of simple rosettes surrounded by engraved concentrated curves as seen in the image (p. IX). The header and footer are bound using metal, possibly lead bindings.⁹

The cover is outfitted with a title added in the 16th century: “Acta Correctoria Presbyterorum Dioecis: Pragensis per D. Correctorem Cleri Anno Domini 1407”. The printed oval bookplate showing the bust of St. Wenceslas was glued to the middle of the inside of the cover with the statement: “S: WENCESLAVS” and the legend “SECRETUM SEMPER FIDEL. CAPITULI S: METROP: ECCL: PRAG”, with a border of laurels.¹⁰ The note written at the top edge is edited under number 520. Another, this time rectangular bookplate with the text “BIBLIOTHEK des allezeit getreuen Metrop. Domcapitels in PRAG” decorated with vignettes in horns in the corners and with the written signature “Cod XX” is glued to the first folio of the manuscript under the original heading.¹¹ Finally, the back cover includes a modern label with the mark of the chapter in a circle and the text: “ARCHIVUM METROPOLITANI CAPITULI PRAGENSIS” with the written signature “XX”. The rear of the back cover included five records dated from 1408, or at least so they claim – edited under numbers 521-525. The corrector files were probably bound in 1408 or shortly afterwards. A recording in the corrector office’s expenses speaks of binding and paper, which means blank folios were also bound. A sum of 14 groschen was paid.¹²

The files were continually recorded during 1407–1410 under the Episcopate of Zbyněk Zajíc of Házmburk (1402–1411) and during the terms of two correctors: Hereš and Ojír of Domanice. Ojír preceded Hereš and as well as succeeded him. Ojír’s second correctorate ended in May 1406 at the latest for unknown reasons. It seems the change was unexpected and the naming of a successor probably took some time. Dominik of Budějovice, the prothonotary of the archbishop’s office, acted as corrector for a transitory period.¹³ The temporary nature of his correctorate is evident from the title of the office in the records of two known cases where he ruled using corrector’s powers invested in him.¹⁴ Hereš ascended to the office sometime after June 11, 1406, where he is listed

9) Acknowledgements to MgA. Karel Křenek from the National Museum Library for consultations about the technical aspects of the volume’s binding.

10) The Ex libris was added above a supplementary text from the 15th century: “Extollens quedam mulier vocem de turba dixit ad eum” (cf. Vulg. Luc. 11, 27).

11) Reproduced on Tab. I.

12) See note num. 519k.

13) See Zdeňka HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Úřad generálních vikářů pražského arcibiskupa v době předhusitské. Ze správních dějin pražské arcidiecéze*, Prague 1971 (= Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et historica, Monographia XLI), p. 136.

14) May 17, 1406 (num. 374), the phrase: “protunc locum correctoriatu tenens” is after his name; June 2, 1406 (num. 33): “tenens locum correctoris”.

as a witness to meetings in the office of the general vicar. If he was a corrector at the time, the scribe present would have surely recorded the fact, especially since he spelled out the unabridged beneficium in the Church of St. Castelus (sv. Haštal).¹⁵ His status as corrector was only confirmed in the sources on August 27 of the same year.¹⁶ The edited volume was used as record until the end of Hereš's correctorate in January 1410 when Ojř of Domanice began his third term in office.¹⁷ We can with certainty say the agenda was very smoothly handed over on January 26.¹⁸ On that day, Hereš managed to deal with 2 cases, while a third record from that day lists Ojř as the corrector.¹⁹ The recording style also immediately changed to the subjective form as described below. Ojř was the corrector for the remaining months listed in the volume and his term could not have extended beyond the beginning of the autumn 1413 when another individual is listed as corrector.²⁰

The volume continued to be used in the coming years, although new cases were of course recorded into new volumes that haven't survived to this day. Some of the cases in this volume were later annotated, although very rarely.²¹ The first is the October 13, 1413 note naming a heretofore unknown Zikmund as corrector.²² Two notes from 1415 named Martin²³ as corrector and as well as another from mid-October 1417 when the youngest corrector's note was added to this volume.²⁴

The corrector was not always the one to write into the volumes. It was very rare for Archbishop Zbyněk himself to be present,²⁵ and sometime later proceedings were led by the Archbishop's General Vicar Jan Kbel.²⁶ This was not in lieu of the corrector, who was often also present, but usually because of the special nature of a particular case. There

15) *Soudní akta konsistoře pražské / Acta judiciaria consistorii Pragensis V (1406–1407)*, ed. Ferdinand TADRA, Prague 1899, num. 630, p. 166. Hopefully, it's not a reach to connect his presence here to talks about filling the office of corrector. Besides the alter dedication, there is little known about the future corrector Hereš and it appears he was new to the archbishop's court; see also Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Korektoři*, p. 93.

