

Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov as a Conservative Utraquist¹

Ota Halama (Prague)

The first Prague printer known by name, Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov, has been variously interpreted from the denominational point of view. Brother Jan Blahoslav characterised him in the sixteenth century as “an ineptly passionate defender of the faith.” For the nineteenth-century classic of literary history, Josef Jungmann, he was a moderate adherent of the Compactata, for the more recent popularising Arne Novák he was a conciliatory Christian.² Another literary historian Milan Kopecký, who – in the second half of last century – devoted to Konáč two monographs and an edited work, once called him a convinced Utraquist, another time an enlightened Utraquist. In contemporary terms, Kopecký explained that Konáč was “a consistent advocate of national unity, rejecting any further differentiation of views in the religious area, which for him was the only realm of ideology.”³ From Kopecký’s characterisation it is close to the most recent one by the scholar of Czech literature from Spain, Eduardo Fernández Couceiro. Despite his reservations vis-à-vis Kopecký, comes close to his opinion, maintaining that Konáč’s “basic religious thinking may be considered as conservatively Calixtine. From 1515, therefore, Konáč supported the official religious line of the Czech state and sharply opposed the Unity and Luther’s teaching.”⁴

Besides literary historians, Mikuláš’s religious view also recently came to the attention of the specialist in the history of printing, Petr Voit, according to whom Konáč “from the standpoint of a tolerant Utraquist, realised

¹ This study was supported by a grant from the Czech Science Foundation (GA ČR) for the project “Cultural Codes and Their Transformations in the Hussite Period” (P405/12/G148).

² See Milan Kopecký, *Literární dílo Mikuláše Konáče z Hodiškova. Příspěvky k poznání české literatury v období renesance* [The Literary Work of Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov: Contributions to the Study of Czech Literature in the Renaissance Period] (Prague, 1962) 10, 14–15, 19.

³ See Kopecký, *Literární dílo Mikuláše Konáče z Hodiškova* and *Humanista z Vysočiny* [A Humanist from the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands] (Žďár nad Sázavou, 1971). Previously Kopecký had edited: Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova, *Pravidlo lidského života* [The Rule of Human Life] (Prague, 1961).

⁴ Eduardo Fernández Couceiro, *Český utrakvistický humanismus v literárním díle Mikuláše Konáče z Hodiškova* [Czech Utraquist Humanism in the Literary Work of Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov] (Prague, 2011) 75–76.

Všehrđ's programme of Czech national humanism.⁵ Concerning an interest in Konáč's relation with the Unity, we also find the earlier assessment of the Protestant theologian, Amedeo Molnár, according to whom in 1511 "we still capture Mikuláš in the position of dignified Utraquist humanism, when he linked up with the irenic stand of the more progressive humanists, which he connected with the Utraquist theoretical foundation of religious tolerance." Later, however, "he revealed a definitely negative attitude toward the Unity and abandoned his earlier irenicism" by leaning "toward an one-sided conciliatory attitude – based on the Compactata – toward the Roman Church."⁶

Thus, Mikuláš Konáč may appear to us as an advocate of religious toleration on the one hand and, on the other, as a critic of the Unity and as a conservative Utraquist, affected by Roman influence and turning against Luther's acceptance in the Bohemian milieu.

In this article, however, I shall not focus on Konáč's relationship with the Unity of Brethren, on which his religious stand has been most often illustrated and which – more than fifty years ago – was described by Amedeo Molnár.⁷ We will be more interested in the form of Mikuláš's Utraquism and its connection with the stormy events of the early 1520s.

Konáč most clearly described the specifics of Utraquism in his printed work, *Rozmlouvání o víře* [Discussion about the Faith] from April 1511:⁸ Utraquists – used interchangeably with "Czechs [Češi]" – are neither heretics nor schismatics. As "good Christians" they merely rejected "human

⁵ Petr Voit, *Encyklopedie knihy. Starší knihtisk a přibuzné obory mezi polovinou 15. a počátkem 19. století* [Encyclopedia of the Book: Early Book Printing and Kindred Trades Between the Mid-Fifteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries] (Prague, 2006) 480.

