

---

## Utraquism's Liberal Ecclesiology

---

**Zdeněk V. David**

(Washington, D.C.)

Utraquism's liberal ecclesiology can be considered an important part of the legacy of the Bohemian Reformation. Despite (or even perhaps in harmony with) their traditionalism in dogma and liturgy, which distinguished them from later Protestants, the Utraquists struck two libertarian notes in theological discourse by their insistence (1) on an interplay between reason and authority, and (2) on a free preaching of the "word of God." Furthermore, having eschewed the monarchic authoritarianism of the Late Medieval Roman Church, the Utraquists maintained a consensual approach in ecclesiastical administration, and their abhorrence of violent methods evidently promoted a tolerant view of other religious denominations. In its intellectual openness and moderation of discourse, stemming partly from its intermediate position between Rome and the Protestant Reformation, the Utraquist Church of Bohemia resembled the Church of England, particularly of the Elizabethan settlement.<sup>1</sup>

The positive aspects of the ecclesiastical features tended to be obscured in the historical record by a tendency to cast a jaundiced eye at the relatively laissez-faire attitude of Utraquism. Thus, tolerance was misinterpreted as religious indifference. Avoidance of strong-armed enforcement was misjudged as excessive permissiveness or even as a condoning of immorality. Freedom of discussion in theology was seen as springing from a lack of intellectual rigor. Hence we shall also explore the reasons why historical discourse has tended to turn what can be viewed as real ecclesiological virtues of the Utraquist Church into alleged vices.

### Freedom and Consensus

Two principles constituted the cornerstones of Utraquism's liberal ecclesiology: (1) the theological openness to rational argument and (2) a repudiation of the administrative and juridical jurisdiction of the Roman curia. Although resulting from a lengthy period of dramatic events, symbolically and formally these principles were enshrined respectively in the so-called Judge of Cheb (*iudex in Egra compactatus, soudce chebský*) of 1432, and in Emperor/King Sigismund's 1436 charter of ecclesiastical liberties.

Intellectual openness was one of the central characteristics of the Bohemian Reformation almost from the very start. It was embraced in the early stages by Hus and his original colleagues in the reform movement. For the Utraquists, the obedience to the popes as well as to the general church councils had its limits. The criterion was a rational demonstration of consistency of the papal

---

<sup>1</sup> Louise Campbell, "A Diagnosis of Religious Moderation: Matthew Parker and the 1559 Settlement," in *Moderate voices in the European Reformation*, eds. Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005) 32-50.

and/or conciliar edicts with the text of the Bible, the "law of God" [*zákon Boží*] as embodied in Scripture.<sup>2</sup> Along the lines of safeguarding personal judgment, Hus went as far as to defend, in a treatise from 1410, the utility of reading heretical books, and oppose their burning as contradictory to sound reason, as well as the precepts of the Church Fathers.<sup>3</sup> The same conviction led him to appeal his excommunication in 1412 from a papal decision to Christ, citing as a precedent, Robert Grosseteste's famous defiance of Innocent IV in 1253.<sup>4</sup> The culminating point that earned Hus wide recognition as a pioneer and martyr of human rights, was his refusal to recant at the Council of Constance in 1415, unless the error of his ideas was demonstrated.<sup>5</sup> As another crucial landmark, the principle of non-contradiction with the Bible as the criterion of religious truth was outlined in the ecclesiological discourses of Jakoubek of Stříbro, the ranking figure of the Utraquist church, in the 1420s.<sup>6</sup> Hence, the use of magisterial command without a discussion, as practiced by the Roman Church, was specifically repudiated by the Utraquists, first with reference to the witness of Hus, then collectively during the Bohemian wars of religion.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, the endorsement of a relatively free discussion of religious issues was codified in the Four Articles of Prague, in the Test or so-called "Judge" of Cheb in 1432, and in the *Compactata* of the Council of Basel in 1436. As noted above, the tenets of the Judge of Cheb were an eminently important milestone in the guarantee of free theological discussion. The Czech Utraquists insisted on them in 1432 before embarking on the negotiations with the Council of Basel, spelling out the supremacy of the Bible over any other ecclesiastical documents or institutions. The Bible and opinions in conformity with Scripture, therefore, were to govern the Council's theological discussions with the Utraquists.<sup>8</sup> The Utraquist Church accepted teachings of popes, church fathers and doctors, and councils that could be extrabiblical (not specifically contained in the Bible), but not those propositions,

