
**A Cohabitation of Convenience:
The Utraquists and the Lutherans
Under the Letter of Majesty, 1609-1620**

Zdeněk V. David

(Washington)

An important landmark in the development of Utraquism in the early seventeenth century was the full legalization of the Bohemian Confession, essentially identical with the Augsburg Confession, a step which was accompanied by the transfer of control over the hitherto Utraquist Consistory from the king and his officials to the Bohemian Diet, dominated by Lutheran nobility. Henceforth the Consistory would administer not only the Utraquists, but also the other so-called *sub utraque* [pod obojí], namely the Lutherans and the Unity of Brethren. This occurred by decision of King-Emperor Rudolf II, incorporated in the famous Letter of Majesty of 9 July 1609. The events and factors leading to the issuance of the document have been thoroughly explored.¹ The aspect that is unclear, and which is addressed in this paper, is the impact of the Letter and of its aftermath on the state of traditional Bohemian Utraquism.

It has been virtually an article of faith with most historians that the Letter of Majesty meant an immediate and irrevocable doom of the Utraquist Church. Along these lines, Václav Tomek has written: "...the Utraquist party, lacking virtually any adherents except for those coerced and those coercing, disappeared [after the events of 1609] almost entirely..."² Krofta has claimed that after 1609 the Utraquist institutions: "...were washed away entirely by the tide of the new conditions."³ Zikmund Winter claims that by 1609 the Utraquists "have by this time almost entirely become [Lutheran] Protestants."⁴ Finally Borový stated most categorically: "On the basis of Emperor Rudolf II's Letter of Majesty...it can be stated that the original Utraquism in the year 1609 became extinct entirely and forever."⁵

The language used in the Letter of Majesty and in its companion document,

1) Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der Ertheilung des böhmischen Majestätsbriefes von 1609* (Prague, 1858); Kamil Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II* (Prague, 1909); Julius Glücklich, "Koncept Majestátu a vznik Porovnaní," ČČH 23 (1917) 110-128.

2) Václav V. Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách od r. 1415 až 1622," ČČM 22 (1848) 462-463.

3) Kamil Krofta, "Od kompaktát k Bílé Hoře," *Listy z náboženských dějin* (Prague, 1936) 355; see also Klement Borový, *Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, arcibiskup pražský; Historicko-kritický životopis*. (Prague, 1873) 196; Jan Kapras, *Právní dějiny země koruny české* (Prague, 1913) 2:536.

4) Zikmund Winter, *Zlatá doba měst českých* (Prague, 1991) 142.

5) "Na základě majestátu císaře Rudolfa II...může se říci, že starý utrakvismus rokem 1609 úplně a navždy zanikl." *Ottův slovník naučný* 1:217.

the Accommodation [*Porovnání*], seemed to support the view of those who regarded the Letter as sounding the death-knell of Utraquism. It implied an adherence to the Bohemian Confession by all those who were not *sub una*. Moreover, the assertions about Utraquism in the several documents of 1609-1618 painted a picture of them, which was curiously in harmony with the fictitious images of proper Old Utraquists disseminated by the propagandists of the Roman Church. The main propositions were four. (1) That the Utraquist priests were ordained by the Archbishop after making the Tridentine profession of faith; (2) that the Utraquist priests owed complete obedience to the Archbishop; (3) that those Utraquist priests, who were not administratively under the Archbishop, fully embraced the Bohemian Confession in 1609 (presumably turning Lutheran); and (4) that the Utraquists constituted an insignificant minority in the total population.⁶

The fatal injury to Utraquism seemed also supported by the fact that the last Administrator of the purely Utraquist Consistory, Tomáš of Soběslav, serving from January to July 1609, had condemned, speaking also for the Consistory, both the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg and the Confession of the Brethren on 7 February 1609. In response to an inquiry by the Bohemian Royal chancery, he reiterated the objections which the Utraquist Consistory had raised against the Bohemian Confession in 1575.⁷

In the light of the above, to argue about the continued health and strength of traditional Utraquism, may seem like trying to square the circle, or trying to prove the impossible. Yet, there is substantial evidence to support this view. What is naturally more important than the rhetoric employed by the official documents is the actual reality allegedly covered by the two documents. This paper shall argue that the reality at the grassroots did not correspond with the declarations at the top.

It will be argued that the support for the Bohemian Confession in 1609 meant establishing its legitimacy as an umbrella for religious dissent from the Roman Church, not as a specific confessional creed of all those supporting its legitimization.⁸ It meant that the Utraquists and the Brethren entered a political alliance with the Lutherans for mutual protection against the party *sub una*, by and large favored by the king and his officials. Inasmuch as the Utraquists, like the Brethren, obviously rejected the theology of the Bohemian Confession, subscribing to the document could be viewed only as acknowledging its function as a symbol of an ecumenical alliance, uniting autonomous religious denominations into what became known as the party *sub utraque*. Since the Utraquists, like the Brethren, did not embrace the theology of the Bohemian Confession to become Lutherans, its text was not regarded as a compulsory theological norm, but as a definition of the outer theological limits consistent with membership in the party *sub utraque*. As in 1575, so in 1609 the political support of the Bohemian Confession was not evidence of its

6) See, especially, *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého, tělo a krev Pána Ježíše Krista pod obojí přijímajících* (Prague, 1619) 205 (no. 27).

7) Josef Vávra, "Katolíci a sněm český r. 1608 a 1609," *Sborník historického kroužku 1* (1893) 15; the text of Thomas's reply is in Vilém Slavata, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého*, ed. Josef Jireček, (Prague, 1866-1868), 1:214-19. Tomáš had been a part of the Consistory's apparatus for a long time, acting for instance as the clerk of the Consistory's court in 1590, see *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* vv. 1-11, 15 (Prague, 1877-1941) 7:453.

8) Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse: Její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Prague, 1912) 437.

religious acceptance. Since the early fifteenth century, a parallel situation had existed in the acceptance by the party *sub una* of the legal validity of the *Compactata* without obviously embracing their religious content. Both phenomena, (1) the recognition of the *Compactata* in 1485 by the *sub una*, and (2) the recognition of the Bohemian Confession in 1609 by the Utraquists and the Brethren, fitted into the framework of the established Bohemian tradition of religious toleration, peace, and harmony.

Utraquism and the Letter of Majesty

1. The alliance tradition

Historically, the political alliance concluded in 1608-1609 between the urban Utraquists with the aristocratic Lutherans and the Brethren may also be viewed as an extension of the discussions around the Bohemian Confession in 1575. As in 1575 the connection of the Lutherans and the Brethren with the nobility gave them more political power than the largely urban Utraquists could master on their own. Hence their political weight, and thus their value as political allies, were not commensurable with their numerical strength.⁹ Even Hrejsa and Krofta admit that the Utraquists not only existed, but were also able to, and did, rally to the Lutherans and the Brethren in support of the Letter of Majesty during the negotiations in 1608-1609 leading up to its adoption.¹⁰ The process began at the session of the Bohemian Diet in May 1608, when Rudolf II's royal crown of Bohemia was jeopardized by the armed pressure of his brother Matthias. The legislative initiative emerged as a series of articles prepared by Václav Budovec of Budov, which were eventually embodied in the Letter of Majesty, reluctantly signed by Rudolf on July 9, 1609.¹¹

The apprehensions of the urban representatives of Utraquism provided the answer to the puzzle why they had agreed to support the legalization of the Bohemian Confession. According to a contemporary account, in May 1608 the barons and knights *sub una* approached those in the Diet administered by the existing Consistory and its priesthood, and urged them to break the alliance with the other estates *sub utraque* inasmuch as their own faith sharply differed from both the Augsburg and the Brethren's confessions. According to the Roman emissaries, if the Utraquists abandoned their heterodox allies, the Emperor was ready to reward them with a special protection of their religion, with grants of high public offices and with other signs of favor. However, the Utraquists, refused to revoke their consent to the legalization of the Bohemian Confession, arguing that the alliance with their heterodox confederates was essential for their own self-preservation. The Utraquists' conviction was that a suppression of the Lutherans and the Brethren would be followed by a disaster for themselves: "If the priests not ordained by bishops [i.e., Lutheran] and the Brethren's clergy were banished, then almost certainly the Consistorial [i.e., Utraquist] clergy would be either banned or brought under the full

9) Concerning the disproportionate weight of the nobles, particular the barons, in contemporary diets see, for instance, Bohumil Navrátil, *Biskupství olomoucké 1576-1579 a volba Stanislava Pavlovského* (Prague, 1909) 3.

10) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 440; Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ: Od Bílé Hory k Palackému* (Prague, 1940) 310; Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II* 17.

11) Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II* 16; for the text of the Diet articles of 1608 see *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 153-157 (no. 15).

jurisdiction of, and into full obedience to, the Archbishop.¹² Aside from its explanatory value of the Utraquists' motives in supporting the Letter, the stance of the Utraquist estates runs counter to two propositions advanced to trivialize the status of Utraquism. These theses, advanced for instance by Gindely and Krofta, postulated that (1) the Utraquists after 1600 gave full obedience to the Archbishop, and (2) that the Utraquists simply did the bidding of the royal government officials.¹³

The reasons which had induced the Utraquist townspeople to seek an alliance with the Lutheran and Unity nobles in 1575 had become even more cogent by 1608-1609, and their decision for the alliance represented, therefore, a rather realistic assessment of the political dangers. As early as 1577, within the milieu of the Roman Church, the destruction of religious dissent in Bohemia had been, in fact, proposed by the application of a procedure more recently known in political and social science as "salami tactics,"¹⁴ that is by sequential elimination of individual groups. Nicholas Lanoy, the visiting inspector of the Austro-Bohemian Jesuit chapter, at that time counseled initially proceeding against the Brethren and other sectarians, and then suppressing the Lutherans, which would subsequently leave the authorities free to deal with the Utraquists.¹⁵ In 1584 Nuncio Bonomi urged Rudolf II to expel the Pikarts and Lutherans from Bohemia, and not tolerate any ministers ordained in Leipzig or Wittenberg. Then he would be free to force the Utraquists into a full union with Rome. Bonomi's successor, Germanicus Malaspina, rejoiced over a breach between the Lutherans and the Brethren in January 1585 at the Diet, since to him the extirpation of the Bohemian dissidence depended on splitting up the various parties. With the same purpose in mind, the nobles *sub una* urged some concessions for the Utraquists, accompanied by a severe suppression of the Brethren.¹⁶ The propagandists for the Roman Church also fell in line behind the approach of fomenting conflicts among the religious dissenters. For instance, the Jesuit Václav Šturm in a treatise of 1584 dwelt heavily on the Brethren's basic theological differences with Luther.¹⁷

The concept of "salami tactics" sank deep roots in the minds of Rudolf II's entourage, and became manifest particularly in the mandates against the Pikharts in 1584 and in 1602. These decrees, inconsistent with the gentlemen's agreement of 1575 under Maximilian II, promising toleration for the Brethren and the Lutherans, aimed at sharpening the differences between the Lutherans and the Brethren, and between both and the Utraquists. As the town representatives would surmise in

12) Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. Karel Tieftrunk, 5 vv. (Prague, 1865-1870) 1:111; also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 437. On the towns' fear of losing religious liberty, if deserted by the nobility, see also Josef Janáček, "Královská města česká na zemském sněmu r. 1609-1610," *Sborník historický* 5 (1956) 230.

13) Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ* 308; Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463; Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder*, 2 vv. (Prague 1861-22) 2:413.

14) This term is based on a brag by Mátyás Rákosi, the infamous Stalinist dictator, about his way of suppressing the democratic opposition in Hungary in the late 1940s, using the simile of the Magyars' treatment of their favorite sausage. On "salami tactics" see also Philip Longworth, *The Making of Eastern Europe: From Prehistory to Postcommunism* (New York, 1992) 80, 231.

15) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 469-474; *Sněmy české* 11:40.

16) On Bonomi and Malaspina see *Sněmy české* 11:58-60.

17) Václav Šturm, *Krátké ozvání ... proti kratičkému ohlášení Jednoty Valdenské neb Boleslavské* (Prague, 1584), 47, 84.

1608, in the quotation cited earlier, the government's moves aimed at an eventual disappearance of Utraquism as well.¹⁸

To explain and to contextualize geographically, ideologically, and historically the decision of the Utraquists to embrace an alliance with the more alien Lutherans and Brethren against the more similar Roman Church, further reasons can be extrapolated or surmised (1) from the analogous behavior of religious denominations in other countries; (2) from the exceptional vulnerability of Utraquism vis a vis the Roman Church; and (3) from historical precedents within Bohemia.

(1) The fact that the Utraquists feared the Roman party, despite their considerable similarity with the Roman Church, more than they did the less similar Lutherans and Brethren, was not an unprecedented stand. It may be, for instance, recalled that the Eastern Orthodox Church of Constantinople under Gregorios Scholarios preferred to take its chances under Turkish Islamic rule to embracing a union with Rome.¹⁹ Similarly, the Orthodox in Poland-Lithuania formed alliances in the sixteenth century with the Calvinists against the political champions of the Roman Church. In a way, the Orthodox had less to fear from a reunion with Rome, than the Utraquists had. The Roman Church would permit the Orthodox under the Unia formula to maintain their distinctive practices and rituals, the hard-nosed attitudes of the curial officials indicated that, with respect to Utraquism, Rome would be satisfied with nothing less than a complete conformity.

(2) In an absolute sense the Utraquists had more to lose from a victory of the Counter Reformation than either the Brethren or the Lutherans. The Brethren had their places of exile prepared abroad (in Poland and Prussia) as a result of previous partial expulsions, especially that of 1547.²⁰ The spirit of Lutheranism was firmly entrenched in neighboring countries, and could not be extinguished by events in Bohemia alone. In fact, Czech Lutherans (after a certain amount of *Gleichschaltung* or brainwashing) would find succor mostly among their German cobelievers after 1620. As for the Utraquists, however, even a theoretical possibility of continued existence was virtually precluded. Their fate would be a complete physical disappearance, although they might continue to live on in national memory.

(3) Going further back in history, the political alliance of the Utraquists with the Lutherans and the Brethren in 1609 may be also be viewed as analogous to the alliance, between the mainline Utraquists and the Taborites during the wars of the Bohemian Reformation, 1420-1431. The political bond of self-preservation operated here also despite drastic, virtually unbridgeable, theological differences. Even the opponent was the same: the secular might seeking to impose the sway of the Roman Church. It may also be recalled that at the beginning of the Protestant Reformation, although the Utraquists did not embrace Luther due to profound theological differences, to an extent they tended to view Lutheranism already then as an ally against the possible ascendancy of the Roman Church. This became

18) Sněmy české 11:54-56.

19) Spyros Vryonis, Jr., "The Byzantine Patriarchate and Turkish Islam," *Byzanto-Slavica* 57 (1996), 82-111. In what must have been one of the colossal miscalculations of the second millennium, Gregorius assumed that the Turks, unable to resist the beauty of the Orthodox service, would abandon Islam for Christianity.

20) Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem, Pa., 1992) 183-193, 224-249.

particularly manifest in the initial negotiations concerning the Bohemian Confession in 1575.²¹ Zdeněk V. David, "The Plebeianization of Utraquism: The Controversy over the Bohemian Confession of 1575," in *BRRP* 2 (1998), 135-141.

2. Guarantees Given the Utraquists

The Utraquist townsmen did not give their consent without guarantees. Despite some of its language, the Letter of Majesty assumed the continued coexistence of a variety *sub utraque*. The basic assurance came from the main architect of the arrangement under the Letter, Václav Budovec of Budov, on June 25, 1609, who specifically defined the party *sub utraque* which rallied under the banner of the Bohemian Confession as consisting of three distinct groups: (1) the Utraquists, that is, those administered hitherto by the Prague Consistory; (2) those administered by priests ordained in Germany, that is, the Lutherans, and (3) the Brethren. Interestingly enough, the Utraquists were named first before the Lutherans and the Brethren. Budovec went on to compare, rather infelicitously, the three distinct groups among the *sub utraque* to the various religious orders in the party *sub una* which differ as to their peculiar rules and rites in clothing, food, and religious rituals. He further compared the three kinds of *sub utraque* to the various churches with which St. Paul had to deal in his Epistles, like the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians. Although diverse in ritual, rules, and even doctrine, the Apostle did not seek to impose uniformity on these ecclesiastical communities.²² Budovec's speech at the Bohemian Diet on January 11, 1603 already foreshadowed his ecumenical attitude. Then, protesting the mandate against the Brethren, he stated that the various *sub utraque*, though differing in religion, (1) helped each other; (2) all were baptized in the name of the Trinity; (3) all served the one Lord God; (4) all fought the Turks; (5) all were under the same ruler. Budovec continued to stress the Christians' common interest in resisting Islamization in his treatise, *Antialkorán*, published in 1614, though originally completed in 1593.²³

Of significance, though a rather ambiguous one, for the Utraquists, was also a guarantee on which the royal government insisted in the form of the so-called *Porovnání*, which accompanied and qualified the Letter of Majesty. On its surface, the document pledged protection of the existing Utraquist priests and parishes in their beliefs and rituals. Utraquist priests could be freely appointed on both royal and private estates, and Utraquists in towns were also to have free access to their services. The government (the highest officials of the land) promised to intercede with the Roman Archbishop of Prague to ordain Utraquist priests.²⁴ With respect to

21) Zdeněk V. David, "Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism's Encounter with Luther," CV 38 (1996) 59-63;

22) Julius Glücklich, *O historických dílech Václava Budovce z Budova z let 1608-1610 a jejich poměru k Slavatovi, Skálovi a neznámému dosud diariu lutherána Karla Zikmundova* [Rozpravy České Akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění. Třída I., číslo 42] (Prague, 1911) 68; Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 1:108-109.