⁶ Amedeo Molnár, "Mikuláš Konáč a Jednota bratrská [Mikuláš Konáč and the Unity of Brethren]," *Theologická příloha Křesťanské revue* 2 (1961) 43–53, here 50.

⁷ Besides the study cited in the previous note, see also A. Molnár, "Konáčův humanismus a Bratři [Konáč's Humanism and the Brethren]," in: Noemi Rejchrtová ed., *Směrování* (Prague, 1983) 66–68. Molnár did not take into consideration the testimony of Jan Kalenec about Konáč, preserved in vol 4 of *Akta Jednoty bratrské*. The document, "Psaní toto jest Kalencovo proti Janovi Augustovi a jeho při, kterouž vydal proti kněžím kališným [This Letter of Kalenec is directed against Jan Augusta and His Polemic, which he Had Published against Calixtine Priests]" from 1540, fittingly illustrates Mikuláš's relationship to the Unity during the first half of 1520s; see also AUF IV, fol. 231r: "And it so happened that thirty years ago I was told by Mr. Mikuláš Konáč, Printer of the Old Town of Prague that the same way as every Pope conjured up something from his own head that was not in the New Testament... So also, in the case of the Boleslav Brethren, this Elder thought something out and another one again added something else, until it happened that from a mosquito they made a great bird eagle-owl." ["I přišlo na to, což před tříměcítma lety pověděl mi pan Mikuláš Konáč Starého města Prahy impresor, že jakož každý papež nětco z své hlavy vynesl, mimo zákon Nový... I při boleslavských bratrích tento starší toto zamyslíl a jiný opět nětco přidal, až přišlo na to, že jako z malého komára udělali velikého ptáka vejra.]"

⁸ See Knihopis Nr. 14 996: Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov, *Rozmlouvání o víře, neméně užitečné jako kratochvilné, v kterémžto římenín, Čech, pikart a mudřec společně rozmlouvají* [Discussion about Faith, Not Less Useful Than Entertaining, in Which a Romanist, a Czech, a Pikart, and a Wise Man Talk Together] (Prague 1511).

invention and papal findings” and they fulfil the law of Christ.⁹ Therefore, they receive communion *sub utraque*, give communion to infants, use Czech chants in the mass, and reject sacramentals. They are ambiguous about purgatory – because it is a great uncertainty [a play on words in Czech: *očistec-nejistec*] – but they uphold the intercession of saints, which occurs without idolatry.

If we add to all of that Konáč’s profound veneration of Jan Hus, his definition of Utraquism corresponds to the form, upheld by Administrator Václav Koranda, the Younger, and his successor at the head of the Utraquist Church, Master Pavel of Žatec. Both of them, in their printed and manuscript works, defended communion *sub utraque* and communion for infants, as well as Czech chants in the mass. Just like Koranda, Konáč also condemned usury.¹⁰ Concerning the rejection of sacramentals as well as relativisation of