---

<sup>2</sup> Thomas A. Fudge, "The Law of God: Reform and Religious Practice in Late Medieval Bohemia," *BRRP* 1 (1996) 70-71. Saint Paul refers to the "law of God" in Romans 7:22, 25, 8:7.

<sup>3</sup> Jaroslav Čechura, *České země v letech 1378-1437: Lucemburkové na českém trůně II* [The Czech lands in the years 1378-1437: Luxembourgs on the Czech throne II] (Prague, 2000) 124.

<sup>4</sup> In refusing to appoint the pope's nephew to a lucrative English benefice; Jiří Spěváček, *Václav IV, 1361-1419* (Prague, 1986) 448-49; Novotný 135.

<sup>5</sup> Brian Tierney, *The Idea of Natural Rights: Studies on Natural Rights, Natural Law and Church Law, 1150-1625* (Atlanta, Ga., 1997) 32, 214.

<sup>6</sup> Vavřinec z Březové, *Husitská kronika* [Hussite chronicle], ed. Marie Bláhová (Prague, 1979) 200-201; Paul De Vooght, *Jacobellus de Stříbro, 1429: premier théologien du hussitisme* (Louvain, 1972) 177-180.

<sup>7</sup> On the strain of open-mindedness and tolerance in Utraquism see also Zdeněk V. David, "Central Europe's Gentle Voice of Reason: Bílejovský and the Ecclesiology of Utraquism," *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997) 33-37.

<sup>8</sup> Bohuslav Bílejovský, *Kronyka cýrkevní*, ed. Josef Skalický (Prague, 1816) 17. On the principle of the Judge of Cheb (*soudce chebský*), recognized by the Council of Basel in 1432, see also Amadeo Molnár and others, *Soudce smluvený v Chebu* [The Cheb Judge] (Sborník příspěvků přednesených na symposiu k 550. výročí) (Cheb, 1982) 9-36; on the Utraquists' refusal to obey popes or councils, if contradicting the Bible, see also František Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce, 2 vv.* (Prague, 1965-66) 2:49, 66, 113, 181-82; or the partial English translation, *The Hussite Revolution, 1424-1437*, ed. John M. Klassen (Boulder, Colo., 1986) 79-82; and Frederick G. Heyman "John Rokycana: Church Reformer Between Hus and Luther," *Church History* 28 (1959) 246.

which they viewed, as in actual contradiction with Scripture.<sup>9</sup> It was particularly Article 7 of the Judge of Cheb which undermined the bureaucratic authoritarianism of the Roman Church.<sup>10</sup>

The promotion of a fairly open intellectual ambiance among the Utraquists was enhanced by a synergistic effect of adding, to the principle of rational examination, the injunction to preach the Word of God freely. This stance was adumbrated by Hus himself when he challenged a papal edict prohibiting him to preach as a violation of Scripture; he claimed that the free preaching of the Gospel by the apostles and their legitimate successors was guaranteed by Christ himself, as recorded in the Bible.<sup>11</sup> The idea of preaching the word of God freely was also promoted by John Wyclif, the late fourteenth-century Oxford scholar, whose doctrines had considerable vogue in the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation, although ultimately the Bohemians refused to follow him in his departures from the orthodoxy of medieval theology.<sup>12</sup> The principle of free preaching passed into mainstream Utraquism through its incorporation into the basic Utraquist documents: the Four Articles of Prague of 1419 (as Article One), and the *Compactata* (as Article Two).<sup>13</sup>