16) *Soudní akta konsistoře pražské V*, num. 834, p. 207.

17) Ojř was an experienced official who even held the post of general vicar for a time. His career was well documented by Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Úřad generálních vikářů*, p. 131.

18) There is a question whether the eye disease blamed for Hereš's departure (see also Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Korektoři*, p. 93) was the only reason he left the office.

19) Note numbers 446–448.

20) See below.

21) Compared in the list of records by date.

22) Record number 203a.

23) See record numbers 25d and 25e. See Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Korektoři*, p. 106n for more on the corrector Martin.

24) Record number 9a. Corrector Martin is also identified in two other records (num. 230a and 332a), which do not have a year in the date.

To be complete, folio 10v includes an addendum in the same form that is a copy of a compromise from June 8 and August 4, 1449 where the arbiter was administration magister Prokop of Kladruby.

25) Record numbers 52, 107, 137.

26) Record numbers 49, 52b, 52d, 52e, 101a, 181, 316, 369, 370, 480.

were individual cases where the Archbishop's official²⁷ or scribe Jan Eliášův took down the record.²⁸

The corrector's main aid was a scribe who managed the files. Václav of Kralovice was the scribe during the early period of the edited volume.²⁹ He was replaced in 1408 by public notary Matěj of Prague.³⁰ It is surprising Matěj was sometimes charged by the corrector to lead proceedings, even in the case of interrogation.³¹

The Office of the Corrector also had a significant number of servants, although they did not all work together at the same time. Most of these were clerics sometimes called the corrector's familiars. Their activities are a matter of discussion, much like other people who worked for the corrector. They are mostly listed only as witnesses, appearing in the files alphabetically: Beneš (possibly the same person as Beneš of Bílina), Jakub, cleric Jan of Drahoraz, Matěj of Sobotka, cleric Mikuláš called Křeček (hedgehog), cleric Pešek, cleric Petr of Mnichovo Hradiště, cleric Petr of Prague, cleric Šimon of Činěves, and Vavřinec of Prague.³²

The corrector controlled the gaoler and his guards out of practical reasons. There were usually two and they are often mentioned in the corrector files as witnesses.³³ Two

27) Record number 141.

28) Record number 248. The leading role of Litoměřice Archdeacon Matěj, who ruled in rather banal matters (as much as record num. 26 shows) in place of the present corrector Hereš can be explained by the authority vested in him by the Archbishop, which is recorded in the volume.

29) Josef NUHLÍČEK (with contributions from Ivan HLAVÁČEK and Markéta MARKOVÁ), *Veřejní notáři v českých městech, zvláště v městech pražských, až do husitské revoluce*, Prague 2011 – here Wenceslaus Blasii de Kralowicz, p. 330, num. 1356, without documentation from the corrector files where he is often mentioned in the index as Wenceslaus de Kralowicz, notarius publicus.

30) J. NUHLÍČEK, *Veřejní notáři* – Here probably referring to Mathias d. Manco de Praga, p. 262, num. 829, again without naming the document in the corrector files; he is also listed often, see index entry Mathias de Praga, notarius correctoris et notarius publicus.

31) This happened four times under the authority of Corrector Hereš: record number 224 – “de mandato speciali per me notarium requisiti”, num. 309 – “ego Mathias notarius de mandato speciali domini Herssonis, correctoris cleri per diocesim Pragensem, requisivi”, num. 323 – “ego Mathias, notarius publicus de Praga, de mandato honorabilis viri domini Herssonis correctoris, requisivi”, num. 334 – “requisitus per me Mathiam, notarium publicum de Praga, de mandato domini Herssonis correctoris”. He led the proceedings twice in place of the absent Corrector Ojř: num. 453 – “interrogatus per me Mathiam, notarium publicum de Praga, notarium prefati domini Ogerii”, num. 454 – “interrogatus per me Mathiam, notarium domini Ogerii”; The lack of an expression of using the corrector's authority here is probably related to the change in style.