⁹ See Mikuláš Konáč, *Rozmlúvanie o vieře*, pp. A3b-A4a: “Because there is nothing else /for what you malign the Czech People/than because, as you said/ -- and I was glad to hear it from you --/that [unjustly] for human institutions/ and papal inventions/you vituperate good Christians/saying everything evil about them./ Because your holy water/ catkin, a genuine herb/is propitious to salvation/believe me that it is nothing./That you prevent us from/singing Czech, as if you did not know/that it is nothing new/but an old concession /from Innocent the Pope/ the Roman highest priest./ For let every spirit praise God/ serve him as it can/ every tongue confess him/ who is worthy of every praise./ Do not rely on purgatory, it is a great uncertainty./ It is better to play with certainty/ and you shall fear nothing;/ be diligent to purge yourself here,/ thereby you shall be well assured/ that at death the conscience/ would need no purgation./ As for the advocacy and intercession of saints/you commit injustice against us, and are greatly mistaken. We neither adore the saints,/ nor give them divine honours, we merely ask for their advocacy,/ or their intercession,/ that they might ask for all of us/ all that they already have./ Also abstinence from food/we know that it is not useless/it not only benefits the very soul/but also the body;/ who then would like to fast,/ he must rid himself,/ first of all, of every sin/, and reject it completely./ Fast benefits such a soul,/ for others it is not worthwhile...” [“Poněvadž pro nic jiného / netupíte lidu českého, / nežli proto, cožs pověděl, / rádt sem to od tebe zvěděl, / že pro lidská ustavenie / a papežská nalezenie / dobré křesťany haníte, / o nich všecko zlé pravíte. / Neb vaše voda posvátná, / jehněd, bylina co platná / jest a prospěšná k spasenie, / věřiz mi, žeť to nic nenie, / že pak zpievati bránite / nám česky, zdaliž nevíte, / žeť to nic nového nenie, / ale staré povolenie / Innocencia papeže, / římského největšieho kněze. / Neb všeliký duch chval Boha, / služ jemu také jakž moha, / jazyk každý vyznáváj jeho, / všelikého chvály hodného. / Nevzpoléhaj na očistec, / nebť jest veliký nejistec. / Lépeť jest jistého hráti / a nebudeš se nic báti, / pilen buď zde se čistiti, / tím se dobře ujistiti, / aby při smrti svědomí / nepotřebovalo čistění. / Kdežs pak dotekl přimlúvanie / svatých a orodovanie, / na tom nám křivdu činíte / a velice se mýlíte. / Ale svatýchč nevzievamy, / cti boží jim nedávamy, než držimy o přimlúvanie, / neb o jich orodovanie, / žeť nám všem toho žádají, / všeho dobrého, jež mají. / Také od jídla zdrzenie, / viemť že neužitečné nenie, / netoliko samé duši, / ale také tělu sluší, / ktož by se pak chtěl postiti, / právě musiet se zprostiti, / najprve hřiechu každého / a odřeknutí se jeho. / Takovýť duši puost prospívá, / jinýt jie platen nebyvá...”].

¹⁰ See Knihopis Nr. 4274: Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova, *Jak lichva škodí bližnímu i vlasti, co zlého plodí a kteraké strasti?* [How does usury damage one’s neighbour and country, what evil it bears and what sorrows?] (Prague, 1515?).

purgatory, the cult of saints, and the practice of fasting, we already find Konáč's models in the time of Master Jan Rokycana.

Konáč, however, was also linked up with Koranda and Žatecký by a common concern about the "Pikart" menace, which at the start of the sixteenth century – like in Rokycana's time – was represented by the Unity of Brethren. It is true that Konáč fully joined the party of conservative Utraquism only after 1511, when the printing of *Rozmlouvání* in its consequences deprived him of the ideals of humanistically oriented religious tolerance. Later on, however, he extended the anti-Pikart stands, his own and those of his church, to also cover the Prague radicals of the 1520s, when an encounter between the Czech and the European reformations culminated in the so-called Prague Tempest of 1524.

The first sallies against the Unity came out of Konáč's print shop in 1515–1516. Four years later, Konáč began printing works against the increasing influence of the Prague radicals. Although only one work can be ascribed to the printer himself, his influence on the contents of other publications cannot be underestimated. Through Konáč, an outlet was also sought by the Prague priests, at first worried by the influence of the Unity. Later on, Konáč was sought for publication by similarly oriented authors, frightened by the growth of the "Pikhart" error, planted from the early 1520s by the Prague radicals among both priests and laypeople.