In order to explain the Utraquists' resistance to surrendering the function of reason and argument in the face of naked magisterial authority, its roots may be sought in the free-wheeling academic disputations at the University of Prague, as well as to the spirit of tolerance in Wyclif's theology.<sup>14</sup> In fact, the Bohemian Reformation's leadership consisted mainly of university teachers and other theological academics accustomed to the application of reason and reasoning, and also to the freewheeling (*quodlibet*) disputations of the late medieval universities.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Thus Jakoubek of Stříbro, the early authoritative theologian of Utraquism, affirmed in 1420 that, as far as the rite of the mass is concerned, ceremonies were to be retained even though not found in scripture unless they were directly contrary to the Law of God. See David R. HOLETON, "Church or Sect?: The *Jednota Bratrská* and the Growth of Dissent from Mainline Utraquism," CV 38 (1996) 19 n. 52. HOLETON cites from Jakoubek's *Egressus Ihesus* (Sermons on Matthew 24) in Prague MS NK X G 20, ff. 98v, 100r.

<sup>10</sup> "...Item in causa quatuor articulorum, quam ut praefertur posequuntur, lex divina, praxis Christi, apostolica et ecclesiae primitivae, una cum conciliis doctoribusque fundantibus se veraciter in eadem, pro veracissimo et evidenti iudice in hoc Basiliensi concilio admittentur...", cited by Radek Zapletal, "Pozvání basilejského koncilu a Soudce v Chebu smluvený," *Theologická revue Husitské teologické fakulty* (1996) 5:78. As the cause celčbre of the difference between Utraquism and Rome, one can take the communion *sub una specie* which, according to the Utraquists, a rational examination had shown to be in contradiction with both Scripture and tradition of the Church, Western as well as Eastern. See, for instance, Bílejovský, *Kronyka* 18.

<sup>11</sup> Novotný 135; Jiří Spěvák, *Václav IV, 1361-1419* (Prague, 1986) 448-49.

<sup>12</sup> On Wyclif's influence, see Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, 2003) 34-37.

<sup>13</sup> Rudolf Řičan, ed., *Čtyři vyznání* [Four confessions] (Prague, 1951) 39; Hrejsa 2:271; Miloslav Kaňák, *John Wyclif: život a dílo anglického Husova předchůdce* [John Wyclif: Life and works of an English forerunner of Hus] (Prague: Blahoslav, 1973) 37.

<sup>14</sup> Stephen Lahey, "Toleration in the Theology and Social Thought of John Wyclif," in Cary J. Nederman and John C. Laursen, eds., *Difference and Dissent: Theories of Tolerance in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Lanham, 1996) 53-58.

<sup>15</sup> See, for instance, Howard Kaminsky, "The University of Prague in the Hussite Revolution: The Role of the Masters," *Universities in Politics: Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, eds. John W. Baldwin and Richard A. Goldthwaite (Baltimore, 1972) 79-80, 104-105;

The Utraquists imparted to theological argumentation the distinguishing marks of striving for reasonableness and of displaying authentic learning. Their historiography did not conceal a low opinion of prelates, such as Archbishop of Prague, Zbyněk Zajíc of Hasenburk (1403-1411), who lacked academic training and relied only on administrative fiat to conduct their office.<sup>16</sup>

Thus, the tone of the Utraquists' discourse was set neither by organizational bureaucrats stressing the exercise of authority nor by folkish sectarians susceptible to emotional enthusiasms. On the issue of bureaucratic legitimization, although initially the Bohemian reformers received some support from the royal government, the latter proved vacillating and ultimately unreliable, and most of the time the Utraquist Church lived under non-Utraquist monarchs and coexisted with Protestant and *sub una* noble estates. For its entire duration it also waged an epochal debate with the ecclesiastical officials of the Roman curia. On the issue of sectarian enthusiasm, although the initial success of the reform movement during the wars of the Bohemian Reformation owed much to the Taborite and Orebite armed forces, inspired by popular emotions, even fanaticism, the Utraquist Church constantly distanced itself from the theological radicalism of their spiritual militancy, while it might have condoned, or even have applauded, the thrust of their physical militarism.<sup>17</sup>