23) *Sněmy české* 10:428. Budovec once more stressed in a letter to Rudolf II delivered by him on February 19, 1603, that the different denominations of Christians were united by (1) belief in the same God and his Son; (2) opposition to the Turkish pagans; *Sněmy české* 10:455; Václav Budovec of Budov, *Antialkorán*, ed. Noemi Rejchrtová (Prague, 1989) 12.

24) Glücklich, "Koncept Majestátu a vznik porovnání," 121-2, 127; Vávra, "Katolíci a sněm český," 12-13; Robert Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský* (Prague, 1992) 37-39.

Utraquist clergy, however, the language of the *Porovnění* lacked clarity, and introduced a degree of confusion as to the actual status of the Utraquists and their clergy. The designation used for Utraquist clergy was "the priests *sub utraque* ordained by the Archbishop of Prague." Since a large number of Utraquist priests must be assumed to have been ordained by bishops of the Roman Church other than the Prague Archbishop, the definition sounded oddly restrictive. What is more significant, however, is that the *Porovnění* did not refer to these priests as under the *jurisdiction* of the Archbishop, but merely to their *ordination* by the Archbishop. Likewise, while the language of the *Porovnění* characterized the Utraquist priests as "not ordained according to the Bohemian Confession," it did not specifically deny their administrative subordination to the new Consistory.²⁵

Certain other documents later reprinted in the official defense statement of the estates *sub utraque* for their insurrection, the so-called *Second Apology* [*Druhá Apologie*] of 1618, appeared to charge that the Utraquists had in fact been coerced to operate under the Roman prelate's authority. The crucial document is the instruction issued for the - as yet unreconstructed - Utraquist Consistory by Rudolf II on January 23, 1609, and included in the *Apology* as Document no. 16. It admonished the Consistory to observe the rituals of the Archdiocese of Prague. On closer examination, however, it becomes clear that the injunction did not refer to the Post-Tridentine usages of the Roman Church, implying obedience to the current Archbishop of Prague. The instruction specifically spoke of the Rubrics of Prague which the Utraquists "had always observed", that is in defiance of the changing modes of Roman liturgy.²⁶ While for the Lutherans these liturgies might have been as abominable as the Tridentine ones, for the Utraquists they had been standard since the Bohemian Reformation, and in no way signified a submission to Rome's current administrative or judicial jurisdiction. Another document of the *Apology* (no. 12) cited the oath which the Archbishop required of the Utraquists before priestly ordination after 1605 which pledged allegiance to the decrees of the Council of Trent and of the Prague Synod of the Roman Church in 1605. The implication was that the candidates submitted to this procedure. Another document, cited by the *Apology* (Remonstrance of 1608, no. 14), however, corrects such a misinterpretation by specifying that the Utraquist candidates refused to take the oath and sought ordinations elsewhere.²⁷

It was simply not the case that the Utraquists were ever administratively subordinated to the Archbishop. The periodic, but unfruitful, discussions of adjusting this relationship, which had been pursued since 1564, were largely abandoned after the fiasco of the Fabian Rezek affair, involving an apostasy to Rome of the Utraquist Administrator in 1593.²⁸ A further cooling of relations followed the succession of Zbyněk Berka (1592-1606) as Archbishop of Prague by prelates who were no longer of Czech nationality. Falling under the Archbishop's power was

25) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 205. Generally on the confusing language of the *Porovnění*, see also the comment of Josef Pekař, *Dějiny československé* (Prague, 1991) 97.

26) "...učení kteréhož se Čechové staří podobojí vždycky přidrželi." *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 160.

27) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 127-130, 141.

28) Josef Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř pod obojí za administrátora Rezka," ČČH 37 (1931) 285-91

exactly what the Utraquists were trying to avoid in accepting the invitation of the Lutherans and the Brethren, communicated by Budovec, to form a tripartite federation in 1608. A possible explanation of such counterfactual assertions in historical literature is that the alleged Utraquist priests under the Archbishop's jurisdiction were those who were authorized to distribute communion in both kinds according to the Tridentine rite, on the basis of the papal dispensation of 1564. However, no self-respecting Utraquist would resort to their services, as is attested by the firm resistance to the occasional attempts of Archbishop Berka to impose Roman priests, distributing communion in both kinds, on traditionally Utraquist parishes in the 1600s.²⁹

In view of the guarantees received by the Utraquists in 1609, one can argue that not much has substantially changed in comparison with the state of affairs since 1575. The informal recognition of the Bohemian Confession and of the Brethren's Confession now became formally legal, but the injunction against a forcible imposition of the Protestant dogmas on the Utraquists was likewise overtly legalized in the *Porovnání*. The most marked change was the broadening of the Consistory to include Lutherans and Brethren, but the very existence of this division between the two served as a kind of additional warranty against pressure toward homogenization of all those standing formally outside the fold of the Roman Church. While historians have maintained that the Utraquists wished to unite with the Roman Church in order to stem the tide of the Protestant Reformation, the opposite was the case. Their aim was an alliance with the Protestants to protect themselves against a forced union with Rome.³⁰

The Ecumenical Consistory

1. Historical background.

In trying to assess the impact of the situation created by the Letter of Majesty on the Utraquists, the thorniest problem is perhaps the loss of the Utraquist Consistory, and its replacement by an institution which would serve all Bohemian dissidents from the Roman Church who observed the limits of the Bohemian Confession of 1575. The advantage of a joint Consistory from the Lutheran point of view is evident. It provided an administrative center which its clergy hitherto lacked. It is less obvious, but also true, that the separate Utraquist Consistory had also disadvantages for the Utraquists; in its lack of social and political weight it exposed the Church to invidious subtle, or not so subtle outside pressures. To explain this fragility, we must at least briefly glance at the situation of the Utraquist Consistory in the preceding period between 1575 and 1609.

The Utraquist Consistory, as a relatively penurious plebeian institution, had a fragile organizational structure. Its primary dependence on the monarch and his officials since 1562 (rather than on the Bohemian Diet) was turning from a factor of strength to one of considerable risk. Lacking its own apparatus for enforcement of

29) *Sněmy české* 10:330, 333.

30) See earlier with reference to Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 1:111. On the alleged desire to fuse with Rome see, for instance, Anna Skýbová, "Česká šlechta a jednání o povolení kompaktát r. 1525," in *Proměny feudální třídy v Čechách v pozdním feudalismu*, ed. Josef Petráň (Prague, 1976) [Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et historica 1 (1976), Studia historica, 14] 97.

decisions or judgments, it needed to appeal to outside agencies, which usually were not particularly sympathetic, be they the King, the highest officials of the land, or the archbishops. Its social and administrative weight was slight, even in comparison with the archbishop's establishment, which was at least underpinned by the income from his estates, although he presided over a relatively small flock. In October 1582 it even appeared that the Administrator might lose his modest source of income as the abbot of the Emmaus monastery.³¹ The discrepancy in power and prestige proved still riskier when the King entrusted the archbishop with protection of Utraquist parishes against Protestant encroachments. As mentioned earlier, the archbishop tended to misuse his power and made attempts, under the guise of protecting Utraquism, to convert their parishes to *sub una*. Even the royal towns, though generally loyal to Utraquism, often failed to fully cooperate with the Consistory in executing its directives.³² Nuncio Speciano's arrangement of Administrator Rezek's apostasy in 1593 underlined the Consistory's vulnerability, despite the fact that its rapid and decisive recovery from this assault testified to its vitality and resiliency.

The status of the Utraquist Consistory deteriorated further in the middle of the first decade of the seventeenth century. With respect to the government the insolent treatment of Administrator Václav Dačický by Chancellor Zdeněk of Lobkovice in 1604 demonstrated the low regard for the Utraquist ecclesiastical establishment on the part of the King's officials, increasingly recruited from the ranks of the Roman Church. To add insult to injury, Dačický found it necessary to appeal to the Archbishop to intervene in his favor with the Chancellor.³³ The use of the Archbishops' mediating role became even less appealing for the Consistory when Berka's death in 1606 inaugurated a series of foreigners in the archiepiscopal chair of Bohemia. Archbishops Karl of Lamberg (1607-1612) and Johann Lohelius (1612-1622), would be scrupulous executors of the Curia's will and, unlike their Czech predecessors, devoid of any vestigial sympathy for Utraquism. In contrast, for instance, Berka himself in his youth had been raised as a Utraquist and his episcopal consecration required a prior humiliating abjuration of religious errors.³⁴

With the threat from the Archbishop and with the King a questionable champion, the argument can be made that the Utraquists actually welcomed the protection by the joint Consistory. The noble protectors of the joint Consistory, the *defensores*, backed in cases of need by the estates *sub utraque*, could muster enough social prestige and political muscle to stand up against the pressures of the Roman Church, and do so more dependably than the King and his entourage with their Roman sympathies and their, at best, ambiguous attitude toward authentic Utraquism.³⁵ There was a precedent of the Consistory's appeal for support to the

31) *Sněmy české* 6:268-269; see also about the Spartan living conditions of the Administrator in 1598, *Sněmy české* 9:592; and his petition of 1582, *Sněmy české* 6:225.

32) Zdeněk V. David, "The Utraquists and the Lutherans: Toleration and Orthodoxy in Bohemia, 1575-1609," unpublished paper presented at the German Studies Association, Twenty-Second Annual Conference, Salt Lake City, October 10, 1998, 5-11.

33) *Sněmy české* 11/1:76; Slavata, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého* 1:47; on Rudolf II's favoritism of adherents of the Roman Church, Jaroslav Pánek, "K povaze vlády Rudolfa II. v českém království," *FHB* 18 (1997) 78-79; *Sněmy české* 10:646.

34) Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř pod obojí za administrátora Rezka," 278-279.

35) See, for instance, Rudolf II's exhortation to the Utraquist clergy and believers to respect and

Bohemian Diet as early as December 1586, when it asked the estates *sub utraque* to intercede on its behalf with Rudolf II.³⁶ Moreover, the *defensores*, who would oversee and support the Consistory, would include town representatives who could be presumed to favor Utraquism.

From the Utraquists' historical perspective the idea of a joint Consistory was not utterly novel. The composition of the transient body of the *defensores*, elected in September 1575 (with Utraquism represented by the town members) may be viewed as a prefiguration of the religious balance of power in the post-1608 Consistory. As an earlier anticipation, one may refer to the abortive discussions between Administrator Martin Mělnický and Bishop Jan Augusta in the late 1560s which raised the possibility of a joint consistory for the Utraquists and the Bohemian Brethren.³⁷ As for other intimations, there had been approaches to the Utraquist Consistory in the late sixteenth-century for adjudication of disputes involving Lutheran clergy, as well as the willingness of the Lutheran noble estates to back the urban Utraquists' Diet petition in 1590 for strengthening the Consistory and for ordination of Utraquist priests by the archbishop.³⁸

2. Federation of the three types of *sub utraque*.

None of the above would have mattered, however, if the new Consistory literally insisted on imposing Lutheranism under the guise of the Bohemian Confession. In fact, it must be stressed that the new joint Consistory, which replaced the earlier Utraquist one, should not be viewed as a Protestant Holy Office, enforcing doctrinal uniformity, but rather as an ecumenical council, loosely confederating and serving the Lutherans, the Brethren, and the Utraquists. This, of course, corresponded to the definition of the groups eventually under the Letter of Majesty by Budovec as indeed a league of three distinct and autonomous types of *sub utraque*. The federated character was reflected already in the composition of the commission that was to formulate the character of the new joint consistory, beginning on 30 July 1609, after it had received the records and archives of the terminated Utraquist Consistory from Tomáš of Soběslav. The commission included together with four each of Lutheran and Unity clergymen also four Utraquist priests with canonical episcopal ordinations, who were hitherto administered by the Utraquist Consistory.³⁹ Budov cogently expressed the basis of the coexistence of the Utraquists, Lutherans and Brethren in a single alliance. Admitting that there was "a triple difference in orders and ceremonies within the party *sub utraque* in Bohemia," he affirmed that "the different orders, ceremonies and ecclesiastical disciplines among them, do not and, God willing, will not destroy the unity of divine truth...or the bond of Christian love among them..."⁴⁰ As the Brethren were to testify

cherish the new Archbishop Martin Medek in February 1582, *Sněmy české* 6:175; František Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* (Prague 1917-1925) viii, xi.

36) *Sněmy české* 7:60-61.

37) David, "The Plebeianization of Utraquism: The Controversy over the Bohemian Confession of 1575," 150; *Sněmy české* 4:411.

38) *Sněmy české* 5:748-749; 7:494.

39) Later four professors of the Prague University, as well as another Lutheran minister, were added, see Hrejša, *Česká konfesse* 473-474.

40) "...jsou v Čechách trojí mezi stranou pod obojí v řádích a ceremoniích rozdíly...", "...pak rozdílné řády, ceremonie a církevní kázně mezi nimi jsou, to už jednotu pravdy Boží,...též ani svazek

in retrospect, the common Consistory was a sign of solidarity and compromise, not of amalgamation.⁴¹

Contrary to some assertions, the Utraquist priests were free to continue the traditional rituals and to adhere to their traditional confessional statements, last summarized by Tomáš of Soběslav in 1609.⁴² Their position under the Consistory was to some extent analogous to that of the Brethren's clergy. The Brethren did not revoke their own confession, and insisted on retaining their own priesthood, orders of worship, and their church order and discipline. While every clergyman had to subscribe to certain minimum requirements of Christian belief, he was free to pursue his proper liturgical ritual. While radical sectarianism was excluded on the one hand, the Utraquists and the Brethren, on the other hand, could engage in their specific rites.⁴³

Beyond that there is evidence that the Utraquists could find a friendly milieu under the new arrangement of ecclesiastical administration. The estates *sub utraque* were willing to advocate the causes of the Utraquists in their protests. For instance, their remonstrance to Rudolf II of 1608, repeated in the *Second Apology* of 1618 as document 14, denounced strongly the brutal treatment of Administrator Dačický by chancellor Lobkovice, the unreasonable promises sought by the archbishop from Utraquist priests before ordination, the omission of the feast of Jan Hus from the calendar, and the transfer of the abbotship of the Emmaus Monastery from the Utraquists to the *sub una*. The estates likewise posed as advocates for Utraquism, in particular by chastizing the Archbishops for their hard-nosed insistence on an oath to Tridentine Decrees as a precondition for ordination of Utraquist priests, which was basically unacceptable for the Utraquists. As pointed out earlier, the remonstrance of 1608, repeated ten years later in the *Second Apology*, most significantly stressed that the Utraquist candidates did not succumb to the blandishments of the archbishop, but turned for their ordination (presumably an episcopal one) elsewhere. The statement about "priests taken from the Archbishop" - in the *Porovnání* - should probably be interpreted as reflecting the continuing hope that the Archbishop might be induced to ordain Utraquist priests. It might also reflect the fact that certain priests were ordained by the Archbishop, either as Utraquists (the seven under Archbishop Berka) or subsequently defected from Roman obedience. In neither case would this category of clergy be in administrative subordination to the Archbishop.⁴⁴

A puzzling element, concerning the post-1609 status of Utraquist clergy, is introduced by the text of Church Order, issued on the instruction of the estates *sub*

lásky křesťanské mezi nimi neboří a bohdá nezboří..."; Glücklich, *O historických dílech Václava Budovce z Budova* 68.

41) *Na spis proti jednotě bratrské od Samuele Martinia etc: sepsaný...Ohlášení* (Lešno, 1635) 43.

42) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 533. On the dealings of Matouš Pačuda with the Consistory in September 1616, see Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* 405; Slavata, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého* 1:214-19.

43) Rudolf Řičan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem, Pa., 1992) 331-332; Antonín Rezek, *Dějiny prstonárodního hnutí náboženského v Čechách od vydání tolerančního patentu až na naše časy* (Prague, 1887) 13; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* viii.

44) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 141, 143, 205. On Berka's Utraquist ordinations see *Sněmy české* 11/1:74.

utraque by the *defensores* after their election on 16 January 1610. This ecclesiastical regulation, addressed to the "priests of the Lord *sub utraque* and with heart and lips adhering to the Bohemian Confession" mandated the abandonment of specifically Utraquist liturgical practices: processions, exhibits of the host in a monstrance, elevation of the host, infant communion, and traditional liturgical books, namely missals, breviaries, and agenda and rubrics of the Archbishopric of Prague. An actual general implementation of this order, covering all the clergy administered by the Consistory *sub utraque*, would have been entirely unacceptable to Utraquists. This is a situation when a document needs to be read not only between the lines, but even against the grain, as Alexandra Walsham points out in facing similar conundrums in the history of the English Reformation.⁴⁵ As just noted above, the statement is counterfactual since the Consistory in its subsequent functioning, indeed, covered not only the Lutherans, but also the Utraquist clergy and the Brethren. The Unity, in fact, subsequently also perpetuated its own liturgical peculiarities and disregarded the regulations of the Church Order.⁴⁶

Hence the liturgical injunctions of the Church Order could be viewed either as mere formalities or empty phrases, or more probably as meant to bind only those clergymen who accepted the Bohemian Confession, not merely as a general umbrella of the permissible, but as their specific and full confessional statement, i.e. the Lutheran clergy. The clue probably should be sought in the address of these rules to "priests of the Lord *sub utraque* and [my emphasis] with heart and lips adhering to the Bohemian Confession," if this phrase is interpreted, not in a generally descriptive, but in a restrictive sense as referring only to the Lutheran clergy.⁴⁷ Such a restriction might have been logical because the Lutheran ministers had hitherto lacked a regular organization which would have issued a formal set of rules. While they had lived in a state of "lawlessness," the Utraquists, like the Brethren, had their rules formally spelled out and established, hence did not need them issued again. The Lutheran clergy, on the contrary, until 1609 had to operate on the margins without an umbrella organization (1) in the private churches or chapels of manorial seigneurs, or (2) under the protection of the city councils of several German-speaking towns that recently defected from the Roman Church.⁴⁸ The latter instances involved continuous battles against the Archbishop's efforts to dislodge them. It might be said that only in 1609 the Lutheran clergy had a chance to step fully out of the closet.

Naturally there was a price to be paid by the Utraquists to their new protectors, the Bohemian estates. The nobility *sub utraque* received its pound of

45) Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Testamenti nostri Iesu Christi pia et fida assertio. To jest: Kšaftu Večeře Páně svatá Starožitnost, pobožná posloupnost, dlouhověká až právě do dne soudného trvanlivost: V níž z nařízení Kristového, z učení evangelistského a apoštolského, z doktorů a sněmů osvícených, z kanonu a práv duchovních, z historií církevních, a nejvíce našich českých, etc.* (Prague, 1613) 213-215. Hrejsa dates the Church Order [církevní řád] to 1609 and reprints it in *Česká konfesse* 484 n. 1. Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *JEH* 49 (1998) 651.

46) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 485.

47) "Protož zvláštní Instrukci Konsistořskou nám kněžím Páně pod obojím, a Konfesí České srdcem i ústy se přiznávajícím, vydati ráčili." Cited by Bruncvík, *Kšaftu večeře Páně* 213.

48) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 484-485; David, "The Utraquists and the Lutherans: Toleration and Orthodoxy in Bohemia, 1575-1609," 4-5.

flesh through a conspicuous, though largely symbolic, display of its religious preferences with the Lutheran and Brethren's clergy featured in the Consistory and in a few prominent churches in Prague. As early as October 1609, Jan Cykáda protested against the tendency to limit the Utraquist clergy's membership in the reconstructed Consistory. Although the first administrator of the joint Consistory, Eliáš Šud of Semanín (1609-1614) was a Utraquist, he was succeeded by two Lutherans, Zykmond Crinitus (1614-1619), and Jiřík Dykastus (1619-1621). It is evidently too strong to say, as Tomek does, that after 1609 the Utraquists "played no noticeable part in the ecclesiastical administration of the party *sub utraque*..."⁴⁹

Hence, the ecclesiastical leaders of Utraquism like, for practical reasons, its political leaders, could feel reasonably secure in a friendly alliance with the Lutherans and the Brethren. While the Roman Church required a full embracing of the Tridentine standard, the Lutherans and the Brethren did not demand a conformity with the Bohemian Confession or another norm, unacceptable to the Utraquists. Escaping the insults of royal officials, and the subtle and unsubtle pressures of the Archbishops to turn *sub una*, might be viewed as a welcome relief for the Utraquists. Switching their patronage from a combination of the Roman Archbishop and the Catholic Habsburg Kings to that of the Lutheran nobility need not have been such an oddity as it might have seemed to some.⁵⁰ As we shall see, it would be a mistake to impute to the Czech Lutherans, that is, the authentic believers in the Bohemian Confession, the same degree of intolerance as characterized the contemporary champions of the Counter Reformation, like archbishop Lohelius, or those of German Lutheranism and Calvinism, like the notorious Matthias Hoë von Hoënegg or Abraham Scultetus.⁵¹ The Czech Lutheran, Samuel Martinius of Dražov, stressed the need of amicable coexistence in a period of confessional diversity in his *Oratio de Concordia ecclesiae* (1618). As for the Utraquists the idea of a joint Consistory also harmonized with their *via media* tradition of open-mindedness and tolerance with respect to diverging religious opinions. Thus Matěj Stříbrský devoted a treatise to charity, published in 1610, which culminates in a hymn celebrating solidarity and concord among the clergy, as well as laity.⁵²

Toleration and Orthodoxy

Hitherto the argument has been directed at showing that the high degree of religious toleration, the outstanding feature of Bohemia in the early seventeenth century, was viewed by the party *sub utraque* as a stable condition, not as a mere prelude to, or a temporary pause before, an impending Lutheran religious homogenization. It is also important to address the opposite (mis)perception, namely that the Bohemian tolerance, in fact, reflected a religious laxness, verging on nihilism. The remarkable freedom of religion in Bohemia in the opening decades of

49) František Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* (Prague 1917-1925) v-vi; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 482; Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463, 468.

50) For the Utraquists, the change of protection from the *sub una* adherents in the royal government to that of the noble Lutheran *defensores* in the Diet, might be compared *mutatis mutandis* to the passing of a Christian community in India from the protection of a Hindu maharajah to that of Moslem nazims or nabobs.

51) On Hoë see, for instance, Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 521-522; on Scultetus, *ibid.* 546-553.

52) Samuel Martinius z Dražova, *Oratio de concordia ecclesiae his ultimis temporibus plurimum necessaria*. (Prague, 1617), ff. B7v-C2v, C5r-C6r, D6v-D7r; Matěj Stříbrský, *Knížka spasitedlných naučení* (Prague, 1610) f. B6v.

the seventeenth century is noted, among others, by the pamphlet, *Euangelische Erklarung auff die Böhaimische Apologia* (1618), which claimed (undoubtedly with some exaggeration): "What is in Bohemia freer than religion? Every house has its own order and discipline, nobody is bound to any one religion, but regrettably everyone can believe what he wants."⁵³ Also the Jesuits commented on the religious laissez-faire in Bohemia in their *Apology* of 1618, published in Vienna after their expulsion from Prague on the outbreak of the Bohemian Uprising. With their penchant for rigorous conformity, the happy coexistence of the three types of *sub utraque* - the Utraquists or *Hussitas*, the Lutherans, and the Brethren - struck them as most reprehensible. According to the Jesuit *Apology*, the three types of *sub utraque* differed among each other more than the Utraquists from the Roman Church. While the Utraquist honored the eucharist as the body and blood of Christ in the Corpus Christi procession, their Calvinizing confreres, like Havel Phaëton Žalanský in 1618, preached that the eucharist was just ordinary bread and wine. The *Apology* asked: "How does one know which Word of God to hold for the right one: Whether that of the Lutherans, or of the Calvinists/Picards, or of the Utraquists [Hussitarum] (which is the oldest in Bohemia)?"⁵⁴ The situation of religious pluralism was equally distasteful for the champions of thought control at the other side of the ledger, particularly the Lutherans of Saxony, whose voice was represented in Prague by Hoë from 1611-1613.⁵⁵ In a way, Josef Válka calls attention to this phenomenon in referring to Czech politicians' willingness to cooperate across denominational lines, but in calling them "superconfessional Christians" [*nadkonfesijní křesťané*] he seems to imply that this meant abandoning the specificity of their religious beliefs. There is also a less drastic suggestion by František Šmahel that the Bohemian religious forbearance - as early as the peace of Kutná Hora in 1485 - marked a lessening of religious dedication.⁵⁶ This, however, need not be the case.

Was there actually a diminution in the particular denominational beliefs? We find, to the contrary, that the spokesmen for Utraquism uncompromisingly affirmed their creeds against the beliefs of the Lutherans and the Brethren, as in 1575 and 1609, and it would be difficult to imagine a more categorical rejection by Lutheran divines of what they interpreted as grave errors of the Brethren.⁵⁷ It is unnecessary

53) *Euangelische Erklarung auff die Böhaimische Apologia*. (Vienna[?], 1618) f. B3v. On this pamphlet, allegedly by Lutherans loyal to the Habsburg dynasty, see Antonín Markus, "Stavovské apologie z roku 1618," ČČH 17 (1911) 213-216. A Czech translation is in Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 2:241-270.

54) Adam Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu ex Boemiae Regno ab eiusdem regni statibus religionis sub utraque, publico decreto immerito proscripta. Anno M.DC.XVIII. die VIII Junij* (Vienna, 1618) 18-19, 52-53.

55) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 521-522.

56) Josef Válka, "Problémy syntézy moderních českých dějin," *Husitství, Reformace, Renaissance: Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek and others. (Prague, 1994) 3:1052; František Šmahel, "Svoboda slova, svatá válka a tolerance z nutnosti v husitském období," ČČH 92 (1994) 677.

57) On the Utraquist attitude see Vávra, "Katolíci a sněm český," 15; text of Thomas's reply is in Slavata, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého* 1:214-19; on the Lutheran attitude, Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 523-526; "Zdání o napravení způsobu církví evangelických českých a uvedení jich v jednotu," in Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 2:43-49; see also Jan Štelcar Želetavský z Želetavy, *Knížka o pravé a falešné církvi* (Prague, 1589) ff. M1r-M2v.

to speak about the Brethren's disdain for the beliefs of either the Utraquists or the Lutherans. As the evidence indicates, this sense of profound religious distinctions did not appear to be weakened or diluted by the genuine cooperation of the lay leaders of Utraquism, Lutheranism and the Unity for political objectives. Thus the urban Utraquists, as long as their church remained protected in its original orthodoxy, did not have to feel threatened by the religious beliefs of the Lutheran nobles or the Unity sectarians, which could equally flourish in their enclosed and safeguarded domains. Within this context, the Utraquists could safely form an amicable political alliance with them against the possible aggression of the Habsburg dynasty or the Roman party. This stance did not imply a dilution or a compromise of their religious devotion, integrity, or firm orthodoxy. The spirit of genuine toleration could coexist with an undiluted, uncompromised, and fervent devotion to a particular church. In fact, the architect of the political alliance of all the *sub utraque*, Budovec, considered the discussion of religious issues and diversity of opinions as a hallmark of true Christianity. An imposition of doctrinal uniformity would be a sign of Islamization. Elsewhere Budovec spoke of the various churches with which St. Paul had to deal in his Epistles, like the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians. Thus the Apostle combined with a firm attachment to definite beliefs, a tolerance for what he considered grievous errors of others. Although he detested, and even wept over, some of the customs of his correspondents, St. Paul placed love for others above all, and repudiated the use of force to achieve a singleness of rites, rules, and even doctrines.⁵⁸

We can call on an outside witness to illustrate the mind set which holds that fervent faith is not incompatible with a willingness to accept coexistence with other faiths, which one holds utterly false. The famous seventeenth-century apostle of religious toleration in England and North America, Roger Williams, compared

the church to an enclosed garden which could be kept free of weeds, while weeds may flourish freely outside its walls. He wrote:

A false religion out of the Church will not hurt the Church no more than weeds in the wilderness hurt the inclosed Garden, or poyson hurt the body when it is not touched or taken, yea and antidotes are received against it.⁵⁹

A politically based tolerance toward other religious groups or churches need not imply a diminution of the attachment to the orthodoxy of one's own group or church.

For the long run there was a pious wish, and possibly even a genuine expectation, that the religious divisions would not last forever. We have noted earlier the Utraquist view of a perpetual negotiation with the Roman Church in an implied hope of opening the misguided (step)mother's eyes to the light of reason. The Letter of Majesty was formally regarded as a provisorium until a universal Christian

58) Budovec of Budov, *Antialkorán* 17; Glücklich, *O historických dílech Václava Budovce z Budova* 68; Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 1:108-109.

59) Roger Williams, *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution, for cause of Conscience, discussed, in A Conference between Truth and Peace* (London, 1644) 103, cited by Norah Carlin, "Toleration for Catholics in the Puritan Revolution," in Ole P. Grell, and Bob Scribner, eds., *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (New York, 1996) 219.

Council would reestablish a unity of faith and practice. The Lutheran theologian, Zacharyáš Bruncvík in 1614 looked forward to such an ecumenical assembly to put an end to dissensions and bloodshed among Christians.⁶⁰

Measures of Utraquist Strength and Vitality

After examining the historical and institutional background of Utraquism's post-1609 adjustment, let us now explore the signs of its continuing strength and popularity among the Czechs of Bohemia under the Letter of Majesty against the conventional historical view of their virtual disappearance during this period.

(1) What was already discussed about the character of the joint Consistory, indicated clearly that there were Utraquist priests under the jurisdiction of the Consistory who did not subscribe to the theology and liturgy of the Bohemian Confession. Priests with unquestionably Utraquist credentials, including canonical ordinations, like Jan Cykáda, Jan Locika of Domažlice, and Matauš Pačuda, operated under the jurisdiction of the Consistory, without evidently being required to embrace theologically the Bohemian Confession. One could, perhaps, speak of a political acceptance, rather than theological endorsement of the Confession on their part.⁶¹

Even under the Letter of 1609 Utraquism maintained its strong presence in towns. The city councils selected their own clergymen for appointment, and sent or delivered through its deputies or envoys a request for confirmation of their candidates to the Administrator and the Consistory. Because of the rooted tradition of urban Utraquism, this arrangement would favor appointment of Utraquist priests, particularly in royal towns.⁶² As pointed out earlier, Prague seemed to be something of an exception in this regard. Because of the prestige value of the city and its position as the seat of the Consistory, Lutheran ministers were appointed as pastors to important churches. However, the bulk of Prague's population remained loyal to Utraquism. Even where Lutheran ministers were appointed, Utraquist services were not eliminated. Thus, a Czech Lutheran, Jiří Dykastus, who served as pastor of the Týn Church from 1614 and later in 1619 was to become the Administrator, had to employ a Utraquist chaplain who performed religious services in the Utraquist mode.⁶³ In 1617 a royal instruction also affirmed the Utraquist dominance in Prague town government, and King Matthias (1611-1619), Rudolf II's successor, included two Utraquists and merely one Lutheran in appointing a Council of Lieutenancy during his absence from Bohemia.

In the spring of 1618, the councilmen of the Old Town of Prague participated in a Utraquist religious procession, which ran against Lutheran precepts.⁶⁴ The decree of the Directors of the insurgent government, as late as June 1619, implied

60) Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II 37*; Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Pravitatis et impletatis haereticae pia et fida ostensio. To jest: Zrcadlo Kacířství: Do něhož kdo zdravě nahlídne, Allegata, u Doktorů Církve vykázaná, přeběhne, pozná, že my Katolíci pod obojí nevinně, a bez náležitého vši Svaté Říše vyslyšení od některých se kaceřujeme.* (Prague, 1614) f. A3v.

61) Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* 405, 412, 461 (Pačuda) 443-445 (Locika).

62) *Ibid.* vii.

63) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 533, 536 n.3, 544 n. 4; "Dikastus," *Ottův slovník naučný* 7:533.