The anti-Unity agitation includes Konáč's own *Dialogus, ve kterém Čech s pikartem rozmlouvá* [A Dialogue in which a Czech Debates with a Pikart],¹¹ the edition of a eucharistic polemic of the priest of Domažlice, Jan Stanislaides,¹² with the Unity, also called *O klanění svátosti oltářní proti pikartským bludům* [On the Veneration of the Eucharist, Against the Pikarts' Errors]. This category includes also the voluminous Latin *Sermones* of the Slav Abbott, Matěj Korambus,¹³ censuring individual articles of the Latin Brethren's *Apologia*, published in Nuremberg in 1511.¹⁴

The second group – reactions to the events of the 1520s – includes

¹¹ See Knihopis Nr. 4273: Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova, *Dialogus, v kterémž Čech s pikartem rozmlouvá, že sú se bratří valdenští všetečně a škodlivě od obů stran oddělili* [A Dialogue, in which a Czech talks with a Pikart, about how the Waldensian Brethren mischievously and harmfully separated from both parties] (Prague, 1515).

¹² See Knihopis Nr. 15 660: Jan Stanislaides, *O klanění velebné svátosti oltářní proti pikartským bludům, z třetích knéh Stanislaidových vybranie* [About the Adoration of the Venerable Sacrament of the Altar against the Pikart heresies; selected from the three books of Stanislaides] (Prague, 1515).

¹³ See Matěj Korambus, *Sermones XII in Apologiam Valdensium facti catholicorumque viro- rum sententiis verissime fulciti, domino Doctori Petro, civi Luthomericensium dignissimo ob antiquam dilectionis necessitudinem iure dicati* (Prague, 1516).

¹⁴ See Lukáš Pražský, *Apologia sacre scripture*, (Nürnberg, 1511); faksimile in: Amedeo Molnár (ed.), Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf Materialien und Dokumente 1: Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder-Unität 3: Bekenntnisse der Böhmischen Brüder (Hildesheim and New York, 1979).

Konáč's edition of the Taborite, or "Pikart", errors from 1420, as well as his edition of priest Mikuláš of Poříčí, who in turn had edited two eucharistic writings of Jan Hus and Jan Rokycana; all of these appeared in 1521–1522. The character of Konáč's orientation in these years is additionally complemented by his *List pravdy* [The Letter of Truth],¹⁵ addressed to King Louis in 1522, and a reprinted retort to it from Martin of Žatec, a priest at St. Henry's Church in Prague.¹⁶ Finally, this set includes Konáč's edition of contemporary songs *O pohnutí pražském* [On the Prague Disturbance],¹⁷ which immediately reacted to the radical's defeat at the start of 1524.

There is a perfectly seamless transition between Konáč's publications directed against the Unity and his prints in opposition to the rise of Prague radicals in the 1520s. The "Pikart" error – the heretical teaching about the Lord's Supper, which in Utraquist's eyes was typical of the Unity – is applied after 1520 to the Prague radicals, who are customarily called Lutherans or Neo-Utraquists. Konáč and related authors find the roots of their heresy in the milieu of the Hussite radicals, specifically in the old Taborite errors, the knowledge about which had been renewed by the appearance of their printed version.¹⁸ Konáč's footsteps were followed also by younger authors and conservative priests such as Bohuslav Bílejovský, and his pupil Pavel Bydžovský, who in the contents and in the form of their anti-Pikart agitation entirely agreed with Konáč.¹⁹ However, with Konáč it is still possible to distinguish

¹⁵ Knihipis Nr. 4276: Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova, *List Pravdy pro řád, pokoj, lásku a svornost Království českého a Markrabství moravského sepsaný a králi Ludvíkovi, Jeho milosti poslaný* [A Letter of Truth, Written for the Sake of Order, Peace, Love, and Concord in the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margraviate of Moravia, and Sent to King Louis, His Grace] (Prague, 1522); ed. M. Kopecký, in: *Humanista z Vysočiny*, 34–42.

¹⁶ Knihipis Nr. 5222: Martin ze Žatce, *Náprava skrze kněze Martina, faráře u svatého Jindřicha v Praze vydaná, toho listu a spisu, kterýžto udělav Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova, směl poslati za dar Nového léta králi, Jeho milosti* [Correction, issued by priest Martin, parish priest of St. Henry's Church in Prague, concerning the letter and text, which – having written them – Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova dared to send as a New Year's Gift to His Grace, the King] (Prague, 1522).