Concerning the second main principle of liberal ecclesiology, the Utraquist Church, protected by the Bohemian Diet, asserted its autonomy from Roman administrators and judges soon after the execution of Hus. In fact from 1420 to 1431, the whole country was in a way at war with the Holy See. The dismantling of Rome's administrative and judicial prerogatives was made officially when King Sigismund, on ascending the throne of Bohemia after a lengthy interregnum, issued an imperial charter of ecclesiastical liberties, dated 6 January 1436. The document reaffirmed the virtual jurisdictional independence of the Utraquist Church in Bohemia and Moravia from the Roman See by excluding nonresidents from appointments to ecclesiastical offices and dignities, and more importantly reserving the right of making appointments to such posts to the Bohemian king and local inhabitants. The decree not only denied the papacy and the Curia the right to sell or donate ecclesiastical vacancies, but also exempted the inhabitants of Bohemia and Moravia

---

Michal Svatoš, ed., *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy* [History of the Charles University]. Vol. 1: 1347/48-1622 (Prague, 1995) 138-42; Jiří Kejř, *Kvodlibetní disputace na pražské universitě* [Quodlibet disputations at the University of Prague] (Prague, 1971).

<sup>16</sup> See, for instance, Břežovský, *Kronyka* 11. Similarly, Štěpán of Kolín, Hus's teacher at the University of Prague, had sharply criticized Zajíc's precursor, Archbishop Jan of Jenštejn (1379-1396), for his imperiousness and ostentation of riches; Martin Wernisch, "Jan z Pomuka i Nepomuka, shrnutý a neuzavřený," *FHB* 17 (1994) 218. More generally, the tension between the argumentative claims of academic theologians and the prelates' disciplinary claims has been recognized as a problem in the late medieval Church; Ian P. Wei, "The Self-Image of the Masters of Theology at the University of Paris in the late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries," *JEH* 46 (1995) especially 430-31. The system of formal *quaestiones* deliberately opposing the theological consensus served to cushion the thrust of the ecclesiastical authority *vis-à-vis* its subjects. See Richard W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe* (Oxford, 1995) 1:145.

<sup>17</sup> Already Jakoubek of Stříbro in the 1410s and Jan of Přebor in the 1430s had shown pronounced impatience with the lack of theological erudition on the part of the folkish religious thinkers; see Božena Kopiczková, *Jan Želivský* (Prague, 1990) 28; Kamil Krofta, "O některých spisech M. Jana z Přebora," *ČČM* 73 (1899) 213.

from the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts located abroad.<sup>18</sup> This last provision renewed, in part, a decree by Wenceslaus IV of 9 June 1418 that protected inhabitants of Bohemia from summonses to foreign church courts.<sup>19</sup> This legislation foreshadowed the separation of the Church of England from the See of Rome, although it was not so drastic, recognizing Rome's power to confirm appointments of episcopal rank, thus preserving a sacerdotal tie between Utraquist Prague and papal Rome.<sup>20</sup>