64) Markus, "Stavovské apologie z roku 1618," 205; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* xi; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536.

that the Utraquists had a predominance in the three towns of Prague.⁶⁵

In violation of the pledge of tolerating a variety of ecclesiastical rituals, the noble *defensores* were occasionally tempted to interfere with the performance of Utraquist rites. Such attempts had more of a nuisance value than a real effect. Thus despite their displeasure, the solemn Utraquist procession of Corpus Christi was conducted in 1613, in which the priests offended the Lutheran, as well as Roman, sensitivities by carrying the sacrament in both kinds in public.⁶⁶ The predominance of Utraquist sentiments among the priests of Prague is indicated by their closing of ranks behind Locika in the face of a vendetta against him in the summer of 1617 for sharp public criticism of Lutheran tenets and rites. As late as April 1618 this Utraquist ecclesiastical luminary could conduct the above-mentioned solemn procession in Prague with the participation of city councilmen. Displaying the sacraments, the marchers commemorated the Resurrection on Holy Saturday.⁶⁷

Thanks in part to the *Porovnání*, Utraquism continued to be protected after 1609 in its existing positions not only in towns, but also on private estates. The principle of non-interference by feudal seigneurs with the religion of their subjects was continued under the Letter of Majesty until the Bohemian Uprising of 1618-1620. In fact, charges of the violation of this principle by the royal government figured prominently in the reasons given for the uprising by the insurgent estate in their *Second Apology* of 1618. This principle rather baffled the other European, and especially the neighboring, lands where the coercion of subjects by their seigneurs was considered a norm under the proviso *cuius regio, eius religio*.⁶⁸ It showed the exceptionality of the pattern of religious toleration in Bohemia at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Utraquism remained particularly strong on royal and archiepiscopal estates despite the fact that the King once more gave the Archbishop Johann Lohelius the right to appoint clergy there on 24 October 1612. A survey of the parishes in 1613 by Tobiáš Cocius for the Archbishop is significant, though rather confused in indicating the Utraquist strength. It covered the deanery of Kouřim with 32 parishes on the ecclesiastical manor of the provostship of St. George, on three private manors of the Kolovrats, Valdštejns, and Vchynskýs, and on six royal manors of Benátky, Brandýs, Malešov, Mělník, Přeřov, and Poděbrady. Only eight of the clergy were classified as Lutheran. Most of the priests were described as preserving traditional rites, hence recognizable as Utraquists. Aside from characterizing them by their rites, the survey referred to them variously as being married, using Czech as liturgical language, administering collective confessions, or as devotees of Jan Hus. Even among the eight clergymen classified as "heretics" (presumably Lutherans or Brethren), there was at least one, the pastor of Lysá, who was actually a Utraquist.⁶⁹ The status quo on royal estates might have been jeopardized after 1615 not in favor of Lutheranism, but that of the Roman side. The managers [*hejtmané, purkrabí*] of royal estates had traditionally played a role of protecting the Utraquist character of parishes on the manors entrusted to their care.

65) *Protokol vyšlé korespondence Kanceláře českých direktorů z let 1618 a 1619*, ed. J. Prokeš (Prague, 1934) 121 (no. 1667).

66) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 485, 533, 534; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619 x*.

67) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619 x*, 446-447.

68) Markus, "Stavovské apologie z roku 1618," 431; see also Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II 22*.

69) Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619 x-xi*; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 539 n. 2.

Apparently with the approval of King Matthias, henceforth these posts went frequently to adherents of the Roman Church, who might have been tempted to place priests *sub una* into Utraquist parishes.⁷⁰

On private estates the parishioners exercised the right to negotiate with their seigneurs about the religious pastors. Thus the inhabitants of Lomnice asked for a Utraquist priest, and those of Soběslav objected to a Lutheran pastor to their manorial lord Jan of Švamberk in 1612.⁷¹ Utraquist clergy also guarded against the appointments of Brethren clergy to Utraquist parishes. In 1611 thirty of them, headed by the dean of Chrudim, petitioned the *defensores* against this practice favored by certain influential manorial seigneurs. While Josef Jireček claims that the protesters were Lutherans, the original report by Pavel Skála ze Zhoře shows that they must have been Utraquists because of their praise of the pre-1609 Consistory, an attitude virtually inconceivable among the Lutherans.⁷²

(2) The denouement of an attempt in 1618 to establish a separate Utraquist Consistory also provides evidence of the strength, independence, and self-confidence of Utraquism under the institutional arrangement in existence since 1609. In this case, some dozen Utraquist priests prepared a memorandum for the royal government in 1617, asking for the erection of a separate Utraquist Consistory. This proposal, eagerly welcomed, if not inspired, by the royal officials, in particular Pavel Michna of Vacinov, was shortly withdrawn on the advice of the most influential Utraquist clergy. The opposition was led by the prominent Matouš Pačuda, who may have been slated to become the Administrator of the proposed ecclesiastical body.⁷³ The Utraquist leaders probably viewed the proposal as just another application of “the salami tactics” by the government to an ultimate solution of the problem posed by the Bohemian Reformation. The rather obscure maneuvering around the establishment (or restoration) of a consistory exclusively for the Utraquists also made evident a substantial presence of Utraquist priests under the joint Consistory. The *Second Apology*, of the insurgent Bohemian estates in 1618, worried that the Utraquist priests’ withdrawal would deprive the existing Consistory of much of its administrative infrastructure, particularly in Prague.⁷⁴

There is an indication that the town leaders were involved in the discussions about a separate Utraquist Consistory, but in the end a majority also decided not to break the alliance with the Lutherans and Brethren, or risk losing the nobles’

70) David, “The Utraquists and the Lutherans: Toleration and Orthodoxy in Bohemia, 1575-1609,” 5-6; Josef Vávra, “Počátky reformace katolické v Čechách,” *Sborník historického kroužku* Sešit 3 (1894) 40; see report on the activities of Captain Zeller on the royal manor of Brandýs nad Labem in 1617, Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách: Kulturně-historický obraz v XV. a XVI. století* (Prague, 1895) 1:267-268.

71) Josef Lintner, “Duchovní správa v Soběslavi za faráře Prokopa Ceterazského v l. 1612-1618,” *Sborník historického kroužku* 8,2 (1899) 25.

72) Josef Jireček, “Literatura exulantův českých,” *Časopis českého muzea* 48,1 (1874) 193; Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 1:326.

73) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 535; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoty podobojí z let 1610-1619* x. For a tendentious report on this event see also Jan Amos Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivenstvích*, in his *Opera omnia* (Prague, 1989) 9/1:102. Komenský’s account is based, in turn, on the *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 33-34.

74) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 31-32; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoty podobojí z let 1610-1619* x-xi.

patronage.⁷⁵ This decision showed that the political leaders of urban Utraquism operated independently, reflecting local interests. The towns' attitude toward the issue of the Consistory was in line with their resistance to the royal government's pleas of 1609 not to form an alliance with the Lutheran and Unity nobles, and even in line with their original decision to support the legalization of the Bohemian Confession in 1575. The moves to establish a new Consistory, promoted by the Royal Chancery, could be seen in this light as aimed at weakening the united front of the *sub utraque* which in the long run could be lethal to Utraquism. A separate consistory could be more easily suppressed together with its parishes, through a Roman *Gleichschaltung* under the archbishop, inasmuch as it would lack the support of the other dissidents who would have been antagonized by the Utraquists' break of the alliance's solidarity.

As a bottom line, the fact that the Utraquist clergy and their urban sponsors, as late as 1618 and 1619, did not go along with the plan for a new Utraquist Consistory suggested that the Utraquists' situation under the existing joint Consistory was on the whole acceptable. The insurgent Bohemian estates put a more ominous spin on the episode in the list of charges against the Habsburg government, contained in the *Second Apology* of 1618. The document claimed that the proposed Utraquist Consistory was to be controlled by the archbishop and its adherent priests reordained. A likelihood of such a proposal is most questionable inasmuch as archepiscopal control had been always anathema to the Utraquists and their priests were already defined, in large part, by holding canonical ordinations.⁷⁶ Not even the most naive of the royal officials could have assumed, prior to the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620, that the Utraquists were ready for an unconditional surrender.

As the original rally of Utraquist priests and towns behind the Letter of Majesty in 1609, so also the refusal of the priests and towns to do the government's bidding in 1618, clearly contradicted the *idéés fixes* of sixteenth-century Bohemian historiography that (1) Utraquism, as a mere phantom, served as a passive and obedient tool in the hands of the King's officials, and (2) that the town councils in their support of Utraquism acted merely as pliable instruments, helping the government to sabotage the Protestant Reformation. The revival of the issue of a separate Utraquist Consistory under the Directors of the insurgent government in December 1618 and in early 1619, however, called for caution in attributing the idea of a restored Utraquist Consistory solely to the manipulation of the royal officials under the Habsburg regime.⁷⁷

(3) Testimony of outside observers continued to stress the presence of Utraquism in Bohemia, as well as the loyalty of the Utraquist priests to the traditional rituals and beliefs. Thus the Jesuits in their earlier mentioned *Apology* of 1618 named the Utraquists in the first place under the heterodox (referring to them as *Hussitas*, as opposed to *Lutheranos*, and *Picarditas seu Calvinistas*) and treated them as the most numerous.⁷⁸ The *Apologia* also indicated that the Utraquists had

75) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 31-32.

76) *Ibid.* 32.

77) *Protokol vyšlé korespondence* 76 (no. 876); Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře* 525-26.

78) Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu ex Boemiae Regno* 18-19; Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách* 1:275.

not changed their beliefs or rituals because of the joint Consistory or the recognition of the Bohemian Confession. That the priests of the Utraquists or *Hussitas* had not undergone a process of Lutherization is further affirmed by the Jesuits' praise for their preserving the following orthodox beliefs and rituals, all which the Lutherans and the Brethren had rejected:

Surely Hus and the Utraquists...have defended the invocation of saints, the cult and veneration of holy relics and images, the celibacy of priests....., the seven sacraments of the New Testament, the sacrifice of the mass, the transubstantiation of bread and wine, the purgatory, the necessity of good works for salvation, holy processions and pilgrimages...⁷⁹

According to the Jesuits' testimony, the Utraquists continued to differ in 1618 more from the Lutherans and the Brethren than they did from the Roman Church.⁸⁰ The Jesuits engaged in some exaggeration, in particular, the Utraquists had accepted clerical marriage since the turn of the sixteenth century. Nevertheless the statement did outline the traditional essential differences separating the Utraquists from the beliefs and practices of the Lutherans (or for that matter those of the Brethren).

(4) Perhaps the most cogent sign of Utraquism's continued importance was its vitality and popularity exactly in the seventeenth century, reliably reported in contemporary sources, which confounded those among historians, who had been proclaiming the Utraquist Church moribund ever since 1517, and its demise has been prematurely and variously dated in historical literature to 1517, 1524, 1539, 1564, 1575, 1593, or 1609.⁸¹ The particularly striking event which usually triggered a need for commentary was the impressive outpouring of popular support for the Utraquist Easter procession conducted in Prague by Locika in the spring of 1618.⁸² Hrejsa pointed out that Utraquism had "many adherents in the conservative strata of the populace." Tischer admitted that the attempts to limit traditional Utraquist ceremonies by the Lutherans collided with "the ingrained inclinations and traditions of the common people *sub utraque*." Eduard Winter stated categorically: "The Czech people held firmly on the traditional rituals, the Czech vespers, the high masses, the sacramental procession and others."⁸³ As late as January 1620, for

79) "Certe Hussius et Hussitae veteres sanctorum invocationem; cultum et venerationem sanctorum reliquiarum et imaginum; caelibatum sacerdotum, monachorum, ac monialium; septem novae legis sacramenta; sacrificium missae, transubstantionem panis et vini; purgatorium; bonorum operum necessitatem ad salutem; processiones et perigraciones sacras et c. aliaq; quamplurima ex Catholicae Ecclesiae fide et instituto defenderunt, quae a recentioribus Utraquistis prorsus rejiciuntur et damnantur." Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu ex Boemiae Regno* 53. This praise of Utraquism and Hus is omitted from the German translation of the *Apologia*, see Adam Tanner, *Apologia, oder Schutzbrief der Societet Jesu* (Vienna, 1618) 68.

80) Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu ex Boemiae Regno* 18-19.

81) Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder* (Prague, 1861-22) 2:413. See also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 533-7; and Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí x-xi*.

82) Eduard Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf im Sudetenraum* (Munich, 1938) 197; *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 31.

83) "Das tschechische Volk hing zäh an dem Althergebrachten, den tschechischen Vespem, Hochämtern, Sakramental prozessionen und anderem." Eduard Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf im Sudetenraum* (Munich, 1938) 197; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 534; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619 x*.

instance, popular commotion made the town councillors of Poděbrady fear for their lives after they removed such hallmarks of Utraquism as the sacred images and liturgical vessels from the church. The amateurish iconoclasts sought to imitate the example of King Frederick's Calvinist chaplain, Skultetus, in purging Prague's Cathedral of sacred images and statues.⁸⁴

The historiographical significance of the unexpected show of Utraquism's strength, on the eve and during the course of the Bohemian uprising, is perhaps best illustrated by the way in which Anton Gindely coped with this phenomenon. Gindely typically confused the political support of the Bohemian Confession in 1575, and again in 1609, with a broad religious acceptance. Actually those who agreed to accept, or even to urge, the legalization of the Bohemian Confession, as we saw earlier, did not ipso facto become Lutherans. It was only from Gindely's angle of vision that the outpouring of sympathy for Utraquism in 1618 could appear virtually incomprehensible, or entirely irrational. He had equated the nobles' highly visible demand for Lutheranism with a broadly popular demand, while actually there was little evidence of an infatuation with the Augsburg Confession among the Czech townspeople or peasantry. The historian tried to deal with the intractable fact of Utraquism's popularity through a Nietzschean sneer at the fickleness [*Wankelmuth*] of the common man.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, elsewhere even Gindely paid a grudging compliment to Utraquism, saying that "the banner of the ancient faith *sub utraque*, due to historical tradition and the remembrance of Hus, remained still ever sacred in the eyes of the multitude."⁸⁶

Yet another concept, embedded in the sixteenth-century historiography, helped to exaggerate the impression of increased Lutheranization and a reciprocal decline of Utraquism. This was the presumption of virtual identity of Utraquist ritualistic and institutional views with those of the Roman Church. Thus the intense dislike of Counter Reformation Catholicism, particularly evident among the lower urban classes, manifested above all during the invasion of Prague by the Passauers in 1611, would be (mis)identified *ipso facto* with an appeal of the German Reformation, or cited as a proof of an assimilation of Utraquism with Lutheranism.⁸⁷ As pointed out repeatedly, Utraquism actually had its own long, and one might say "venerable," tradition of intense aversion to certain institutional and procedural aspects of the Roman Church, in particular monasticism, papal or episcopal executive and judicial jurisdiction, and ostentatious displays of ecclesiastical splendor or power. These attitudes were independent of, and antedated the emergence of, Luther and his teachings.

In Utraquism's historical memory monastic orders featured as the most virulent advocates and energetic abettors of an extermination of religious dissent. In his magisterial work of sixteenth-century Utraquism, Bohuslav Bílejevský explained the rationale for the destruction of monasteries during the early stages of the

84) Zikmund Winter, *Kulturní obraz českých měst* (Prague, 1890), 1:442.

85) Gindely *Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder* 2:413.

86) Anton Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání* (Prague, 1870-1880) 1:217; or in a partial English translation, Anton Gindely, *History of the Thirty Years' War* (New York, 1884) 1:53.

87) On the description of the riots see James R. Palmitessa, "The Prague Uprising of 1611: Property, Politics, and Catholic Renewal in the Early Years of Habsburg Rule," *Central European History* 31 (1998) 304-314; Josef Janáček, *Rudolf II. a jeho doba* (Prague, 1987) 477-478.

Bohemian Reformation. According to him, the monks proved to be incorrigible opponents of the Bohemian cause. Failing to respond to earnest exhortations and admonitions, they persisted in casting their anathemas against the Utraquists and favoring the foreign invaders. Hence the Utraquists had little choice but to neutralize these - to use a modern military metaphor - fifth columnists in order to prevent the monasteries' employment as shelters or points of support for the genocidal campaigns of the crusaders.⁸⁸ Thus the popular attacks on monasteries in 1611, focused particularly on the Franciscans at the Church of our Lady of the Snows, had their antecedents as far back as the fifteenth century, especially in the waves of antimonastic violence in 1448 and 1483. They reflected the perennial quarrel with the Church of Rome, which was at its core an ecclesial, not a dogmatic one. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, monasteries were viewed as exotic islands or fortresses, staffed almost entirely by unsympathetic foreigners, in the midst of Czech normalcy. Archbishop Berka reporting to Rome the expulsion of the Capuchins from Prague in 1600, feared that all monastics might be expelled from the city, if not slaughtered.⁸⁹

The Utraquists' special dislike of the Jesuit Order was explicable, aside from its quasi-monastic character, by its stature as the prime promoter of papal jurisdiction, and as a stern opponent of any deviations from Roman practices. In addition, the Society of Jesus sponsored certain characteristics of the Counter Reformation's thrust which ran against the grain for the Utraquists.⁹⁰ Such was, for instance, the flamboyant display of religious art. This, in turn, led the Utraquists to emphasize their traditional restraint with respect to veneration of saints and images, which dated to the fifteenth century. The reaffirmation of this stance should not be automatically construed as an assimilation to Lutheranism.⁹¹ Thus the expressions of popular resentment against monasticism, against the advocacy of papal administrative ascendancy, or against the flamboyance of the Counter Reformation had deep Utraquist roots, and a Lutheran input was not necessary for their activation.