32) Documents according to the index: Benessius, servitor domini correctoris (probably Benessius de Bielina, clericus); Jacobus, servitor domini Ogerii correctoris; Johannes de Drahoraz, clericus, servitor (familiaris) domini Herssonis correctoris; Mathia de Sobothka, servitor dom. Herssonis correctoris; Nicolaus d. Krzeczek (Krzeczco), clericus, servitor Herssonis correctoris; Pessa, clericus, servitor Herssonis correctoris; Petrus de Grediss Monachorum, clericus, servitor domini correctoris; Petrus de Praga, clericus, servitor Herssonis correctoris; Simon de Czwinewes, clericus domini correctoris; Laurencius de Praga, familiaris et servitor Herssonis correctoris. Besides these, the list also included cleric Aleš of Žatec (Alexius de Zacz).

33) The fact they often acted as witnesses was jokingly referred to by the corrector's notary, when he remarked: “presentibus famosis et religiosis viris Jacobo et Otteпка, custodibus carcerum, yakz swaty nedyw sie gich mochyzy tot nycz nenyte etc” – record number 146a.

guards, Václav Otépka and Jakub called Parvín were the guards for almost the entire period under study, with the latter replaced near the end of the period by Florian. The former guard Bric or Birč is also mentioned several times.³⁴

The corrector could also invite experts to help decide the most serious cases as shown by a note about testing a delinquent who presented himself as a priest.³⁵

The surviving volume of corrector files was started in February 1407 with the first record dated February 14. However, the start of a new volume is not connected to the start of corrector Hereš's term as he was firmly ensconced in office. The opening record includes not only his role as corrector and official title, but also his full beneficium: "honorabilis vir dominus Hersso, rector altaris corporis Christi in ecclesia sancti Castuli Maioris civitatis Pragensis, corrector cleri diocesis Pragensis".³⁶ From there, he is regularly and understandably just labelled as the corrector in a shorter form (with the shortest version: "dominus H. corrector").

The more interesting point is the existence of two headings. While the first (see below) is the regular labelling of a new volume or file, the second heading³⁷ set up a thematic sorting of more serious cases, most often culminating in a verdict, into another part of the volume. That was true to a great extent beginning with folio 90r and more or less continually until folio 103r. The scribe also expected an independent index for this part and thus gave each of the following folios a letter heading.³⁸ In the end, the new index was not created and the names of delinquents were written into the introductory index. Later, the blank pages were used to continue records from the previous parts of the volume and the heading that found itself within these records was struck through.

Besides sorting the more serious cases for a simpler overview, the separation could

34) Listed in the index as: Wenceslaus (Mathia?) Otepka, custos carcerum; Jacobus d. Parwin, custos carcerum; Florianus, custos carcerum; Birczo de Praga, olim custos carcerum. There is the unique case where the witnesses are listed as Václav Otépka and a certain Cumentarius – record number 130.

35) This refers to Vojtěch of Braškov, who was tested and found guilty by magister Mikuláš Kakabus – see record number 502.

36) That would be occasionally repeated (records number 9 and 14), but this is also the beginning of the manuscript, when such supplementary information about the corrector was understandable because it had no bearing on his performance in the post.

37) "Acta correctoria furum, latronum et sacrilegorum comparata per honorabilem dominum Heressonem, protunc cleri correctorem. Et inceptum est in eisdem notari de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo septimo in mense Februario et infra per Wenceslaum de Kralowicz, notarium publicum" – today found before folio 337 on fol. 80r (reproduced on Tab. V).

38) Their inclusion in the edition would have been confusing, which is why they are listed here: A – fol. 80v; B – fol. 81r; C, D – fol. 81v; E, F – fol. 82r; G, H – fol. 82v; I – fol. 83r; K, L – fol. 83v; M – fol. 84r; N – fol. 84v; O – fol. 85r; P – fol. 85v; Q, R – fol. 86r; S – fol. 86v; T – fol. 87r; W – fol. 87v, which is here used as the first letter of the name Wenceslas in the heading. An example with the letters K and L is displayed on a reproduction of Tab. VI.

have been a clue about the activities of the archdeacon, although there is no direct evidence for this.