Freed from the administrative rules of the Roman Church, the Utraquists were also free to liberalise the internal governance of their church. Thus, the Utraquist Church renounced the interdicts, anathemas, excommunications and other drastic spiritual weapons that were employed conspicuously by the Roman Church in the late medieval and early modern times.<sup>21</sup> Fittingly, in view of Hus's fate, this included an opposition to the burning of heretics.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, the internal administration of the Utraquist Church stressed assent rather than passive submission. Under this approach, in particular, the appointments and transfers of priests, especially in urban parishes, were not dictated, but negotiated, between the Consistory and the municipal authorities.<sup>23</sup> The large volume of correspondence reflected Utraquists' replacement of the command mode of ecclesiastical governance, characteristic of the Roman Church, by a largely consensual method requiring argumentation with the aim of persuasion. The Consistory engaged in frequent disputes with the towns about the candidates to be appointed and confirmed as priests, even if the nominees of both parties were unimpeachably Utraquist. The towns also wished to retain well-liked priests, and therefore hindered their transfers by the Consistory. The confrontational exchanges between the towns and the Consistory reflected the healthy give-and-take system of consensual administration.<sup>24</sup> Ironically, modern historians accustomed to the exercise of automatic obedience, exacted by the typical *Machtstaat* of Central Europe, disapprovingly viewed this practice as a descent into administrative chaos, and as yet another sign of Utraquism's perversity.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Husitská revoluce* 4:100-101. For Sigismund's decree see AČ 3 (1844) 427-431. See also Winfried Eberhard, *Konfessionsbildung und Stände in Böhmen, 1478-1530* (Munich, 1981) 44-45.

<sup>19</sup> Tomek, *Dějepis* 3:622.

<sup>20</sup> MacCulloch, *Cramer* 116.

<sup>21</sup> Kamil Krofta, "Václav Koranda mladší z Nové Plzně a jeho názory náboženské, [Václav Koranda the Younger of New Plzen and his religious opinions]" *Listy z náboženských dějin* (Prague, 1936) 258. As a parenthetical observation, the Utraquists likewise escaped the dread engendered by the Calvinist stress on predestination. Concerning the potentially baneful effect of this doctrine see Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *JEH* 49 (1998) 629, as well as her references to Michael MacDonald, *Sleepless Souls: Suicide in Early Modern England* (New York, 1990) 64-67; and John Stachniewski, *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair* (New York, 1991) especially ch. 1.

<sup>22</sup> Jiří Kejř, "The Death Penalty during the Bohemian Wars of Religion," *BRRP* 6 143-163.

<sup>23</sup> The consensual system of administrative discipline was stipulated, for instance, in the Candlemas Day Articles of 1524, points 1-6, see Bartoš Písař, *Kronika pražská*, ed. Josef V. Šimák. FRB 6:21-22.

<sup>24</sup> *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* [Czech councils from 1526 until our time], vv. 7-10. For a critical assessment of Utraquist ecclesiology see also Julius Pažout, *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících, 1562-1570* [Meetings and letters of the Utraquist consistory 1562-70] (Prague, 1906) especially, p. v.

As firm adherents to the historical apostolic succession for the valid ordination of priests, the Utraquists remained episcopalians and even papalists; from the viewpoint of church governance, however, they feared the heavy hand not only of the pope but eventually also of the monarchic bishops, and they preferred to rely on a collegium of priests, the Consistory, so that their system of ecclesiastical administration could be called presbyterial (though of course not Presbyterian). In this regard the Utraquist Church differed markedly from the other denizen of the *via media*, the Church of England, which had retained an administrative episcopacy as one of its cornerstones.

The liberal ecclesiology of Utraquism with an openness to discussion in theology, however, did resemble the intellectual ambiance of the Church of England of the Elizabethan settlement.<sup>25</sup> The *Ecclesia Anglicana* with its emphasis on reason and its latitudinarianism was paving the way toward the liberal outlook of the English political culture. The emphasis on the rights of reason involved not just freedom of thought, conscience or discussion, but eventually demanded justification in politics as well, concerning institutional rules and functioning.<sup>26</sup>

## Religious Peace

The Utraquists' attitudes contributed greatly to the maintenance of peaceful religious coexistence in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Bohemia. Three factors may be considered to account for their relatively pacific attitude: (1) memories of the horror of the wars of the Bohemian Reformation; (2) the belief in free discussion and respect for unacceptable opinions; and (3) the absence of confessionalisation.