(5) Independent evidence as to the strength of Utraquism at the time of the Bohemian Uprising can be read back from the situation after the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620. One such source is the "conversion" figures. For instance, in an early rehearsal of the Counter Reformation, the Jesuits brought into the fold of the Roman Church in Český Krumlov eleven Utraquists to two Lutherans in late 1619, and seventy-one Utraquists to thirty-three Lutherans in 1620. Moreover, most of the Lutherans were probably German.⁹² Another indication would come from the behavior of the common believers. When in 1622 the observance of the feast of Jan Hus and the Bohemian martyrs was secretly prohibited, it was reported that the

88) Bohuslav Bílejovský, *Kronyka církevní*, ed. Jozef Skalický (pseudonym for Josef Dittrich) (Prague, 1816) 25-26.

89) *Sněmy české* 7:439; 10:102.

90) For a testimony on the intense dislike of Jesuits and monks by the common people of Prague see also *Sněmy české* 7:439-440.

91) For the deep-seated Utraquist reserve concerning the veneration of images, see, for instance, Martin Žatecký, *Knižka proti ošemetné počtě a pokryté Svatých*, ed. Jan Štelcar Želetavský z Želetavy (Prague, 15932), originally published in 1517.

92) Tomáš Bílek, *Dějiny řádu tovaryšstva Ježíšova a působení jeho vůbec a v zemích království českého zvláště* (Prague, 1896) 480.

population of Prague gathered en masse in front of the locked churches on 6 July. There was another sign of the numerical weakness of Lutheranism. While Utraquist worship had been suppressed in 1622, Prague's Lutheran churches were permitted to function until 1624, out of Ferdinand II's regard for his ally, the Elector of Saxony. This temporary dispensation covered merely two places of worship, which implied that the rest of Prague churches had been primarily Utraquist.⁹³ The strength of Utraquism is also made evident by the substantial presence of its priesthood after the Battle of the White Mountain, as reported by the Catholic historian and not a friend of Utraquism, Václav V. Tomek: "In ...the complete uprooting of the country's legal order [1621], the party of the Old Utraquists raised its voice once more... Some of its priests approached the viceroy, Count Charles of Lichtenstein, asking that they be permitted, according to the established custom, to distribute communion in both kinds...and to be administered by a Consistory composed of their own clergy..."⁹⁴ In addition to this group of clergy, which must have been substantial in size, another group of six Utraquist priests submitted unconditionally to Archbishop Lohelius in March 1621.⁹⁵

Even later after several years of Counter Reformatory suppression we find evidence of strong Utraquist feelings among the rural population. When rumors of religious tolerance spread in 1627 in Litomyšl district, peasants from many villages demanded from the Catholic dean of Litomyšl masses in the Czech language and communion in both kinds.⁹⁶ In view of the Lutherans' rejection of the canonical mass, these were evidently Utraquist, not Lutheran, desiderata.

The evidence, just presented, points to a conclusion that Utraquists remained substantial in numbers, perhaps the largest among the three types of *sub utraque* between 1609 and 1620. In assessing this evidence one more basic question remains to be asked. How then to explain the contemporary statements that their number had been insignificant by 1609? Above all, this is implied in the text of the *Porovnání*.⁹⁷ The answer probably lies in the fact that the noble authors of such pronouncements referred to the circles of acquaintances in their own class, among whom the Utraquists were indeed grossly underrepresented. The limitation of the nobles' social contacts is suggested, for instance, by the diaries, which Adam the Younger of Valdštejn kept between 1602 and 1633. Among some five hundred personal references, there were virtually none to commoners.⁹⁸ The aristocrats were not likely to pursue acquaintances, or fraternize, with the townspeople or the peasantry. Such an impact of the nobles' social perspectives, distorting their

93) Václav Lída, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hl. města Prahy* 7 (1933) 27-28; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 579-581.

94) Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463; see also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 574-5; Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, ed. Theodor Tupetz. (Leipzig, 1894) 107-111; Tomáš Bílek, *Reformace katolická; neboli Obnovení náboženství katolického v království českém po bitvě na Bílé Hoře* (Prague, 1892) 16-17.

95) Against Hrejsa's opinion, Lída shows that the two groups were not identical in Lída, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 9, 11 n. 42; see also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 575.

96) *Dopisy Reformační komise v Čechách z let 1627-1692*, ed. Antonín Podlaha (Prague, 1908) 5-6.

97) Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II* 41.

98) Adam the Younger of Valdštejn, *Deník rudolfinského dvořana, 1602-1633*, ed. Marie Koldinská and Petr Maťa (Prague, 1997) 400-450.

quantitative assessment of Utraquism, is suggested by Budovec's earlier statement of 1603: "...we know of no one who would be adherent of the Prague Consistory here or elsewhere in the country, namely among the higher estates..."⁹⁹ Without taking into account the distorting lenses of his social vision in Budovec's assertion of 1603, his statement about the virtual nonexistence of Utraquism would represent a blatant contradiction to his rallying cry of 1609 for the alliance of the three types of *sub utraque* in which he named the Utraquists in the first place.

Looking at the issue in another way, the assertions that there were virtually no Utraquists in Bohemia might acquire a spurious semblance of veracity from a recent trend in the historiography of nationalism. This school, represented by Ernest Gellner, Eric Hobsbawm, and others, has denied the existence of authentic European nations in the sixteenth century, and placed their origin into the nineteenth century.¹⁰⁰ If one took into account only the "feudal" nation excluding the commoners, then indeed the Utraquists would be meager in numbers in Bohemia. Only three per cent of the nobles could be classified as Utraquists in the opening decades of the seventeenth century.¹⁰¹ As noted earlier, Czech historical literature has shown a bias toward the views of the upper classes and the skepticism about ordinary people's intellectual commitments in its trivialization of the popular enthusiasm for Utraquism in 1618. A similar problem has been noted recently in English sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historiography where the emphasis on the upper classes has thwarted the proper understanding of the religious orientation of the populace at large, "especially the laity below the rank of the landed gentry."¹⁰² It is ironic that Czech historians, writing in the age of liberal democracy, should view the religious scene through the eyes of the noble elites, which constituted less than one per cent of the total population of Bohemia. Those writing in the era of egalitarian socialism had at least some excuse, inasmuch as a measure of contempt for the mentality of the common man was not alien to the Leninist variant of Marxism.¹⁰³

Utraquism as a Plebeian Church

The persistent character of Utraquism as a religion of the commoners can be illustrated from the principal surviving work of Pačuda, one of its intellectual leaders, who as noted earlier was considered for the post of administrator, had a specifically Utraquist Consistory been restored in 1617. To begin with, Pačuda's populist bent can be surmised from his excoriation of the sinfulness of pride. It was not just pride in general, which would be routine for any Christian to denounce; he aimed his rhetorical fire power specifically at the hubris of the mighty, a quality

99) "...nevíme tu vo kom, kdo by se koncistoří Pražskou spravoval a jinde v zemi, zvláště z vyšších stavů, o nich nevíme." *Sněmy české* 10:427.

100) See also Ernest Gellner, *Encounters with Nationalism* (New York, 1995), and *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1983); Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. (New York, 1992); Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition* (New York, 1983).

101) Josef Pekař, *Dějiny československé* (Prague, 1991) 91.

102) Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *JEH* 49 (1998) 621.

103) Reliable estimates indicate that in 1600 Bohemia's barons and knights comprised 1,400 families; Jan Kapras, *Právní dějiny zemí koruny české* (Prague, 1913) 2:436. The classical statement of Lenin's contempt for the intelligence of the masses is enshrined in his seminal *What Is To Be Done?* (1902).

which naturally tended to characterize the nobility in Bohemia as well as elsewhere.¹⁰⁴ Pačuda emphasized that already in prehuman history, God dealt severely with the pride of the angels. Subsequently, the Lord delighted in casting down the mighty from their high places of political or military power, in humiliating those thirsting after glory. Examples were the Prince of Tyre, suffering a ghastly death at the hands of foreigners (Ezekiel 28.1-10), Sennacherib, the King of Assyria, murdered by his own two sons, King Antiochus of Syria, excluded from human society by a foul disease, and the Pharaoh, who with his entire army perished in the Red Sea. Military power turned into weakness, heroism into cowardice, health into sickness. Belisarius, a captain of Emperor Justinian I, having fought brilliantly in Persia, turned into a beggar after his eyes were gouged out in captivity. Pačuda, in summing up, drew on the words of Isaiah (2:13): "Thus the Lord God knows how to cut down the high cedars of Lebanon and the impressive oaks of Bashan."¹⁰⁵

As a counterpoint to castigating the vice of haughtiness, Pačuda characteristically extolled the inherent virtue of physical labor, the lot of the ordinary people. According to him, labor as such was not a punishment for sin. Had Adam maintained his virtue intact, he and his descendants would enjoy working and reap continuous benefits. Constructive labor would be connected with merriment, gaiety, and thanksgiving, and it would be performed in confidence that its fruits would be properly and happily utilized and augmented by one's descendants. It was sin that overlaid the essentially joyful and fruitful process of physical work with the pall of pain, callouses, and sweat, and made the resulting benefits uncertain for succeeding generations. It can be taken as another sign of his populist predilection that in calling attention to the biblical injunction that man should raise his bread by the sweat of his brow, he commented: "...some interpret this text so as to mean that emperors, kings, princes, and barons should plow and till the land; the priests also should have their homesteads, like the peasants, and others should be occupied with such work..."¹⁰⁶ Although he implied a disagreement with the statement, simply raising it in the public forum may be seen as highly significant.

Against the masculine accents of both Roman and Protestant Christianity with their patriarchal favoritism, but in the tradition of the Bohemian Reformation, Pačuda took up the cause of women. Like the harsh view of physical labor, so also the subordination of women to men, according to him, was an abnormal state of affairs due to Adam's downfall. Ideally, the female would be the male's equal partner, participating fully and equally in the family's decisions and enterprises. A husband would seek consultation and mutual agreement with his wife, and never simply command her to act or to desist. Pačuda emphasized that even in the fallen state man had to treat woman with respect: "...the wife should not serve her husband for a foot stool, because she is not a bone taken out of his leg, but she should be his

104) Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích, 1471-1526. Šlechta* (Prague, 1994) 2:140-141.

105) Matauš Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje které věci (z stran lidského pokolení) předešly příchod a narození mesiaše pravého Krista* (Prague, 1616) ff. G6r-G6v, J4v-J5r.

106) Matauš Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje které věci (z stran lidského pokolení) předešly příchod a narození mesiaše pravého Krista* (Prague, 1616) f. K8v [p. 152]. Unfortunately, Pačuda's answer to this challenging statement is unknown. The one available copy of his work, held by the Strahov Monastery Library in Prague under the call number BX VI 22, ends abruptly at this point.

help mate because she was created from the rib bone near to his heart.”¹⁰⁷

The plebeian character of Utraquism, or its status as a religion of the commoners, did not, however, involve a decline in its intellectual leadership to the primitive level of an unsophisticated folkish religion, usually associated with the Waldensian or Lollard ministers. Utraquist priesthood remained loyal to the traditional roots of the Bohemian Reformation which were firmly planted in the academy. Pačuda, for one, displayed a remarkable knowledge of both Greek and Latin patristic literature, citing from Cyprian (C1v, D6v, K5v),¹⁰⁸ Lactantius (B6v), Eusebius (E2v), Basil the Great (B8v), Ambrose (K5r, K6r), Chrysostom (E1r), Augustine (A7v, C4r, G4v, G5r, K4v), Gregory the Great (C7v), and Bernard of Clairvaux (D5r, E4v, F3v, F8v, J6r). Incidentally, of these at least two, Gregory the Great and Bernard of Clairvaux, were theologically unacceptable to the Lutherans.¹⁰⁹ Pačuda also displayed familiarity with Greek classics, such as Homer (J4r), Herodotus (J3v), Euripides (J4r), Aristotle (C2v), Diodorus Siculus (B6r), Strabo (B4r), Philon (B1v), Plutarch (C4v, J5r), and Claudian (G1v), as well as Roman classics, such as Plautus (J6r), Cicero (E5v, H7r), Ovid (C2v, G1v), Lucanus (G8r), and Lucius Apuleius (C5v). What was even more important, his citations were not merely perfunctory, mechanical or ornamental, but used creatively and effectively for purposes of illustration or amplification.

Utraquists and Lutherans: Differences

Despite the cooperation between the Utraquist townsmen and the Lutheran nobles in Bohemian parliamentary politics, and the association of the Utraquist priests with the Lutheran ministers in the joint Consistory *sub utraque*, the traditional dogmatic differences persisted. Most had been defined in the Utraquist responses to the Bohemian Confession in 1575 and 1609 and, on the Lutheran side, in the Bohemian Confession and in the works of theologians like Jan Štelcar Želetavský of Želetava and Jiří Taciturnus between 1575 and 1608. The continuing divergence of belief and practice, once more, indicated that the political rapprochement was not accompanied by a doctrinal assimilation. There is no evidence of a progressive amalgamation of Lutheranism with Utraquism into a new syncretic religion of Neo-Utraquism.

First, a highly visible divide continued to be the Lutheran opposition to the communion of infants. Zacharyáš Bruncvík in his *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* (1613) firmly rejected the practice. Jiří Taciturnus in his Lutheran catechism, somewhat misleadingly titled *Zlatý řetízek pravého katolického náboženství* [The Golden Chain of the True Catholic Religion] and published in 1616, not only condemned infant communion, but went on to compare its practice to giving communion to drunkards, persons of ill repute, the enraged, blasphemers, or heretics.¹¹⁰ As Noemi Rejchrtová has recently pointed out, the communion for infants was not an isolated precept, but rather an outgrowth of the Utraquists' profound respect for the status of children, the

107) Matauš Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje* ff. J8v, also J6v-K3v.

108) References in parentheses in this paragraph are to folios in Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje*.

109) *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, ed. Erwin L. Lueker, rev. ed. (St. Louis, 1975) 86, 627.

110) "Opilých a zlopověstných, nemluvnátek, také vzteklých, též ruhače a kacíře, nechce mít pán u večeře." Jiří Taciturnus z Háje (Hájský), *Zlatý řetízek pravého katolického náboženství...k dobrému mládeži školní Aušpurské konfesi* (Prague, 1616) f. K4; Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 214-215.

nature of whose faith Christ had posited as an example for the adults.¹¹¹ Not the Lutherans, but the victorious Counter Reformation would suppress this Utraquist rite.

Second, another highly visible mark of distinction was the adoration of the host outside the eucharistic service, which the Lutherans had discarded. The Utraquists, on the other hand, performed this ritual with enthusiasm, particularly in the elaborately festive Easter and Corpus Christi processions. Such displays irritated the Lutherans particularly in 1613 and in 1618, as also the Jesuits' *Apology* of 1618 testified. As noted earlier a particularly impressive and well-attended Easter procession of 1618 was conducted by Locika of Domažlice, then pastor of St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague. While at that point he became a target of Lutheran retribution, he was destined to play a martyr's role during the subsequent Counter Reformation.¹¹² Thus in his person the *via media* of Utraquism achieved a particularly poignant expression. The new Church Order for the Lutheran clergy issued on 16 January 1610, as cited by Bruncvík in his *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* (1613), proscribed any veneration of the host outside the Lord's Supper, including in processions, in a monstrance, in Christ's grave on Holy Thursday, or by elevation of the host. Czech Lutherans upheld the principle, attributed to Melancthon, that the eucharistic transformation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ was a transient occurrence, not continuing past the service of Lord's Supper.¹¹³

Third, there was a conspicuous difference between the Utraquists and the Lutherans on the issue of venerating the saints, particularly with respect to Hus and other martyrs of the Bohemian Reformation. Dykastus viewed the invocation of saints as a thoroughly errant practice which contradicted the Old Testament's injunction against detracting from honor due to God. In the New Testament, John the Baptist's humility before Christ taught that religious veneration belong to the Saviour alone. A Lutheran catechism, titled *Summa náboženství pravého z Konfessí České vybraná* [The Sum of the True Religion Extracted from the Bohemian Confession] and published in 1618, referring to the issue of the invocation of saints, stated categorically: "...we should neither invoke the Saints, nor have recourse to them."¹¹⁴ This statement challenged the centuries' long veneration of the martyrs of the Bohemian Reformation, particularly Hus, in the public worship of the Utraquist Church.¹¹⁵ At the same time, it showed how far the Bohemian Confession deviated from the Utraquist tradition, and how distinctly it stood within the precincts of Augsburg. The *Summa náboženství pravého* referred respectfully to "Doctor Martin Luther" and appended his *Otázky křesťanské* [Christian Questions]. In contrast, there was not even a token mention of Hus in either this catechism or that of Taciturnus. Similarly, Zykmond Critinus, a Lutheran and the Administrator of the Consistory *sub*

111) Noemi Rejchrtová, "Svatý Vojtěch v zrcadle české reformace," *Teologické texty*, 8,3 (1997) 94.

112) Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu* 18-19; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536-537; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* x, 446-447.

113) Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 214-215; Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* f. C7r.

114) Jiřík Dykastus (Miřkovský), *Postylla: nebo Kázání krátká na evangelia svatá* (Prague, 1612) 1: 24-25, 33; *Summa religionis verae ex Confessione Bohemica excerpta/Summa náboženství pravého z Konfessí České vybraná* (Prague, 1618) f. C8.

115) "Bohoslužebná skládání o Husovi z XV a XVI století," ed. Václav Novotný, in *Prameny dějin českých* 8 (Prague, 1932) especially 431-444, 458-472.

utraque (1614-1619), in his book of meditations, *Křesťanské dílo denní* [The Daily Christian Work](1613), deferred to Luther as an authority on spiritual life, again without any mention of Hus.¹¹⁶

Fourth, related to the rejection of the invocation of saints was the Lutherans' opposition to religious images, depicting either the Trinity or the saints. Zacharyáš Bruncvík, in his *Idolorum pia suplantatio* (1613), cited in opposition to the veneration of images particularly the edicts of the two iconoclastic Byzantine Emperors, Leo III (717-741) and Constantine V Copronymos (741-775), and those of the Council of Constantinople (or Hiereia) in 775, without noting that these decisions were subsequently reversed, particularly by the Second Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787). In an earthy simile, he called veneration of images a spiritual adultery which violated the mystical marriage between Christ and his Church. In the *Zrcadlo Kacířství*, Bruncvík specifically denounced the depiction of the Holy Spirit as a dove, and that of Christ as a lamb, and defended an early Persian iconoclast, a certain Xeneias, as a man "enlightened by divine truth," who should not suffer vilification.¹¹⁷

Fifth, one may note a hardening of the position on the salvific role of good works in the Lutheran literature of this period. While Dykastus, writing in a book published in 1592, still praised prayer, fasting, and almsgiving as influential with the divinity, Bruncvík in his treatise of 1613 presented unambiguously the orthodox Lutheran view on justification by faith alone with a corollary dismissal of the doctrine of the purgatory. As one of his arguments, he cited Luke (16.22-25) on the postmortal fate of Lazarus, carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, and the rich man, cast into Hades. Luke did not mention an intermediate cleansing as an option.¹¹⁸

Sixth, and undergirding the other points of difference, the Lutherans opposed the use of liturgical books which the Utraquists had employed as a basis of their traditional rites since the beginning of the Bohemian Reformation, some one hundred years before Luther. These volumes were inherited, by tradition and in fact, from the service books of the Archdiocese of Prague, dating to the mid-fourteenth century, specifically the missals and breviaries, as well as the agenda and rubrics of the Archbishopric of Prague. A striking evidence of the importance attached to these pre-Tridentine liturgical books is their appearance already among the Bohemian incunabula.¹¹⁹ According to David Holeton Utraquist liturgical texts were in fact

116) "Otázky křesťanské s odpovědmi na ně od D. Martina Lutéra sepsané pro ty, jenž k Stolu Páně přistoupiti chtějí," *Summa religionis verae ex Confessione Bohemica excerpta* f. E6v; Zykmond Crinitus, *Diarium Christianum. Křesťanské dílo denní* (Prague, 1613) 129.

117) Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Idolorum pia suplantatio. Kázání o tom, že obrazové jakož svaté Trojice Boha v podstatě jediného, neviditelného a neobsáhlého, tak i jiných svatých a světic, na něž poklona, vzývání a čest Boží se přenáší, v Církvi Páně trpění býti nemají* (Prague, 1613) ff. C2v-C3r, C7r. Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* ff. D4r, E2r.

118) Franciscus Tillemannus, *Krátký výklad aneb vysvětlení sedmi žalmův kajících svatého Davida*, tr. Jiří Dikast. Prague: Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, 1598, f. (:) a-b, (:) 2a; Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Kázání o Pravém a jediném očištění křesťanském v němž hříškové naši, samým milosrdenstvím Božím a trvalou zásluhou Krista Pána, zde na světě, kdež čas milosti jest, se očisťují*. (Prague, 1613) f. C4v.

119) These incunabula included the Statutes of Archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice (1476), the Prague missal (1479) and the Agenda of the Church of Prague (c. 1479), see Emma Urbánková, "Nejstarší prvotisky českého původu," in *Knihtisk a kniha v českých zemích od husitství do Bílé hory: Sborník prací k 500. výročí českého knihtisku*, ed. František Šmahel (Prague, 1970) 24-30; for references to the traditional Utraquist liturgical books see, for instance, Václav Koranda, *Traktát o*

incompatible with Lutheran usages. The proscription of their use was included in the above-mentioned new Church Order for the Lutheran clergy under the Consistory *sub utraque*, issued in 1610.¹²⁰

Finally, in view of the routine charges in historical literature of the Utraquists' craven submissiveness to royal authorities,¹²¹ it is curious to note the fervor of Lutherans' commitment of loyalty to secular sovereigns under virtually any circumstances. Thus Dykastus in his *Postylla* (1612) condemned the heretical and unfaithful [*bludní a nevěrní*] Christians who would murder such monarchs as William of Orange (1584), or Henry III (1589) and Henry IV of France (1610), or attempt to assassinate James I of England (1605). What is particularly significant is Dykastus's model of proper attitude toward the sovereigns. It was that of the early Christians who prayed for the pagan Emperors set on martyring them.¹²² Such a degree of devotion to state power would be hard to find in Utraquist writings. It would present a problem for the Lutheran theologians to justify the uprising against kings Matthias and Ferdinand II.

On the whole, the Lutherans decisively discarded some of the most cherished of Utraquist practices, particularly those of infant communion, the public display of the eucharist, the veneration of Jan Hus and other martyrs of the Bohemian Reformation, and the traditional liturgical books. This stance indicated the width of the chasm that continued to separate the confessors of Augsburg - even under the label of the Bohemian Confession - from the direct heirs of the Bohemian Reformation. It was the same chasm that has been pointed out previously by Pavel Bydžovský in his writings of the 1540s, by the opponents of the Bohemian Confession in 1575, and by the Utraquist spokesmen in 1609. The new church order for Lutheran clergy of 1610, summed up the difference between the Lutherans and the Utraquists. According to this document, "the priests of the Lord *sub utraque* and with heart and lips adhering to the Bohemian Confession" should (1) abstain from veneration of the host outside the liturgy, (2) abandon infant communion; and (3) avoid the traditional liturgical books of the Archbishopric of Prague.¹²³

Utraquists and Lutherans: Flirtations

Despite the social and economic antagonism between the towns and the nobles, political considerations led the Utraquist towns to perpetuate their political alliance with the Lutheran aristocracy until the turning point at the White Mountain in

velebné a božské svátosti oltářní (Prague, 1493) ff. S3r - S3v; Pavel Bydžovský (Smetana), *Děťátka a neviňátka hned po přijetí křtu sv. Tělo a Krev Boží, že přijímají mají* (Prague, 1541) ff. B1r-B1v; Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 213-215.

120) David R. Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," *BRRP* 2 (1998) 116-120; Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 214.

121) Jaroslav Böhm and others, *Československá vlastivěda*, Vol. 2: *Dějiny* (Prague 1963) 1:380; Václav V. Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách, od r. 1415 až 1622," *ČČM* 22 (1848) 463.

122) Dykastus, *Postylla: nebo Kázání krátká na evangelia svatá* 1: 25. Ralph Keen, *Divine and Human Authority in Reformation Thought: German Theologians on Political Order, 1520-1555*. (Nieuwkoop, 1997) 6, characterized the Lutheran attitude toward political power: "when the Reformers appealed to secular authorities, they did so with a conception of authority that secularized the ecclesiastical order and subordinated it to the political order."

123) Cited by Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 213-215.

1620.¹²⁴ On the religious level, the Czech Lutherans, as we saw, repaid the political fidelity of the Utraquists by acting in a fairly tolerant, and hence loyal, manner toward the Utraquists even against some of the language of the Letter of the Majesty of 1609. As noted earlier, Czech Lutherans, for instance, in exceptional cases even condoned the sharing of churches with the Utraquists, although of course with separate services. The most striking instance of this was, of course, the sharing of the prestigious Týn Church in Prague, after the appointment of Dykastus as pastor in 1614. Martinius of Dražov, the prominent Lutheran pastor of St. Castulus (Haštal) in Prague since 1617, made a major speech at the University of Prague on 9 December 1616, which focused on the need of cooperation across denominational lines in order to safeguard the freedom of religion. In what may be considered an overture to the Utraquists (as well as the Brethren), he cited historical examples of resolving peacefully religious disagreements, and the disastrous consequences of the wars of religion. Martinius was to become a member of the Consistory in 1619.¹²⁵ As noted earlier, the Jesuits of Prague, in their Viennese exile in 1618, reflecting on the recent period in Bohemia, expressed their dismay that the Utraquist should form an alliance with the Lutherans and the Brethren against the Church of Rome despite the profound differences with their confederates, particularly on the nature and the adoration of the eucharist.¹²⁶

While accommodating to the Utraquists on the right, Czech Lutherans were also willing to approve of non-Lutheran devotional literature on the left. A prime example are the works of the English Puritan divine, William Perkins, which were translated into Czech by three clergymen: Jiří Oekonomus of Chrudim, Jan Regius of Žatec, and Simeon Valecius of Louny.¹²⁷ The same tendency permitted the Lutheran nobility to select as the King of Bohemia in 1619 the Calvinist son-in-law of James I, Frederick of Palatinate. All this showed that the Czech Lutherans did not display the same rigid intolerance as their fellow believers abroad. In fact, their attitude would be subject to a scathing criticism by the their previously mentioned German confrere, Hoë von Hoënegg, from 1613 the principal preacher at the court of Johann Georg, the Elector of Saxony, who had resided in Prague two years previously (1611-1613) as the pastor of a German church in the Old Town.¹²⁸

Despite their preference for the tradition of Luther over that of Hus, as preserved and cherished by Utraquism, it would not be fair to represent the Czech Lutherans as entirely rejecting the historical and cultural heritage of Bohemia. While there is little doubt about their sincere and full acceptance of the Augsburg Confession, there is also evidence that the Czech Lutherans tended to justify embracing Luther's teaching by a presumption that Hus anticipated Luther. This

124) Pravoslav Kneidl, *Městský stav v Čechách v době předbělohorské* (Ph. D. Dissertation. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1951) 175.

125) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536 n. 3, 544 n. 4; Martinius z Dražova, *Oratio de concordia ecclesiae* ff. B7v-C2v, C5r-C6r, D6v-D7r.

126) Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu* 18, 28-29.

127) William Perkins, *Anatomia conscientiae. Aneb pobožné rozbírání a vysvětlení svědomí lidského* trans. Jan Regius, (Prague, 1620); William Perkins, *O opuštění Božím*, trans. Jiřík Oekonomus, (Prague, 1610); William Perkins, *Traktát trojí krátký, ku potěšení zarmoucených kajících lidí*, trans. Simeon Valecius (Prague, 1613); William Perkins, *Traktát velmi platný a užitečný*, trans. Simeon Valecius. (Prague, 1616).

128) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 521-522.

perpetuated the view of the Supreme Justice, Bohuslav Felix Hasištejnský of Lobkovice, when he proposed the adoption of the Bohemian Confession in 1575.¹²⁹ For instance, the Lutheran minister, Zacharyáš Bruncvík, tried to discern precedents of certain Lutheran tenets in Czech Utraquism. In his *Kšaftu Večeře Páně*, published in 1613, he sought to equate Hus's opposition to indulgences with that of Luther and Zwingli. In his *Idolorum pia suplantatio* (also from 1613), Bruncvík tried to relate Lutheran views on religious art to a statement by Jan Hus, cited by Aeneas Sylvius, and the decisions of the Utraquist Synod of 1421.¹³⁰ These arguments ignored the facts that Hus opposed only the misapplication of indulgences by Pope John XXIII, not their very existence, that Aeneas Sylvius was an unreliable witness, and finally that the Utraquists firmly believed in the veneration of saints. Similarly, the Utraquists' uncompromising view of the mass as a sacrifice, belied Bruncvík's perception of the Utraquist Articles of 1524 in *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* as a Lutheran-like reform of the mass.¹³¹ Seeking to present the Articles of 1524, which he cited from a work of Matěj Kolín of Chotěřina, as a Lutheran document, Bruncvík omitted some and (mis)interpreted others in a Lutheran sense. Above all, endorsements of infant communion, Hus's sainthood, and the theology of Hus, Jakoubek of Stříbro, and Jan Rokycana were missing, and a rejection of the traditional Western liturgical books was added.¹³²

The most valiant attempt to relate Luther to Hus, made on the Czech Lutheran side, was probably that of Martinius of Dražov, who prepared a lengthy treatise, *Hussius et Lutherus*, published in 1618, to show various external parallels in the lives of both. The crucial doctrinal comparison, however, was not fruitful. Martinius chose to compare the Bohemian Confession of 1575 with the Augsburg Confession, especially in chapter four under the heading "Doctrinae Hussii et Lutheri collatio."¹³³ The former, which was in fact a derivation from the Augsburg Confession, was (mis)represented as an epitome of Hus's teachings. Martinius actually compared one Lutheran text with another rather than the teachings of Hus with Luther's. Nevertheless, as late as 1619 in an exhortation to the soldiers in the Bohemian uprising the Lutheran theologian, Jiřík Bartolomeus, proudly recalled the prowess of their ancestors in the wars of the Bohemian Reformation. However, he did not draw any theological lessons from their feats, and discussed them alongside other victories against unfavorable odds due to divine aid, such as Gideon's victory over the Midianites (Judges 8.4-10), and repulsions of the Turks in 1532 and 1598.¹³⁴ At

129) Josef Riss, "Život a literné působení Sixta z Ottersdorfu," ČČM 35/1 (1861) 82; *Sněmy české* 4:392; see also Martinius z Dražova, *Oratio de concordia ecclesiae* f. B4v.

130) Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 170-171; Bruncvík, *Kázání o tom, že obrazové* ff. C4v-C5r. Bruncvík quoted Hus's alleged statement from Aeneas's *Bohemian Chronicle* as "dei et sanctorum imagines delendas," *Kázání o tom* f. C2r.

131) Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 215.

132) Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 163-169; Matěj Kolín of Chotěřina quoted the Articles of 1524 in *Antiqua et constans confessio fidei ecclesiae Christi in regno Boemiae et Marchianatu Moraviae, quam vulgo partem sub utraque sacramentum venerabile corporis et sanguinis dom. Jesu Christi communicantium appellant* (Prague, 1574) ff. E3v - F1v.

133) Samuel Martinius z Dražova, *Hussius et Lutherus, id est: collatio historica duorum fortissimorum Iesu Christi militum* (Prague, 1618) 130-142. See also Arnošt Kraus, *Husitsví v literatuře, zejména německé* (Prague, slovesnost a umění, 1917-1924) 2:6.

134) Jiřík Bartolomeus, *Kázání krátké ku potěšení a napomenutí pobožným vojákům* (Hradec Králové, 1619) ff. B6v-B7v.

the other side of the ledger, Czech Lutherans had no compunction about their allegiance to “the authentic original Augsburg Confession [*pravé originální Konfesí Augšpurské*]”, as Zykmund Crinitus, subsequent Administrator, declared on the title page of a treatise, published in 1609.¹³⁵

Czech Lutherans and Germany

While the vestigial echoes of Hus and the Bohemian ways were insufficient to support the construction of Neo-Utraquism, a novel synthesis of the teachings of Hus and Luther, it would not be appropriate to regard the Czech Lutherans simply as German clones, who were “intellectually dependent entirely on German culture.”¹³⁶ This is illustrated by the experience of earlier-mentioned Martinius. In his subsequent stay in Saxony during the 1620s, despite a course of study at the University of Wittenberg, he would find himself unfit to serve German congregations due to limitations of language, and his lack of empathy with local mentalities.¹³⁷ More generally, even their minor and relatively innocuous deviations would subsequently - in post-White Mountain exile - make the Czech Lutherans subject to harsh pressure from their German Lutheran hosts to abandon such deviations and accept a full *Gleichschaltung*. This proscription evidently included doing no more than paying lip service to a substantial connection between the reform programs of Hus and Luther. The authoritative Saxon theologians of Wittenberg showed no inclination to have Luther share any of the limelight with Hus, as they would make clear in a statement of 1620, justifying the Saxon aid to Ferdinand II to crush the Bohemian Uprising:

...for us as the Sons of light, it is proper...to multiply the said Holy Truth, which from the infinite mercy of God a hundred years ago was first introduced to no one else, but solely to us Germans and especially to the Saxon nation, [and conducted] down from heavens, through the hands of Doctor Luther, into our faithful hands.”¹³⁸

The German theologians thus categorically excluded Hus from any share in the revelation of the Lutheran religious truth.¹³⁹

While the Czech Lutherans conscientiously subscribed to the tenets of the Augsburg Confession, as well as to the teachings of Luther and Melancton, their theological apologetics and devotional literature tended to rely to a considerable degree on Transrhenish Europe. The inspirational and moralistic writings of the Puritan William Perkins were in special vogue with four of them appearing in Czech translations between 1610 and 1620. Among Czech theologians, the prominent

135) Zykmund Crinitus, *Spis kratičký o osobě Pána Krista* (Prague, 1609).