¹⁷ Knihipis č. 14 101: *O pohnutí pražském, proč a kterak se jest stalo* [About the Prague Uproar: Why and How It Happened]; ed. Josef Vítězslav Šimák, *Kronika pražská Bartoše Písaře – Paměti o bouři pražské roku 1524 – Listy a kronika mistra Jiřího Píseckého – Přílohy* [Chronicle of Bartoš Písař; Memoirs of Prague Tempest of 1524; Letters and Chronicle of Master Jiří Písecký; Supplements], FRB 6, 363–366; see Petr Daněk, *Tisky vokální polyfonie, rané monodie, hudební teorie a tabulatur v Čechách (1500–1630)* [Prints of Vocal Polyphony, Early Monody, Musical Theory and Ancient Notation], *Soupis dochovaných a v Čechách uložených tisků* (Dissertation, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, 2005) 9.

¹⁸ See the reference to a lost print of Konáč from after 1521, cited in Konáč's bibliography in: Kopecký, *Humanista z Vysočiny*, 14: "Erronei ac heretici dogmatis circiter annum dominice incarnationis millesimum, quadringentesimum vicesimum in Bohemia exorti postea vero et reprobati, condemnatique, notabiliores ac perniciores hic ponuntur articuli."

¹⁹ See Ota Halama (ed.), *Bohuslava Bílejovského Kronika česká*, Prague 2011; Knihipis Nr. 1387–1398.

the anti-Brethren phase of his writings, with the younger authors this boundary is indistinct and thus it often becomes difficult to determine whether their “Pikart” is a Taborite, a member of the Unity of Brethren, or a Prague 1520s radical, influenced moreover by the Lutheran Reformation.

From the viewpoint of the mentioned publications that deal with religious polemics from 1515–1516 and 1520–1525, we can then reconstruct Mikuláš’s ecclesiastical and religious orientation in the following way.

Konáč’s Utraquism is characterised, above all, by communion sub utraque, communion for infants, Czech singing at mass, and veneration of the martyr of Constance and the Bohemian saint, Jan Hus. After 1511, Konáč re-evaluated his attitude toward holy water and other sacramental, and also corrected his standpoint toward purgatory and fasts in favour of conservative concepts. In the 1522 *Letter of Truth*, addressed to King Louis, Konáč clearly rejects the views of the Prague radicals, headed by the clergy of Prague, to whom he writes in a hyperbolic allegory: “You wish to destroy human inventions all of which are Christian feasts: the Incarnation, the Nativity of our Lord, the Resurrection, Ascension, Sending of the Holy Spirit [Pentecost], Feast of the Holy Trinity, Sundays; feasts of the Virgin Mary, of the Apostles, of the martyrs, of the confessors, of the holy virgins, etc.; fasts, vigils, chants proper to every feast and time, mass vestments, masses, missal, creeds, etc., the law of God.”²⁰ From the Candlemas Day Articles of the Prague clergy adopted in early 1524, we know that the reforms of liturgical life in Prague had not actually gone that far.²¹ Yet it is evident that Konáč insists on the preservation of the traditional shape of the ecclesiastical year, as well as of the customary form of the mass, the transformation of which we actually encounter under priest Martin Hánek in the Bethlehem Chapel in 1523.²² What is important, however, is Konáč’s claim that the Prague radicals rejected – in addition to baptism, mass, and sermons – “all the other sacraments and institutions of the holy church.”²³ Also illustrative are Konáč’s ironic sallies that he addresses to the radical clergy of Prague, namely that those: “who opposed holy water – one of the first human inventions – so much that rather than being once sprinkled by it, many of them would rather swear falsely ten times, deceive, rob, and cheat friends, etc., and rather than kiss the hand extended to them as a sign of Christian peace, solidarity, and love, they would rather initiate many conflicts and blood sheds.”²⁴

Considering that we have only a few reports which would depict – from the viewpoint of Utraquist conservatives – the events in the capital of the

²⁰ Kopecký, *Humanista z Vysočiny*, 38–39.