The pacific inclinations in avoiding religious strife should be seen as conditioned and enhanced by the memory of the destructiveness of the internal and external conflicts of the Bohemian Reformation. While not going as far as the Unity of Brethren, which embraced the doctrine of non-resistance to evil, the Utraquists did not hide their aversion to the use of forcible means and compulsion. The Utraquist priest Jan Bechyňka at the turn of the fifteenth century, deploring the use of force and violence, stressed the patience and tolerance of the Utraquists, which led to their peaceful co-existence with the more belligerent *sub una*.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, Bílejovský's tendency to look askance at the Taborite militarism, if it had gone beyond what was seen as the legitimate defense of the Bohemian Reformation, appears to be typical of a sixteenth-century Utraquist. A prominent Utraquist, the author, Blažej Nožička of Votín, writing later in 1566, strongly condemned religious warfare, especially with reference to the 1440s, as unnecessary and thus purely destructive. Nožička likewise emphasized the detrimental effect of the ideas of the Taborites and their partners, the Orebiters, in inciting violence and dissension in the

---

<sup>25</sup> On the similarity, see Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way* 103-110.

<sup>26</sup> *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig, 10 vv. (New York, 1998) 5:601.

<sup>27</sup> Noemi Rejchrtová, "Jan Bechyňka: Kněz a literát [Jan Bechyňka: Priest and scribe]," *ARBI* 3 (1984) 17-18.

very center of the Bohemian Reformation movement.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Daniel Adam of Veleslavín in his edition and translation of Georg Lauterbeck's treatise on government (Prague, 1584) includes a stern warning against unrestrained warfare, preferring two years of negotiations to one of armed conflict.<sup>29</sup>

The memories of destructive violence undoubtedly helped to foster the relatively amicable attitudes and relationships among the various groups in sixteenth-century Bohemia, particularly on the Utraquist side. After the cornerstones of the *Compactata* and the Judge of Cheb, the principle of free discussion and the benign attitude toward the views of others was further legally fortified. The Peace of Kutná Hora of 1485 proscribed accusations of heresy and mutual vilification between the Utraquists and the adherents of the Roman Curia.<sup>30</sup> Along these lines, an Utraquist assembly of clergy and lay estates in April 1523 issued an injunction against the derisive labeling of disagreeable doctrines or opinions as heretical.<sup>31</sup> The Utraquists' continued tradition of gentleness and civility characterized the well-known response of the Utraquist Administrator, Martin Klatovský, in his *Rozsuzování upřímné Artykuluov některých* [A Sincere Review of Certain Articles] (Prague, 1544) to the vitriolic attacks by the Brethren's bishop Jan Augusta.<sup>32</sup> To avoid strife, and despite the urging of Ferdinand I, the Consistory refused to answer the intemperate charges by a Roman theologian, apparently Johannes Cochlaeus, against the writings of Bydžovský.<sup>33</sup> The author Václav Plácel of Elbing in his introduction to Josephus Flavius, *Historia židovská* (1592) opposed the use of violence in the spread of true religion which should occur not by an iron material sword, but rather through preaching of the word of God.<sup>34</sup> Similarly, Jan Kocín of Kocinét in his

---

<sup>28</sup> Blažej Nožička z Votína, *Knížka proti bludům některým před tisíci lety odsouzeným* [The book against some errors proscribed a thousand years ago] (Prague, 1566) f. K(v). Sweden is another example of a nation that turned to pacifism from, and possibly as a reaction to, an earlier history of bloodshed and military ferocity.

<sup>29</sup> Georg Lauterbach, *Politica historica: O vrchnostech a správčích světských knihy patery* [Five books on the aristocracy and secular trusteeship], tr. Daniel Adam of Veleslavín. Prague: Daniel Adam of Veleslavín, 1584; Milan Kopecký, *Daniel Adam z Veleslavína* (Prague, 1962) 25. Conversely, the Bohemians' military reputation markedly diminished abroad by the latter part of the sixteenth century, contrasting with their martial image during the wars of Bohemian Reformation; see, for instance, Karel Stloukal, "Z diplomatických styků mezi Francií a Čechami před Bílou Horou [From the diplomatic relationships between France and Bohemia before the White Mountain]," ČČH (1926) 489.