136) As *Ottův slovník naučný* 24:769, characterizes the Lutheran Jan Štelcar Želetavský of Želetava.

137) *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě od konce 15. do začátku 17. století*, eds. Josef Hejnic and Jan Martínek (Prague, 1966-1982) 3:270.

138) *Uvážení Kurfirstských Saských Theologův v Vitenberce na otázku zdaliby stav Říše Římskému Císaři v této nynější Český válce napomáhati chtíc...* (S.l.: 1620) f. B2r.

139) While close to historical reality, this separation of Hus from Luther need not be seen as diminishing, but actually as enhancing Hus's stature. Instead of serving as a stepping stone to Luther (or an imperfect Luther, or a shadow Luther), the emancipated Hus becomes more of a historical figure in his own right: for the secularist a champion of liberty, for the religiously-inclined a patron saint of Vatican II Council and thus of contemporary ecumenicism..

Bruncvík, relied largely on English dissenting divines for his encyclopedic *Zrcadlo Kacířství* (1614). He also held in high esteem the collection *Harmonia confessionum fidei, Orthodoxarum, et Reformatorem Ecclesiarum* (Geneva, 1581), and similar compendia, which prominently featured the Protestant creeds of western Europe, particularly English, Scottish, French, Dutch, and Swiss. In his *Kšaftu Večeře Páně*, the Lutheran theologian drew on Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, and on Laurence Humphrey's *Contra Edmundi Campioni rationes* for information on Wyclif and the Lollards.¹⁴⁰ The conspicuous interest in English nonconformist theology is explored more fully in a subsequent section of this article.

Utraquists and the Roman Church: Frigidity

Aside from the presumption that Utraquism disappeared after 1609 by coming under the aegis of the new Consistory, another scenario of Utraquism's disappearance called for its virtual fusion with the Roman Church. Let us now examine this latter claim.¹⁴¹ While the Czech Lutherans exhibited a rather benign and tolerant attitude toward Utraquism (in contrast to their foreign, especially Saxon confreres), the representatives of the Roman Church in Bohemia continued to display a Post-Tridentine rigidity and intolerance, which contrasted with the more benevolent stance earlier in the sixteenth century. The frigidity seemed to increase after the affair of the apostasy of Administrator Rezek in 1593. The unfriendly tone on the Roman side was accompanied by the more conspicuous ascendancy of foreign personnel in the hierarchy of the Roman Church in Bohemia. It was in particular the introduction of German prelates, Lamberg and Lohelius, to Prague after the archiepiscopate of Berka.

The more militant tone vis-à-vis Utraquism can be illustrated from the writings of the prominent theologian of the Roman Church in Bohemia, Petr Linteo of Pilzenburgk. In a head-on clash with Utraquism, Linteo focused on the the alleged illegitimacy of the requirement of lay communion in both kinds. He attributed its introduction in Bohemia under Jakoubek to the work of the devil who sought to disturb the harmony in the Western Church in which, without any quarrel, the laity had received communion under the species of bread only. The devil chose as his instrument Peter of Dresden, who in turn infected Jakoubek in 1414:

...in front of him...[Peter] poured this poison out of his own mouth; having absorbed it, [Jakoubek] immediately the following day boasted to the masters and bachelors in the Great College that he had found the way of life in the Lord's Testament. He declared the customary communion *sub una specie* to be in error, and extolled and approved the communion *sub utraque* as the only means to salvation.¹⁴²

As a horrendous consequence, argued the Roman apologist, the new precept could cast doubts about salvation of the ancestors of the Czechs, and

140) Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* f. E2v; Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 113, 115, 122.

141) See, for instance, Pekař, *Dějiny československé* 97.

142) "...před ním..., jed ten z oust vylil: kterýžto on do sebe přijav, hned nazejtří... v Velké Koleji mezi Mistry a Bakaláři tím se chlubil, že by v Zákoně Božím Cestu života našel. A tak navyklé pod Jednou způsobou přijímání za bludné položil, přijímání pak pod Obojí tak zvýšil a schválil, jakoby jináč přijímající spasení býti nemohli." Petr Linteo of Pilzenburgk, *Krátká správa o přijímání velebné svátosti pod jednau a dvojí způsobau* (Prague, 1613) 14-15.

about the chances of salvation for the people in many other Christian lands where communion *sub una* had been practiced for centuries. Next Linteo took the opportunity to denounce another cardinal principle of Utraquism, which was objectionable to the Roman Church, namely that of searching for religious truth through free argumentation. Thus he attributed the embracing of communion *sub utraque* to reason, saying about Peter of Dresden that he was “more competent in grammar than in the Scripture,” and characterizing Jakoubek as “a venturesome person and a rash logician.”¹⁴³ As his trump card, Linteo brought up the allegation that Hus did not approve of the communion *sub utraque*. According to him, the Bohemian reformer was greatly saddened when he learned about the use of the lay chalice in his homeland, while he was imprisoned in Constance. Elsewhere in his book the Roman critic of Utraquism claimed again that Hus characterized lay communion *sub utraque* as an act of rashness [všetečnost].¹⁴⁴ He capped his assessment of communion *sub utraque* by calling its initiators “the instruments and henchmen of a satanic deception and tyranny.”¹⁴⁵

Turning to the *Compactata* issued to the Utraquists by the Council of Basle 1436 with a guarded approval of the lay communion *sub utraque*, Linteo claimed that the concession was invalid, inasmuch as the document did not bear the approval of the Roman curia. That remained the case into the sixteenth century, as attested by the failure of Bohemian King Vladislav II Jagellonian (1471-1516) to obtain a papal approval of the *Compactata* shortly before his death. Linteo characterized as legitimate only the permission for the Lay Chalice by Pope Pius IV, which was included in a letter to the Electors of Cologne and Trier, Archbishops of Salzburg, Prague, Bremen, and Esztergom, and the Bishops of Hamburg and Jurck, and dated April 16, 1564.¹⁴⁶ Even though this permission involved a disavowal of the superiority of communion *sub utraque*, Linteo still depicted the papal grant as a precarious concession which was just temporary. He proceeded to cite reasons why in any case to receive *sub una* was preferable to communion in both kinds, even though he acknowledged that in principle both forms were appropriate. He offered altogether ten arguments in favor of communion in one kind, stressing that the demand for communion *sub utraque* had opened a Pandora’s box of heretical notions.¹⁴⁷

The alleged fusion of the Utraquists with the Roman Church after 1609 had received a semblance of support from the documents appended to the *Second Apology* of the Bohemian estates (1618). One document, in particular, quoted the oath which Utraquist candidates for the priesthood were supposedly required to take prior to their ordination by the Archbishop of Prague.¹⁴⁸ The Tridentine text, as cited, in fact contained an abject promise of the submission to the Holy See, but by

143) "v grammatyce ovšem, ale ne v Písmech zběhlého" (Peter) *ibid.* 14; "jako člověkem smělym a logikářem odvážlivým." (Jakoubek) *ibid.* 15.

144) "Z čehož však Mistr Jan Hus v Konstancy v vězení, když mu to bylo oznámeno, veliký měl zármutek, a jím to vše ne k rozumu a pobožnosti, ale k všetečnosti, kterak by ho o jeho hrdlo připravit měla, přičetl." *Ibid.* 17, see also *ibid.* 68.

145) "Ti byli přijímání pod obojí začátkové, ti satanášového v tom obmyslu a tyranství nástrojové a náhončí." *Ibid.* 17.

146) *Ibid.* 29-30, 38.

147) *Ibid.* 44-48, 54, 68.

148) *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého* 127-130.

itself proved little about the actual Utraquist ordinations. We have touched on this issue earlier in the article. On the one hand, there was nothing new about this text. As early as the 1560s the Archbishop of Prague had come to insist on the submission to the Tridentine document by any new ordinands, thereby terminating any further archiepiscopal ordinations of Utraquists in Prague. Subsequently, Utraquist priests were ordained by bishops outside Bohemia, particularly in Passau, Wrocław, Olomouc, Poznaň, and Nitra.¹⁴⁹ On the other hand, there seems little independent evidence that, from the turn of the sixteenth century, any Utraquist candidates for the priesthood actually submitted to such a requirement either before or after 1609. The Tridentine oath, of course, would have been taken by those Utraquist priests who had originally received their ordinations under *sub una* and then shifted their allegiance. These priests, however, could not be considered bound by a juridical submission to the Holy See. As an example, one can cite the case of the prominent Utraquist priest, Jan Cykáda, a member of the Consistory in 1605-1609, who had been ordained by the archbishop and had served as a priest *sub una* during the 1590s.

In any case, the leading Utraquist theologians of the period 1609-1620, like Pačuda, Locika, Cykáda, or Jakub Soffian Walkmberger of Walkmbergk, could not be considered lackeys of the Roman Church, any more than they could be viewed as Crypto-Lutherans. As an example, the notable Utraquist pastor, Locika of Domažlice, preached so critically about the Roman Church in 1613 at his parish church in Prague that he received a formal reprimand from Administrator Crinitus, a Lutheran.¹⁵⁰ If, as Hrejsa maintained, the adherents of the Roman Church, guided by the Nuncio and Cardinal Melchior Klesl, supported in 1618 the plan for a Utraquist Consistory, as a way to weaken the united front *sub utraque* and bring the Utraquists into submission to the Archbishop, the Utraquist priests clearly refused to swallow the bait.¹⁵¹ On the popular side the Utraquist hostility to the institutions of the Roman Church can be gleaned from the assaults on the monasteries, noted earlier, which accompanied the invasion of the Passauers in Prague in 1611. Incidentally, one of the victims of these riots was Linteo, the anti-Utraquist controversialist just cited, who was then severely beaten and died two years later possibly as a consequence of his injuries.¹⁵²

Only after the outbreak of the Bohemian Uprising in 1618, the voice of the Roman Church toward the Utraquists softened once again, reminiscent of the views expressed at the mid-point of the previous century. This occurred in the oft-cited Jesuit *Apology*, which the Society published in Vienna, first in Latin, then in a German translation, after its expulsion from Bohemia on June 1, 1618. As noted earlier, the Jesuit *Apology* praised Hus and the Utraquists for their belief in invocation of the saints, relics, priestly celibacy, the seven sacraments, the sacrifice of the mass, transubstantiation, and purgatory. Nevertheless, the labeling of the Utraquists with the Lutherans and the Brethren, without any qualification as non-Catholics [*Aatholicos*] struck a surprisingly dissonant note. Despite the evident

149) Klement Borový, *Martin Medek, Arcibiskup pražský* (Prague, 1877) 73-74.

150) Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách* 1:272.

151) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 534-535.

152) Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII. věku* (Prague, 1875-1876) 1:453.

juridical schism between them and the Roman curia, prior to 1609 Roman authorities might consider the Utraquists as still essentially participants in the Catholic Church. Elsewhere in the *Apology*, however, the Utraquists are contrasted with the Lutherans and given the credit for defending much of the “faith and institutions of the Catholic Church.”¹⁵³

Utraquists and the Church of England: Mutual Misperceptions

Because of the previously noted sharing of the *via media* between the Utraquists and the Anglican Church it appears paradoxical that the two had little contact or even mutual knowledge, although relations between Bohemia and England substantially increased in the period culminating in the Bohemian Uprising. The explanation for this seemingly unnatural separation is that the knowledge of the religious situation on each side was propagated by the religious radicals, Lutherans and the Brethren in Bohemia and nonconformists in England, and the Utraquists and the Anglicans tended to view each other in this distorting mirror.

Except for the translation of John Jewel's *Apologia*,¹⁵⁴ the interest in English religious thought in Bohemia seemed focused on the outright Protestant or Puritan trends, appealing to the Lutherans and the Brethren. This was most likely a result of availability. While continental Protestants had only slight, if any, interest in the authentic Anglicans, they favored the English nonconformists, and even printed or reprinted their writings in places like Geneva. The Continental dissemination facilitated the effect of such literature on Bohemia's Lutherans. Typical of the use of English nonconformist sources in Bohemia was a passage concerning Wyclif in the treatise *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* (1613) by the Lutheran, Zacharyáš Bruncvík. He referred to the works of the theologian Laurence Humphrey (1527-1590) whose Protestant leanings made him clash with such moderates in the English Church as Archbishop Parker and John Jewel, particularly over the highly symbolic and emotionally charged issue of liturgical vestments.¹⁵⁵ Otherwise Bruncvík cited Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* on Wyclif, a list of fifteen notable Lollards from a publication he called *Catalogus testium veritatis*, and again from Humphrey on the burning of Wyclif's books in Prague in 1410.¹⁵⁶

Bruncvík displayed an even broader knowledge of English religious radicalism in his *Zrcadlo Kacířství* (1614). He relied largely on such English sources (in Latin) to demonstrate that mainline Protestantism either had not embraced positions of the alleged ancient and early medieval heresies, as charged by the controversialists of the Roman Church, or if it did so, such teachings were not really heretical but orthodox. The Czech Lutheran referred to the Oxonian Puritan, Robert

153) Markus, "Stavovské apologie z roku 1618," 207; Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu* 18; see also 53: "...quamplurima ex Catholicae Ecclesiae fide et instituto defenderun."

154) John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, *Apologia, to jest: Dostatečná Obrana Víry a Náboženství Církví Englických* (Prague, 1619), translation of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, *An Apologie, or Answer in Defense of the Church of England* (London, 1562, reprinted New York, 1972).

155) Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 113. He refers to Laurentius Humfredus, *Contra Edmundi Campiani rationes*, evidently citing from Laurence Humphrey, *Iesuitismi*, 2 vv. (London: Henricus Middletonus, 1582-1584). On Humphrey see *DNB* 10:246.

156) The Lollard inventory included figures familiar from the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation, such as Ricardus With, Joannes Oldecastel, and Petrus Payne; Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 115; see also *ibid.* 113 (ref. to Foxe), 122 (ref. to Humphrey).

Abbot, and even to James I's *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* (1609) on the issues of the Antichrist, and false prophets.¹⁵⁷ He repeatedly cited another Puritan, William Whitaker, as well as his own old favorite Humphrey, on the nature of the church and religious rituals. The special relevance of these two writers to the Bohemian scene may be seen in the fact that both directed much of their polemical fire at Edmund Campion's *Rationes decem*. As mentioned elsewhere, Campion had spent seven years at Jesuit colleges in Brno and Prague (1573-1580), and two of his works, including *Rationes decem*, had appeared in Czech translations early in the seventeenth century.¹⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Bruncvík had most frequently recourse to the also Puritanically inclined Matthew Sutcliffe, and to the low churchman, Bishop Thomas Morton, for their wide-ranging inventory of real or putative historical deviations from the true Christian faith.¹⁵⁹ He featured Morton's anti-Roman polemic, *Apologia Catholica* (1606) as one of his main sources on the title page of his *Zrcadlo Kacířství*.¹⁶⁰ It was typical of the radical leanings of his English sources that Humphrey, Morton, Sutcliffe, and Whitaker, according to him, all vouched for Calvin's Christian orthodoxy. In the same context, Bruncvík objected to William Gifford's equating Calvin's followers with those of Mohamed in *Calvino-Turcismus* (1603) by citing Sutcliffe's counterblast, *De Turco-Papismo* (1604), which drew parallels between Rome and Islam.¹⁶¹ He also rejoiced that for Humphrey, Morton and Whitaker, far from being a heretic, Luther was "a special vessel of God [zvláštní nádoba Boží]." ¹⁶²

157) Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* ff. A8r, C2r, D4v, D6v.

158) While Laurence Humphrey criticized Campion in *Iesuitismi*, William Whitaker published his *Ad decem rationes Edmundi Campiani Jesuite, quibus fretus certamen Anglicanae ecclesiae ministris obtulit in causa fidei, responsio* (London:, 1581). On this controversy see also Thomas M. McCoog, "Playing the Champion: The Role of Disputation in the Jesuit Mission," in Thomas M. McCoog, ed., *Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits* (Woodbridge, UK, 1996) 133-134. The two Czech trans. are Edmund Campion, *Wšech Pikartských, Luteryánských, i jináč zrotilých Prevytkantů, Hostides. To jest: Deset podstatných příčin, kterýchž jistotau, velebný kněz, a zmužilosrdnatý Mučedlník Edmund Kampian, z Tovaryšstva jména Ježíšova pohnut jsa, vše víry Ržímské Odpůrce, k zjevnému před Englickau Královnu, o Víru potýkání, pobídl; Jim se pak z brlochu na světlo vyjítí nechtělo* (Olomouc, 1602); and Edmund Campion, *Spis krátký Edmunda Kampiana Societatis Jesu, Theologa a Mučedlníka Božího, ktrý ne tak dávno pro víru S. Katolickau smrt ukrutnau podstaupil: Vznešeným Doktorům a Mistrům učení Oxonienského a Kantabrigienského podaný* (Prague, 1601).