²¹ Šimák, *Kronika pražská Bartoše Písaře*, 21–25

²² See Ota Halama, “Kněz Martin Hánek z Betléma,” in: eds. Robert Novotný, Petr Šámal and others, *Zrození mýtu, Dva životy husitské epochy* [The Birth of a Myth: Two Lives of the Hussite Era] (Prague and Litomyšl 2011) 191–202.

²³ Kopecký, *Humanista z Vysočiny*, 39.

²⁴ Loc. cit.

Bohemian Kingdom in the early 1520s, Konáč's words are especially valuable. In addition, what is also valuable, are Konáč's views of the traditions to which he adhered together with other conservative Utraquists.

Above all, it is the tradition of the *Compactata* of Basel, the role of which the radicals were questioning, and therefore Konáč was reminding them: "Do hold and preserve the *Compactata* of Basel; they were with great difficulty and at great expense negotiated and established by your fathers for the sake of peace and Christian love after much blood shed."²⁵ Konáč, however, had already recalled the role of the *Compactata* in the ecclesiastical life of the country in 1515, when in his *Dialogue* the Pikart asked the Czech-Utraquist, why Rome continued to accuse the Utraquists of heresy, he is told that "I do not know any other reason than your initial and crazy defection, and then perhaps because of our own less irenic, unwise, and unlearned clergy, who just like you (Pikarts) oppose certain ecclesiastical rules, as well as certain obligatory and defined articles."²⁶ The *Compactata* themselves, of course, were valued most highly by the Utraquist: "Have you not heard about the *Compactata* which we received from the Church then gathered in Basel? In them, it is explicitly stated that we are the true sons of the Holy Church; and that no-one is to call us heretics because of the Lord's chalice. It is also recorded in the *Land Registers* [*Desky zemské*] how one party is supposed to treat the other."²⁷ Finally, he specifies the proper sense of the agreements concluded in Basel: "The *Compactata* also point out and demonstrate that the Czechs have preserved all the rules, established by the Church concerning the reception of Christ's blood and some other articles."²⁸

Beside the *Compactata* tradition, Konáč also clearly connects with a tradition that may be called Husian and Rokycanian [*husovská a rokycanovská*]. It is not only that the veneration of Hus penetrates the entire opus of Konáč, but it is also evident in his controversy with the Prague radicals. He juxtaposes Hus's example not only to Martin Luther, but also uses it against the reformist efforts of the Prague radicals. The connection with Hus, likewise leads Konáč to intensify the national moment, he says:

Jan Hus, an excellent and holy man never did – as many now overtly do – oppose my rules, but held and preserved them with great seriousness and diligence, and led and admonished others to do likewise. However, he opposed the avarice, the pride, and the impurity and other improprieties of those who had appropriated a spiritual status for themselves. However, Martin Luther, a monk and a German, states

²⁵ Ibid., 41.

²⁶ Konáč z Hodiškova, *Dialogue*, C5a.

²⁷ Loc. cit.

²⁸ Ibid., C5a-C5b.

that he himself knows me better than anyone else. It would be surely that way, if he embraced peace, love, and Christian concord, and ultimately my sister – compassion – and thus, like my mentioned Jan Hus, he would follow the way of my Lord with his cross. If Luther and with him all the other preachers really led and assimilated the life of Christ; if they denounced the avarice in the Church – the source of great disorder – if they kept and preserved properly my rules, as they were intended, and led and admonished others in that regard, then I tell you that they would recognise me (that is, the Truth) immediately (without any screen) and thus they would bring a great benefit to the Church.