However, that did not take place as cases were recorded chronologically and the heading was struck through. It appears that creating a new volume the sorting could have been mechanically carried over. The change either shows a different practice under corrector Hereš or a change in the correctors' powers. Besides the sorting of the most serious cases for clarity's sake, this could suggest the continuing participation of the archdeacon. Today, it is impossible to determine when the independent corrector files began being kept. Besides the edited volume, we only know of the existence of a volume from the first phase of Hereš's term in 1406.³⁹ Similarly formulated records were also kept in the previous period by the archdeacons, although there is only evidence this was true of Prague Archdeacon Pavel of Janovice, whose is the only inspection protocol to have survived.⁴⁰

Small variations in the records could have been caused by a change in person of the corrector himself. While records from the correctorate of Hereš are written objectively (*dominus Hersso corrector*), the style changes to the subjective under his successor Ojř (*coram nobis domino Ogerio correctore*), but the change was not thorough.

The manuscript cannot be considered a final text. Most of the records were taken down during proceedings as shown by the frequent corrections and notes. This is also supported by the character of the records that are sometimes schematic, with gaps left in the interest of brevity, such as in repeated formulations. Records for some cases were started but not completed⁴¹ or some had only titles⁴². Other times the title was added after the fact.⁴³ Several dozen cases left spaces where most often names were to be added later, which suggests their transcription into files from temporary notes.

The manuscript includes 638 individual records. The edition took into account their content and a record did not receive a new number if it was a later updated with further information. These were instead given letters for indexing, so only 525 records are listed. If a record to a specific case appeared elsewhere in the volume, then it received a new number in the interest of clarity and order. The volume strictly maintains the order of the records and moves a record or its part only in a very few individual cases if the scribe added a note explaining the continuity of the text. Users are referred to other re-

39) See mention in records 262a and 519l.

40) The records can be found at the end with the heading *Obligaciones – see also *Protocollum visitationis archidiaconatus Pragensis annis 1379–1382 per Paulum de Janowicz archidiaconum Pragensem factae**, edd. Ivan HLAVÁČEK – Zdeňka HLEDÍKOVÁ, Prague 1973, pp. 380–403. All proceedings took place under the auspices of the archdeacon with the exception of one where the final arbiter was Corrector Vojslav of Miličín (p. 380).

41) Records 23, 36, 39, 203a, 229, 267, and record after number 505.

42) Record number 97.

43) Records 287, 386, 387 a 448.

cords dealing with the same case after the case number to make using the volume easier.⁴⁴ Addendums were added in later years pointing to later volumes that have not survived to this day. The scribe only carried this out in cases that directly continued from those already dealt with and that were recorded in the volume. For a better idea, here are the number of cases for each year.⁴⁵

| | | | |
|------|-----------------|------|----|
| 1406 | 2 ⁴⁶ | 1410 | 92 |
| 1407 | 161 | 1413 | 7 |
| 1408 | 243 | 1415 | 2 |
| 1409 | 119 | 1417 | 1 |

Records begin with a date in almost all cases. Years in the records are rare because the scribe counted on their continuity stemming from headings that stated the year or the dating at the beginning of the corrector's term.⁴⁷ The first heading on folio 1r is also a heading for the volume as a whole: "Acta correctoria presbiterorum comparata per honorabilem virum dominum Herssonem, protunc correctorem cleri, de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo septimo et inceptum est in eisdem notari in mense Februario et infra."⁴⁸ A heading labelling the year as 1408 appears on folio 40r: "Anno Domini M° CCCCVIII°." The expected labelling of year 1409 has not been preserved because it was probably cut out folio 69. The year 1410 is again simply added on folio 110r: "Anno Domini millesimo CCCC^{mo} decimo." A new heading with the year appears two folios later (112v) marking when corrector Ojř took office: "Anno Domini M°CCCC^{mo}X^{mo}, acta acti-cata tempore honorabilis viri domini Ogerii, correctoris etc."