<sup>30</sup> Thomas A. Fudge, "The Problem of Religious Liberty in Early Modern Bohemia," CV 38 (1996) 67-70; Ernest, Denis, *Fin de l'indépendance bohème*. 2nd ed., 2 vv. (Paris, 1930) 1:208-209; František Šmahel and others, *Jihlava a Basilejská Kompaktata: [Jihlava and the Basil Compactata] Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodního symposia k 555. výročí přijetí Basilejských kompaktát, 26-28. červen 1991* (Jihlava, 1992) especially 11-27. For the text of the Peace of Kutná Hora, see AČ 5:418-27. See also Václav Koranda, Jr., *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* [Tract on great and holy sacrament of the altar] (Prague, 1493) f. A3v - A4r.

<sup>31</sup> František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého*, 5 vv. (Prague, [1893]) V:508-09.

<sup>32</sup> Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem, Pa., 1992) 155-156.

<sup>33</sup> František M. Bartoš, "Katolický vládní spis proti utrakvistickému podávání dítkám z kalicha z r. 1549 [Catholic governmental texts against Utraquist communion for children from the chalice from the year 1549]," ČČM 92 (1918) 69-70.

<sup>34</sup> According to Plácel, God's teaching is also an antidote against heresies. In the Old Testament God preserved his people despite their many divisions and faults in religion; Josephus, Flavius, *Historia židovská. Na knihy čtyry rozdělená* [History of the Jews. In four books], trans. and intro. Václav Plácel z Elbingu. (Prague, 1592) 2-3, 15-16.

introduction to Flavius Magnus Cassiodorus, *Historie církevní* (1594), counselled calm and self-confidence in confrontation with religious error which could not subvert the pillar of truth. He also approved of opposing error through discussion and persuasion.<sup>35</sup>

Aside from the memories of war horrors, the moderation of the Utraquist theologians' discourse can be attributed to their centrist theological position. There was a similarity here with the other sojourners on the religious *via media*, the divines of the Church of England, who were known for having a greater intellectual tolerance than their Puritan opponents.<sup>36</sup> An illustrative example of a curious, calm, and civil examination of Luther's doctrines by two Utraquist priests was offered by the correspondence between Šimon of Habry and Jan of Německý Brod in 1528-29. Characteristic of this non-confrontational attitude was also the complaint by priest Šimon about the excesses of Luther's polemical language, particularly his insults of Henry VIII in *Contra regem Angliae* (1522).<sup>37</sup> It is apropos to recall the mildness with which the archetypal Utraquist, Bydžovský, in the 1540s had treated Luther's doctrines, or with which he had chided the alleged errors of the Brethren.<sup>38</sup> On the points of disagreement, such as the sacramental priesthood, solafideism, the veneration and invocation of Mary and the saints, Bydžovský's attitude toward the Lutherans paralleled the future Anglicans' view of their disagreements with fellow Protestants.<sup>39</sup>

On the Anglican side one can cite, as a parallel with Bydžovský's treatment of Luther, Hooker's courteous treatment of Calvin about whom he spoke with respect in the Preface to *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, while, at the same time,

<sup>35</sup> Kocín cited the example of Bishop Theodoret of Cyr in the early church; Flavius Magnus Cassiodorus, *Historie církevní*, trans. Jan Kocín of Kocinét (Prague, 1594) f. )( 2r, p. 3.