[Jan Hus, muž výborný a svatý, rádóm mým, jakož již mnozí to zjevně činí, se neprotivil, nébrž velikú vážností a pilností tak sám držel a zachovával i jiné k témuž vedl a napomínal. Ale lakomství, pýše a smilství i jiným neřádóm těch, kteříž sobě duchovní jméno osobili, se protivil. Ale Martin Luter, mnich a Němec, praví, že mne sám mimo všecky jiné nejlépe zná. A taktž by jistě bylo, jestliže pokoj, lásku a svornost křesťanskú, naposledy sestru mú Utrpnost oblíbí a tak jako muoj Jan Hus jmenovaný tou cestú za páném mým s křížem svým bráti se bude. Kdyby život Kristuo Luter a s ním všickni jiní kazatelé skutečně vedli a na sobě ukazovali, lakomství v cierkvi, z něhož jest veliký neřád pošel, se protivili, je tupili, řády mé řádně tak, jakž sú k čemu a proč zpuosobeni, drželi a zachovávali, jiné k témuž vedli, učili a napomínali, ó pravím jistě, žeť by mě, totiž pravdu, beze vsí zástěry hned poznali a tak by veliký prospěch v církvi učinili.]²⁹

However, what is then meant by the Rokycanian tradition? The Old Annalist characterised the elected Utraquist Archbishop, Jan Rokycana – in the record of his 1471 death – as a hammer against the Pikarts [kladivo na pikarty].³⁰ We can only wonder whether in mentioning “Pikarts” he had in mind the Taborites, the Brethren, or both. In Konáč’s own work we encounter a revival of interest in Taborite Pikarts in the 1520s, when he published the heretical Taborite articles in reaction to current events. Rokycana’s anti-Pikart abjuration formula was also utilised by Administrator Havel Cahera after the defeat of the Prague radicals in 1524. Rokycana likewise makes an appearance in a little known print by Konáč in 1522, which contains anti-Brethren polemic of the Prague priest Mikuláš, parish priest of the Church of St. Peter in Poříčí.³¹

²⁹ Kopecký, *Humanista z Vysočiny*, 38.

³⁰ See František Šimek (ed.), *Staré letopisy české z vratislavského rukopisu* (Prague 1937) 146: “He was a true hammer against the enemies of the chalice and the Pikarts.”

³¹ *Knihopis* Nr. 3265: “O velebné svátosti těla a krve Pána Krista, co a kterak o ní držáno od věrných a věřino býti má. Spis Mistra Jana k Robertovi v Konstanci v žaláři sepsany. Item jiný o témž. A pak list k témuž mistra Rokycany.”

Mikuláš inserted his brief treatises into the framework of a Czech translation of Hus's *De sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini* and of Rokycana's opposition to the Brethren's concept of the eucharist.³²

Of course, this edition of Hus's and Rokycana works is well known, as well as recorded in the lists of their works by František M. Bartoš and Pavel Spunar.³³ In addition to preserving the writings of the foremost figures of the Bohemian Reformation, Konáč's publication of Mikuláš's polemic testifies to the conditions in the Utraquist Church in the early 1520s, when the fiction about Hus's opposition to eucharistic veneration was spreading. This fictitious claim aroused a powerful response so that we hear:

that many so openly maintain in this present time with the perverse teachers and ancestors of their disruptive mischievousness; and especially that Master Jan Hus would have so believed, held, and written; causing thereby an enormous injury to this Christian man [že mnozí nynější času tohoto převrácené učitele své výtržné všetečnosti předky svými zjevně tvrdí; a zvláště mistrem Janem Husi, že by on tak věřil, držal a napsal; muži tomu křesťanskému v tom přílišnú křivdu činíce].³⁴

Similarly, priest Mikuláš of Poříčí was less concerned with archiving the Utraquist classic writings than with publicising the views of Hus (the saint) and Rokycana (his disciple) at a time, when it was possible to document from their actual writings the traditional form of eucharistic veneration, as well as the traditional eucharistic concept, both of which derived from the teaching of transubstantiation, and which conservative Utraquists embraced.