There are also other cases where the date was fully recorded. For example, record 508 from October 10, 1409, where a celebratory formulation demonstrates the several weeks-old declaration of obedience of the Prague Archbishopric to Pisan Pope Alexander V., whose pontificate is listed in the dating.⁴⁹

44) The reference is always tied to the number without the index as the indexed connection is clear. We stress that the links only connect cases and not the individuals taking part (that's what the index of people is for), which is why cases about the same person are not listed here even if the violation was the same. The references were dropped only in the case of members of the bands of brigands because of the large number of defendants.

45) Cases that cannot be accurately dated are not listed here, which are numbers 97, 125, 223a, 230a, 262a, 332a, 332b, 360a, 519bb, 520 a 525.

46) These two records were added to the file later outside of the regular chronology. It's possible the scribe wrote them down from notes in the interest of record keeping. Errors in dating are unlikely because the official in question in both cases was Dominik of Budějovice, who represented the corrector for a temporary period in 1406 – see above

47) This can sometimes complicate cases where records were entered after the fact outside of chronological order.

48) Reproduced on Tab. I.

49) A similarly detailed dating is also used at the beginning of record number 462.

Records thus began with a dating, often only with a relative placing (*Die suprascripta...*; *Item die...*). The date of the day and name of the month was usually listed.⁵⁰ When calculating the exact day of the week, possible with more than 580 records, the results show 82 cases on Mondays; 93 on Tuesdays; 99 on Wednesdays; 89 on Thursdays; 94 on Fridays; and 82 on Saturdays; with Sundays showing a reduced amount with 41, which is actually surprisingly high. It is clear the days weren't separated into workdays and others.⁵¹

The scribe also often recorded the hour, or the time of the day of proceedings. The most cases, 82, took place during *hora terciarum*, followed by *hora vesperorum* (43 records), and *hora meridiei* (10). Eight cases took place after sundown (*hora completorii*) and only one took place during *hora nonarum*, which was already moved to a time around mid-day in this period. This information cannot be taken absolutely because the times are included in only about a quarter of the records, but the trend is clear: the corrector was most active in the morning and pre-noon hours, especially between morning mass and lunch, and then again in the late afternoon.

It's not surprising almost all acts took place in the archbishop's court in Prague's Lesser Town (*Malá Strana*) where the corrector's office was located. Besides the cases heard there, one case each was heard in the house of the Prague Archbishop's official (number 115), the home of magister Blažej Vlk, the deacon of the Chapter of All Saints (number 172) an even in a Nymburk rectory (number 437).⁵²

Although the Archbishop's Court is listed as the location in only 138 records, there is convincing evidence that 633 cases took place at the location, but in various spaces. The room used is listed in 141 records. The corrector most often used the spaces that stood next to the *gaol*.⁵³

Swearing an oath was part of testimony for some of those called to give statements to the corrector. Sometimes the oath was required before the beginning of questioning, while other times the witness took the oath only before answering certain questions. Testimony under oath appears in 70 records. It can't be determined if an oath was required each time and was so regular that the scribe didn't bother recording it or whether it was required only under certain circumstances. We favor the latter because if the oath was strictly required in all cases, then the swearing would probably be listed only in

50) Holidays that fell on a certain day were rarely mentioned (record number 1). This expanded version of dating is related to it being the first entry in the volume where the full title of the corrector is also listed.

51) See also Jan ADÁMEK, *Úřední dny v pražské arcibiskupské kanceláři na počátku 15. století*, in: *Církevní správa a její písemnosti na přelomu středověku a novověku*, edd. Ivan Hlaváček – Jan Hrdina, Prague 2003 (= *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Philosophica et historica* 2, *Z pomocných věd historických* XV), pp. 147–169.

52) The record of events in the West Bohemian town of Radnice (num. 522) is of a different character where the corrector's authorities are unclear and the record suggests it was recorded for formal reasons.

53) There are too many occurrences of this to list them all here.

a short form without a description to correspond to the records' concise nature. It can also be expected that the notary did not add the note about the taking of the oath after the fact (as happens in record number 317), only after the record of the questioning had been completed: "Interrogatus per iuramentum de premissis."

The swearing of the oath took various forms, possibly with a simple note: "iuratus", "respondit per iuramentum", "sub iuramento", "iuravit dicere veritatem", or the longer form "qui per iuramentum solitum iuravit et sub iuramento respondit" or by explicitly recording its form. This takes place in various forms, such as swearing on the texts of scripture (i.e. "per iuramentum ad sancta Dei ewangelia manuctum") or in rare cases on the crucifix ("ad ymaginem crucifixi juraverint"). There are records of both being used, and even occasionally the ceremonial "qui ad sancta Dei ewangelia et ymaginem crucifixi Salvatoris Domini nostri Ihesu Cristi iuravit dicere veritatem ad interrogata."