159) He relied on the following of Sutcliffe's works: *De Catholica, Orthodoxa, et vera Christi Ecclesia* (London, 1592), *De Monachis, eorum Institutis et Moribus* (London, 1600), and *De Missa Papistica, variisque Synagogae Rom. Circa Eucharistiae Sacramentum Erroribus et Coruptelis* (London, 1603), Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* ff. A7v, B5v, B7v. Sutcliffe subsequently acted as a sponsor of the New England colonies, *DNB* 19:176. In *Zrcadlo Kacířství* Bruncvík has 49 references to Sutcliffe, 41 to Morton, 35 to Whitaker, and 17 to Humphrey.

160) Thomas Morton, *Apologiae Catholicae, in qua paradoxa, haereses, blasphemiae, scelera, quae Jesuitae et Pontificii alii Protestantibus impingunt, fere omnia, ex ipsorum Pontificiorum testimoniis apertis diluuntur* 2 vv. (London, 1606). *DNB* 13:1061, cites the opinion of Morton as "belonging to that class of episcopal divines who differed in nothing considerable from the rest of the reformed churches except in church government."

161) Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* ff. B3v-B4r, C5r. He referred to William Gifford's *Calvino-Turcismus. Id est Calvinisticae perfidiae cum Mahumetana Collatio* (Antwerp, 1597 and 1603), and to Matthew Sutcliffe's *De Turcopapismo, hoc est De Turcarum et Papistarum adversus Christi ecclesiam et fidem Conjurazione, eorumque in fidem et moribus consensione et similitudine* (London, 1599 and 1604).

162) Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* f. C4r.

As noted earlier Czech Lutherans showed a lively interest in the devotional works of the Puritan William Perkins (1558-1602), among them the lengthy *Anatomia conscientiae*, which appeared in Prague in Czech translations by Oeconomus, Regius and Valecius between 1610 and 1620. Of the three translators, Regius would continue his interest in England where he traveled for two years, 1633-1635 from his post-White Mountain exile in Saxony. Bruncvík in his *Zrcadlo Kacířství* likewise referred to Perkins's rejection of the purgatory.¹⁶³ As also noted earlier, Czech Lutherans shared the outrage of the English nonconformists over the alleged Gunpowder Plot of 1604-1605. Abraham Scultetus, preaching in honor of Frederick of Palatinate's coronation as Bohemian King on October 24, 1619 praised the Crypto-Lutheran Archbishop Thomas Cranmer who in repentance burned his right hand by which he had signed a statement approving of the mass. According to Frederick's court preacher, Cranmer's and others' subsequent martyrdom for their evangelical faith under Queen Mary, caused the rise of the devout ranks of Protestant believers.¹⁶⁴

To round out the story about the subsequent cooperation between the Brethren and the Puritans, it might be noted that, in exile after the White Mountain, Comenius, the bishop of the Unity of Brethren, promoted the popular work *Praxis pietatis* by the Puritan theologian, Bishop Lewis Bayly (d. 1631). Comenius had a Czech translation published in Leszno, Poland, in 1630, and another in Amsterdam in 1661. What attracted the Brethren was apparently Bayly's emphasis on good deeds, especially fast and prayer, as aids to salvation. At the other end of the spectrum, the Brethren could also heartily agree with the bishops' rejection of venerating the saints, not excluding the Virgin. The interest of the Puritans in the Brethren would also lead to the story, possibly apocryphal, of the offer of the presidency of Harvard College of Massachusetts in New England to Comenius in the 1640s.¹⁶⁵ Likewise in the post-White Mountain period, the Unity was asked to supply additional material for a new edition of Puritanism's *chef-d'oeuvre*, Foxe's martyrology. When the deadline was missed in 1632, the Brethren's intended contribution was published separately in London in 1650 as *The history of the Bohemian persecution*.¹⁶⁶

163) See n. 128 above concerning the translations. On Regius in England see Jireček, "Literatura exulantův českých," 217-219; Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české* 2:163. Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství* f. C8r, and also E1r, referring to William Perkins, *Problema de Romanae fidei ementito catholicismo* (Cambridge, 1604).

164) Dykastus, *Postylla: nebo Kázání krátká na evangelia svatá* 1: 25; Abraham Scultetus, *Vysvětlení Žalmu XX v Valdsaxu* (Prague, 1619) ff. E1r, E2r.

165) Lewis Bayly, *Praxis pietatis. To jest O cvičení se v pobožnosti pravé knížka milostná* (Leszno, 1631) 284-291, 442-44. The Amsterdam edition was published by: Kopydlanský, 1661. On Comenius and Harvard see Samuel E. Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College*. (Cambridge, Mass., 1935) 243-245.

166) Jan Amos Komenský, [Johann Amos Comenius], *The history of the Bohemian persecution*. By A.A. for John Walker, 1650. It was preceded by a Latin translation, *Historia persecutionum ecclesiae bohemicae* (published originally in Leiden in 1647 and 1648); see Jan Amos Komenský, *Opera omnia* (Prague, 1989) 9/1:199-338. The Czech original was published subsequently as Jan Amos Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivěnstvích církve české hned od počátku jejího na víru Křesťanskou obrácení v létu 894 až do léta 1632 za panování Ferdinanda Druhého. S připojením historie o persekucí valdenských roku tohoto (1655) stálé* (Leszno, 1655); 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Jan Paskovský, 1663); see Komenský, *Opera omnia* 53-198.

The Bohemian focus on English religious radicalism seemed to mirror the English interest in Bohemia which centered on Taboritism and tended to (mis)perceive Hus and Jerome as Proto-Protestants. The appreciation of Utraquism as a *via media* seems to have been lost.¹⁶⁷ Perhaps under the influence of Foxe, the Puritans (mis)appropriated Hus so convincingly that the Anglican polemicists habitually included him and Jerome of Prague in the company of Proto-Protestants, such as the Albigensians, the Waldensians, the Taborites, and Wyclif. Anthony Milton relates a particularly poignant episode in that regard, which - albeit dating from the post-1620 period - evidently reflected a long-term attitudinal trend. An almanac, published in London for 1631 by William Beale replaced several medieval saints in the Prayer Book Calendar by Foxe's Lollard Martyrs, Wyclif, Savonarola, as well as Hus and Jerome of Prague. An Anglican critic, John Pockington, condemned the work as "a Calendar...wherein the Holy Martyrs and Confessors of Jesus Christ...are rased out, and Traitors, Murderers, Rebels, and Hereticks set in their roome."¹⁶⁸ The relatively insular character of Anglicanism - contrasted with the international orientation of Puritanism - also may partly explain the problem of obtaining accurate information about mainline Utraquism.¹⁶⁹

An analogous misperception seemed to have characterized the Utraquist view of Anglicanism as a more radical phenomenon than it really was. While the Lutherans honored Thomas Cranmer and the Marian martyrs, the Utraquists went in the opposite direction to celebrate Thomas More and John Fisher, as evident from the writings of Pavel Bydžovský. Šimon Ennius Klatovský, in the introduction to his translation of Robert Barnes's *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum*, likewise honored Thomas More as both "noble and learned" [*vznešený a učený*].¹⁷⁰ Perhaps, the Anglicans' full break with the papacy - compared with the Utraquists' merely partial one - played a role in this misperception. Archbishop Berka also had an exaggerated notion of the Anglican radicalism. In a letter to Rudolf II of July 3, 1599, he compared England to Heidelberg as a hotbed of Calvinism.¹⁷¹

Though never explicitly repudiating Christian ecumenicism or catholicity, a distinct national insularity seemed to lead the Utraquists, as the Anglicans, to largely surrender the field of international contacts to their fully reformed compatriots. Thus an opportunity for mutual recognition - if not mutual support - was lost. Moreover, because of the complexities of their differing attitudes toward the papacy, Anglicanism appeared more, and Utraquism less, radical than reality warranted. This also hindered the likelihood of mutual appreciation, or possibly Christian affection.

167) Concerning such misjudgments see Zdeněk V. David, "The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517-1621," *JEH*, 46 (1995) 646.

168) Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (New York, 1995) 314, see also 89, 293, 301, 303, 305-306.

169) Moreover, Bohemia's religious affairs had to compete for attention in the early seventeenth century with other parts of Europe such as Poland; Michal J. Rozbicki, "Between East-Central Europe and Britain: Reformation and Science as Vehicles of Intellectual Communication in the Mid-Seventeenth Century," *East European Quarterly* 30 (1997) 401-419.

170) Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est* (Prague, 1554) is entirely devoted to the martyrdom of Fisher and More; Barnes, *Kroniky. A životůsepsání nejvrchnějších BiskupůŘímských jináč Papežů* (Nuremberg, 1565) f. 195v.

171) *Sněmy české* 9:682-683.

Utraquist and the Bohemian Uprising

The Utraquist towns remained loyal to their alliance with the Lutheran nobles and against their own convictions and better judgment followed the aristocrats into the revolt against kings Matthias and Ferdinand II in 1618 with disastrous results. The reluctance of the towns was graphically described by Mikuláš Dačický, the outstanding townsman/historian.¹⁷² After the defenestration of the two royal lieutenants, Jaroslav Bořita Martinic and Vilém Slavata, the councillors of the city of Prague disassociated themselves from the violent act of the nobles. *Euangelische Erklerung auff die Böhaimische Apologia* (1618) repeats the charge that the Prague town council objected to the Defensores' action in the spring of 1618. According to *Euangelische Erklerung*, the towns still on the day of the Defenestration, May 23, 1618, refused to join the uprising against the King. In analogy to the situation in 1575, when the towns had initially refused to support the Bohemian Confession, the towns now were threatened and intimidated to ally with the noble estates. It is not true as some - trying to explain the reluctance of the cities - maintained that the royal government appointed many *sub una* into town councils, the Utraquists predominated.¹⁷³ Another source, resurrecting the old legend of the irresistible royal power over the towns, argued that the royal judges intimidated the town councils into refusing to join the insurrection. The same source, however, contradicted itself on the next page when it admitted that it was the hesitation of the town councils - not royal pressure - that the nobles had to overcome in order to recruit the towns for the insurrection. In the end, the towns elected ten of the thirty Directors who assumed power from the defenestrated lieutenants of the king, and headed the new insurrectionary government. The towns, however, still counseled moderation and negotiation with the King at the Diet of August 25, 1618 when there could be no question of pressure by royal judges appointed in towns by the King.¹⁷⁴

The towns' reluctance to join the uprising may be in part ascribed to the Utraquist ingrained aversion to forcible resolutions of internal or external conflicts, a tendency which had evolved in reaction to the destructiveness of the wars of Bohemian Reformation in the first half of the fifteenth century. Although this pacific attitude had not reached the truly Tolstoyan proportions, as it had in the Unity, it did help to foster the Utraquist tolerance vis á vis the *sub una* and the Lutherans on the domestic front. The Utraquist quasi-pacifism was, however, only one ideological obstacle which the Lutheran nobles had to face in spearheading the uprising. The Lutheran chaplains had to justify their masters' imbroglia with an enthroned monarch against their own coreligionists, for instance, against the taunts of the *Euangelische Erklerung* that true and sincere Evangelicals owed obedience even to evil rulers [*zlé vrchnosti*] and "whoever opposes or vituperates the sovereign, opposes God himself, [inasmuch as] the monarchs concerned bear and manifest the image of God in their persons."¹⁷⁵ Thus, in response to the Lutheran qualms,

172) Kneidl, *Městský stav v Čechách v době předbělohorské* 176; Mikuláš Dačický z Heslova, *Paměti*, ed. Antonín Rezek, (Prague, 1878-80) 1:245.

173) Markus, "Stavovské apologie z roku 1618," 205; *Euangelische Erklerung auff die Böhaimische Apologia* ff. A3r, C1v.

174) *Přehled dějin Československa*, eds. Jaroslav Purš and Miroslav Kropilák (Prague, 1980-1982) 2:95 vs. 96, 100.

175) *Euangelische Erklerung auff die Böhaimische Apologia* f. A2r.

Bartolomeus argued that a war with its perils, as a visitation from God, roused the feeling of religious awareness which tended to decline during the period of peace with its sense of security. Its incidence could be also viewed as a divine scourge in the punishment for sins.¹⁷⁶ Not only kings or princes, but also other rulers established by God could declare war, such as free estates, entrusted with administration of their land (which was presumably the case in Bohemia). A just war could oppose not only enemies of God, but also those who threatened the security of recognized privileges, liberties or properties.¹⁷⁷

The (mis)management of the Bohemian uprising (1618-1620) demonstrated further the dysfunctional character of the Bohemian nobility by revealing its startling incompetence in the direction of both diplomatic and military affairs. Their lack of civic-mindedness even during the insurrection was manifest in their endeavor to shift the burden of taxation from themselves on to the towns.¹⁷⁸ In this the nobles not only showed their traditional cavalier haughtiness and recklessness, but they also reproduced the notoriously exploitative and restrictive policy that marked the Habsburg dynasty's self-defeating paranoia vis-a-vis the towns both in the Spanish and central European territories, incidentally, with disastrous consequences for the economic development of their realms. At the Diet of July 1619, the towns did regain their freedom with the abrogation of the restrictions on their self-government which dated to Ferdinand I's punishment of 1547, and gained a measure of influence in the county (*kraje*) governments. The election of Frederick of Palatinate as king on August 26, 1619, however, deprived them of their share in central government with the consequential dissolution of the body of the thirty Directors. The new high royal officials were appointed entirely from the noble estates. Soon the towns likewise lost their representation in the county governments. Moreover, a disregard for the feelings of the Utraquist townspeople can be seen in the violation of their religious *via media* by the Calvinist zeal of Frederick's chaplains, particularly by their iconoclastic cleansing of the Prague cathedral.¹⁷⁹

Otherwise, however, the insurgent governments during the uprising (both directorial and royal) did not interfere with Utraquist townsmen or with Utraquist clergy. Religious pluralism continued under the Consistory after the uprising, as evident from Directors' orders of July 1618 which stipulated that the administrator should prevent clashes among clergy of different convictions. The proceedings against Locika of Domažlice in December 1618 seem to be an isolated case of persecution of Utraquist clergy.¹⁸⁰ Official restrictions affected adherents of the Roman Church, including the expulsion of the Jesuits and exclusion of *sub una* from the councils of royal towns. Archbishop Lohelius likewise had to seek the security of Vienna. However, the adherents of Rome, who forswore the principle that "promises given to heretics need not be kept," were tolerated, as also were the Franciscan and Capuchin orders.¹⁸¹

176) Bartolomeus, *Kázání krátké ku potěšení a napomenutí pobožným vojákům* ff. A2r-A2v, C3v.

177) *Ibid.* ff. A7v, B2r.

178) For instance, František. J. Kroiher, "Nevlastenectví českých stavů nekatolických v době předbělohorské," *Sborník historického kroužku* Sešit 3 (1894) especially 69.

179) Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský* 37-39; *Přehled dějin Československa* 2:104, 106.

180) Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536-537; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* 447.

181) *Protokol vyšlé korespondence* 20-21, 36 (no. 180), 76 (no. 890); Jan Fiala, *Hrozné doby*

Conclusion

In conclusion, four propositions can be suggested as to the state of the Utraquist Church in Bohemia between 1609 and 1621. (1) Whether or not individual Utraquist priests had to promise allegiance to the Tridentine creed when ordained by the Archbishop of Prague or another Roman prelate was ultimately irrelevant, because operating as a Utraquist priest implied repudiation of obedience to the bureaucratic apparatus of the Roman Church. (2) The Utraquist clergy functioned under the authority of the Consistory *sub utraque*, not that of the Archbishop of Prague. (3) While embracing the Bohemian Confession as a symbol, the Consistory *sub utraque* did not enforce Lutheran ecclesial uniformity, but rather provided a milieu federating three types of *sub utraque* with distinct confessions and liturgies: the Utraquists, the Lutherans (the authentic adherents to the Bohemian Confession), and the Unity of Brethren. (4) The Utraquists (or Hussites as they were improperly called) constituted a substantial portion, perhaps a majority, of the *sub utraque* among the Czech townsmen and peasants.

protireformace (Heršpice 1997) 68-69. A decree of the Directors requested in June 1618 the towns of Prague to stop singing of songs disparaging the *sub una*; *Protokol vyšlé korespondence* 32 (no. 109).