Bartoš's lists thus inform us that – in the case of Hus – Mikuláš of Poříčí published these writings with Konáč in order that the reader might learn “how much the wisdom of many contemporary teachers [was] inconsistent with the wisdom of that early teacher, and how far their way [deviated] from

³² Ibid., D3b-D7a: “Mistra Jana z Rokycan list někdy psaný proti oddělení od kněžstva bratří valdenských, a že se křesťané z viery klaněti mají Kristu Pánu v svátosti velebné těla a krve boží etc.”; see also Jaroslav Bidlo ed., *Akty Jednoty bratrské – I*, (Brno 1915) 11–17. Mikuláš elicited a reaction from Lukáš of Prague in his *Odpověď na spis v nově vydaný od kněze Mikuláše, faráře u svatého Petra na Poříčí v Praze léta patnáctistého dvamezciemého*, vtištěný v Litomyšli téhož roku 1522 [Response to the Treatise Newly Published by Priest Mikuláš, Parish Priest of St. Peter's Church in Poříčí of 1522, published in the same year in Litomyšl]; see also Knihopis Nr. 5029. Lukáš responds to the critique of the Brethren's eucharistic teaching and defends the ecclesiastical structure and independence of the Unity. He likewise includes an overview of the Brethren's early contacts with Rokycana,

³³ See František M. Bartoš and Pavel Spunar, *Soupis pramenů k literární činnosti M. Jana Husa a M. Jeronýma Pražského* [List of Sources for the Literary Activity of M. Jan Hus, and Jerome of Prague] (Prague, 1965) Nr. 77, 125–127; F. M. Bartoš, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna* [Literary Activity of M. Jan Rokycana, M. Jan Příbram, M. Peter Payne] (Prague, 1928) Nr. 37, 43–44.

³⁴ See *O velebné svátosti těla a krve Pána Krista*, D7b.

his” [jak velmi se nesrovnává nynějších mnohých učitelů múdrost s tohoto starého učitele múdrostí a kterak cesta jich daleko jest od cesty jeho].³⁵ In the case of Rokycana, the reader might easily conclude “that the teachings of contemporary teachers are more mischievous than solid, and surely deserving of the deepest contempt [“žeť sú nynějších učiteluo více všetečná nežli gruntovní jich učenie a největšího potupení jistě hodná“].³⁶ Bartoš’s lists, however, do not tell us the interesting fact that between the treatises of Hus and Rokycana there is inserted a hitherto little known polemic, the author of which is the priest Mikuláš of Poříčí himself, titled: “A much needed treatise against the contemporary demented deviations from the true faith concerning the venerable sacrament of the Lord’s body and blood, and giving reasons from the Holy Scripture that the Lord Christ should be adored in his venerable body and blood” [“Proti poblúzeným času tohoto od pravé viery při svátosti velebné těla a krve Páně spis velmi potřebný a duvodové z zákona Božího, že má klaněno býti Kristu Pánu v svátosti velebné těla a krve jeho“].³⁷

Thus, only the Spanish specialist, Eduardo Fernández Couceiro, mentioned at the start of this article, has correctly defined, in his recently published booklet, the conservative form of Konáč’s Utraquism. At the same time, as the first one, he significantly expanded the scope of Konáč’s antagonism to cover not only the Unity of Brethren, but also the Prague radicals of the 1520s whom, however, he simplistically places among the adherents of Luther’s teaching. Truth is also on the side of the otherwise controversial Milan Kopecký, who has stressed Konáč’s distaste for denominational differentiation as contrary to national unity. According to our sources, Konáč is after 1511 a genuinely conservative Utraquist. At the same time, his writings are a precious reflection of the religious conditions in Prague, which are, properly speaking, otherwise known only from Bartoš’s *Kronika o pohnutí pražském* [Chronicle of the Prague Upheaval].

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

³⁵ Ibid., A2a.

³⁶ Loc. cit.

³⁷ Ibid., B5b-D3a.