It's interesting to note the oath did not always take the same form. The passages "qui iuramento solito et consueto precedente respondit" certainly would not suffice for such a conclusion, although in some cases (309, 310, 343, 432) the taking of a "middle oath" is discussed, such as "qui medio iuramento ad sancta Dei ewangelia prestito respondit." It cannot be said how this differed from the regular, full form of the oath.

There are several types of records in the volume. Most often they are records of questioning suspects or previously convicted individuals, or possibly witnesses. We also can find records of punishments, incarceration, release from the gaol, pardons, and records of a procedural nature such as naming arbiters, verdicts, subpoenas, postponement of proceedings, or statements of no contest if a party did not attend proceedings. It is these procedural records that do not always correspond to the corrector's powers. The records are proof the corrector files enjoyed the status of a public record and were fully accepted much like court files kept at the office of the general vicar. Some of the corrector cases would belong more to this court, but for some reason were not transferred. The last type of record are the rare but important rulings that will be discussed below.

Interrogations were always held with prior knowledge of the case. The reporters of the infraction were most often archdeacons who would encounter many violations, although they are rather rarely mentioned (cases number 2, 16, 21, 26 – where the Archdeacon himself led the case, 219, 221, 237, 259, 261, 268, 269, 293, 297, 338, and 427). Deans were also often listed as reporters, but they are even more rare (cases 382, 472), as are other individuals (i.e. the noble Jan Křinecký of Křince in case 458). The level of evidence available to the corrector probably varied greatly and was certainly directly dependent on the way the inspection was performed and on the level of the supplementary written material produced during the visit. In a small number of cases, the corrector could work with very specific results processed into articles (i.e. 48, 220, 270, 281, 376a, 417), which could be presented by another individual (i.e. 457, 457a). Other times it seems

charges were investigated on the basis of “secondary” testimony. Questions and answers are always short but clearly recorded. Some cases include direct quotes from testimony (i.e. 188, 224, 258, 269, 376a, 383, 463, 486a).

When necessary, the corrector could request a local investigation (*inquisitio ad partes*), which appears in 30 cases.⁵⁴ Occasionally, the files include transcriptions of the original reports the investigators provided to the corrector (139, 406, 457a).

The records vary greatly in terms of content. Many of the cases deal with violations of celibacy, both real and rumored. There is a surprising number of cases that deal with larceny, theft, and sacrilege. The rise in the number of these cases is associated with the rooting out of several groups of brigands that were active throughout the Czech lands and included several priests and clerics without a benefice. There are also repeated cases of gambling and related visits to pubs, drunkenness, and disorderly behavior unbecoming of pastoral life. A fraction of the cases deals with the most serious transgressions. There is a single murder and one case each of usury, black magic, or poorly performed exorcisms. Impersonating a priest is a similarly isolated incident as is simony or other violations in administering the sacraments. However, the goal of this introduction is not to describe the content of individual cases and files because this can still be found in Antonín Podlaha’s work.⁵⁵

Besides diocese clerics, correctors could also investigate monks, especially if they belonged to an order that provided significant spiritual guidance. This means specifically the Benedictine and Premonstratensian orders.⁵⁶

After interrogation, the corrector usually issued his orders and warnings associated with a list of sanctions should the orders be violated. Penalties usually included imprisonment, steep fines, and threats of excommunication. The defendant would often express his will to fulfill the orders. It can therefore be said the grand majority of cases ended with a conditional sentence, although sometimes no verdict was issued.

The corrector would issue a sentence and ceremonial verdict presentation in the most serious cases where guilt was clearly proven.⁵⁷ That was expressed in different graphic form where verdicts were written in larger and more careful script. We can find 28 of these and only two issued by the corrector Ojří. The style didn’t correspond to other cases

54) Records 6a, 14, 21, 48, 112, 132, 143, 214, 220, 224, 268, 269, 273, 281, 332a, 363, 371, 376, 376a, 406, 432, 446, 451, 453, 454, 458, 463, 463a, 486, 493a.

55) Akta korektorů, pp. 7–43.

56) See also Jan ADÁMEK, *Řeholníci a úřad korektora kléru na počátku 15. století*, in: *Historia monastica I. Sborník z kolokvií a konferencí pořádaných v letech 2002–2003 v cyklu „Život ve středověkém klášteře“*, ed. Dušan Foltýn, Prague 2005 (= *Colloquia medievalia Pragensia* 3), pp. 97–102.

57) For more details on the corrector’s verdicts concerning clerics, see also Jan ADÁMEK, *Korektor kléru arcidiecéze pražské jako trestní soudce*, in: *Sacri canones servandi sunt. Ius canonicum et status ecclesiae saeculis XIII–XV*, ed. Pavel Krafl, Prague 2008, pp. 343–351.

in one of these instances and thus probably cannot be counted.⁵⁸ Some rulings were announced about the same people repeatedly, so in total seven priests, sixteen clerics, and one layperson were convicted. The verdicts are recorded in a strict formulaic form that included names, type of violation, and length of sentence or banishment that varied only in the slightest of ways: “Christi nomine invocato pro tribunali sedentes et ipsum solum pre oculis habentes per hanc nostram sententiam diffinitivam, quam ferimus in hiis scriptis, pronunciamus, declaramus prefatum N, (crime inserted), propter que et alia ipsum condempnamus ad standum in scala per (time in hours) et in carcere clauso per annos (number) continuos, ubi quartis et sextis feriis pane doloris et aqua angustie sit contentus. Banientes ipsum decetero de diocesi Pragensi perpetue in hiis scriptis. Moderacionem vero pene eiusdem domino nostro archiepiscopo Pragensi et suis successoribus ac nobis specialiter reservamus.” The sentence continued in a cursorily script with the record of announcing the verdict: “Lata et lecta est hec sententia per honorabilem virum dominum N, correctorem cleri diocesis Pragensis, anno Domini ..., die ..., hora ..., in ... curie archiepiscopalis, presentibus NN.”⁵⁹

However, individuals under neighboring diocese occasionally found themselves before the corrector – especially from the Olomouc and to a lesser extent the Litomyšl diocese, but there were isolated cases from the Passau, Poznan, and Wroclaw diocese as the deciding factor was where the individual had been apprehended.

The last folio of the volume (135v) lists various costs the corrector incurred under the heading „Nota exposita et distributa per dominum Herssonem, correctorem cleri diocesis Pragensis“.⁶⁰ They bring interesting and partially irreplaceable supplementary information about the activities of the corrector’s office. Here, we can surprisingly find expenditures for torture⁶¹ and the costs of repairing the gaol, as well as payments to carpenters and smiths. The costs of paper and binding the corrector files are also notable.

A contemporary index is bound to the manuscript, which was created as the files were recorded and was absolutely necessary for the practical use of the volume.⁶² The index is valuable today because it at least gives an overview of the people whose cases were recorded in the folios that have not survived. It also provides supplementary information about people in the records themselves.⁶³

58) See record number 472.

59) An excerpt is reproduced on Tab. VII.

60) See also records number 519. Folio 135v is reproduced on Tab. VIII.

61) Only in one case is it mentioned; the payment was meant for the armed guards (preconi) – č. 519c.

62) An excerpt is reproduced on Tab. II.

63) An interesting note about daily office practice is the rectangular piece of paper measuring 6cm × 3.5cm placed between folios 65 and 66. The card is covered in rather careful script that does not belong to any of the scribes of the corrector files. It’s a reminder for the corrector that an unnamed holder of rectory income and his concubine were called to appear on a specific date (“Memoriale ad dominum correctorem, quod citetur conventor cum sua concubina

There is no explanation as to why only the one volume of corrector files survived despite their continual use from the end of the 1380s until 1420. It's possible to assume the files travelled together with the archive during its exile. The only lead is a record copy probably created as a template and recorded in the corrector's files in 1449, which is associated with the administrator and dean of the chapter Prokop of Kladruby. The record of the arbiter's decision was announced in Pilsen and the manuscript may have been there as well at the time as that is where the Prague Chapter found a home the year before.

Besides its primary factual testimony, the volume is by itself very convincing proof of the efforts on the part of the archbishop and his officials to improve the behavior of pastors from the Prague diocese. It proves the disciplinary demands repeatedly expressed at all-diocese synods were not just empty proclamations without actual results. It also plays witness to the significant perseverance in fulfilling these demands and confirms the functioning of the corrector's office and the fact that the structure of the church, which was often labelled as bloated and ineffective, was able to repair itself from the inside. Growing disrespect for authority, not only the church, led to the doubting of its authority, which was then one of the basic reasons why these mechanisms lost their effectiveness. A spreading practical Wycliffism along with an upending of the social order then led the country on a march into the turbulence of the Hussite period.

* * *

The inspection protocol by Archdeacon Pavel of Janovice⁶⁴ became the model for organizing this volume because of the very similar characteristics of both sources stemming from their administrative closeness. The editor worked to make the structure of the manuscript clear while striving to make it user-friendly.

The whole text was transcribed and the many abbreviations were written out. Writing into square brackets occurs only where the scribe shortened the word, but failed to mark it in the usual way. The exceptions are the many uses of "et cetera" which is transcribed as "etc" so its use, especially in the middle of a sentence, is not disruptive.

The numbering of the days regularly written in Roman numerals are left abbreviated even in the cases where the scribe marked them in the upper index. For example, they

ad feriam secundam post Judica non obstante procuratore"); the name Bušek ("Bussek") written in another script on the other side probably isn't related because no holder with such a name is listed in the files. The date was then used to identify the case. This produced March 14, 1407, which was the Monday after the Passion Sunday. The record from this date (number 376) doesn't include a summons, but an investigation order in the case of Matěj, the former priest from Housek, who was the holder in Deštná (see the index under: Mathias, plebanus olim in Hussii) and his concubine is mentioned as well (num. 376a).

64) Cited in note 40.

remain “Die XX^{ma} mensis...”. Dated information in the text are only used in cases where it cannot be determined using other tools (knowledge of the liturgical calendar and the days of saints is not a prerequisite).

In most cases, the omitted years are not filled in – the records basically pass in chronological order and discrepancies can be cleared up using the special index (*Datationes relationum secundum ordinem*). The corresponding year for the basic record (of non-indexed or ex-post records) in blank spaces is listed in the header on each folio.

Mistakes and omissions by the scribe are either left in place in their original form with a note [!] showing the correct or probable form if necessary.⁶⁵ In cases of clear errors, the correction is made directly in the text while the original version is in the notes. Specific repeated formulations, such as “pro reformandis carcerum” or “sub pena perpetuis carceribus” are left in their not completely correct but original form. Unclear or unintelligible passages are labelled with a [?], again sometimes with a note. All headings and the later addendums (as much as it is possible to ascertain the time of their recording) are also kept as are all corrections, cuts, and damage to the material that made reading the text impossible. If a larger amount of text is added above, then the indexing is at the end. Personal and place names were transliterated.⁶⁶ However, in order to lighten the notes, their identification or descriptions are left for the index of names and places. The way the volume was created led the scribe to make various omissions (sometimes purposefully to be filled in later) in the text or to break up sentences. Filling words into brackets and marking stylistic inadequacies was used only where the message could fail to be understood. The records also include passages of direct speech – either recorded by the scribe for greater clarity, or inadvertent where the testimony was translated into Latin. These spots are inserted after a colon into parentheses and start with a capital letter.⁶⁷ Capital and lowercase letters in the edition often don’t follow the original where they are used inconsistently and unexpectedly, which is also true of punctuation. The edition also uses capital letters in the names of people and places, names of divine beings, and the names of months. Where possible, questions and answers from interrogations are recorded as independent sentences for greater clarity (*Interrogavit...*, *Interrogatus...*; *Respondit...*). Other unusual markings by the scribe are pointed out in the notes.

65) The unusual manner of writing some words is preserved if it was done consistently. For example, the repeated naming of *mancionarius* instead of the correct *mansionarius*; the scribe in this case probably used the phonetic form of the word that doesn’t have a Czech equivalent.

66) With the exception of the “f”, where the uppercase version is usually expressed as the double lowercase “ff”; which is a graphic element and thus isn’t differentiated.

67) The statement is only added after the colon without the parentheses if the objective and subjective form are used in the same sentence or where it is impossible to differentiate.