<sup>36</sup> See John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York, 1998) 57, 61-62; and literature cited in Sheila Lambert, "Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship," *Past and Present* 124 (1989) 68, n. 118. Like the Anglican authors in the tradition of John Jewel, Richard Hooker, or Richard Montagu, so also the Utraquist Church of Bohemia fostered discussion rather than edicts, and preserved a nonconfrontational, even cordial tone in discussion with religious interlocutors. Montagu maintained that theological subjects "should, above all, be moderately, calmly, and quietly handled..;" and he exhorted the religious controversialist: "Let himsele...goe honestly, sincerely, soberly, scholler-like to worke: Let him set affection, partiality, sinister ends apart: Let him come home to the poynts controverted, without rowling, rambling, raving: joyne issue instantly with the Question where it lyeth..." in his *A Gagg for the New Gospell? No, a New Gagg for an Old Goose* (London, 1624) f. \*3v.

<sup>37</sup> František Dvorský, ed., *Dopisy kněží Šimona z Habru a Jana faráře Německo-Brodského o rozdílech ve víře, 1528-1529* [Letters of the priests Simon of Habr and John, parish priest of Německý Brod on the differences in belief, 1528-9], in *AČ* 14 (1895) 335. On Luther's insulting answer to Henry VIII, see Gustav Kawerau, *Hieronymus Emser: Ein Lebensbild aus der Reformationsgeschichte* (Halle, 1898) 40-41; the text is in Martin Luther, *Contra Henricum Regem Angliae. 1522* in *Luthers Werke* 10, Zweite Abteilung 178-79.

<sup>38</sup> Zdeněk V. David, "Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism's Encounter with Luther," *CV* 38 (1996) 42-53.

<sup>39</sup> It may be summed up by the famous statement by the stalwart of the *via media*, Richard Hooker: "As farre as they followe reason and truth, we feare not to tread the selfe same steppes wherin they have gon, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whome we much more affect leavinge it for newer and changinge it for worse; we had rather followe the perfections of them whome we like not, than in defects resemble them whome we love." Richard Hooker, *Folger Library Edition of the Works* [Hereafter: *Works*] (Cambridge, Mass., 1977) 2:121 [*Laws of Ecclesiastical Policy* (Hereafter LEP) V.28.1.]

outlining or implying his profound disagreements with the great Genevan.<sup>40</sup> Bydžovský's characterization of Luther and Melancton as "the most learned men in Germany [nejučeniejší w niemcych]"<sup>41</sup> can stand side by side with Hooker's description of Calvin as "I thinke incomparably the wisest man that ever the french Church did enjoy, since the houre it enjoyed him."<sup>42</sup> Hooker could regard Calvin as "wise," "of great capacity," and "deserving of honours," while at the same time he could distance himself from his own Puritan compatriots who, he felt, surrounded Calvin's writings with an aura of infallibility,<sup>43</sup> and claim that Calvin's ecclesiastical regime at Geneva was "little better than popish tyranny disguised and tendered... under a new form."<sup>44</sup> Similarly, Bishop John Jewel, one of the architects of the Church of England's *via media* and Hooker's mentor, could refer to Luther and Zwingli as "those excellent men, sent by God for the enlightenment of this world."<sup>45</sup>

Aside from the inherent moderation of the *via media*, Erasmus's influence can be cited as a common denominator in the mild, even courteous tone which we find in the religious argumentation against opponents among the late Utraquists, on the one hand, and the early Anglican or proto-Anglican divines, on the other hand. It is well known that Erasmus's writings, which counselled prudence and moderation in religious discourse, enjoyed an unusual moral authority in Bohemia in the sixteenth century.<sup>46</sup> Thus, Erasmus referred to the examples of Christ, St. Paul, and St. Augustine as masters of gentle polemics. Accordingly, he endorsed the power of civil discourse in dealing with religious dissensions, noting that: "The spirit of Christ in the Gospels has a wisdom of its own, and its own courtesy and meekness."<sup>47</sup> In the same spirit, Erasmus objected to what he called Luther's "savage torrent of invective."<sup>48</sup> Inasmuch as Erasmus's good temper and civility had influenced theological discourse in England, particularly for Jewel and probably for Hooker as

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. 1:3-12 [LEP Preface 2]; see also Arthur Dickens and John Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985) 68.

<sup>41</sup> Pavel Bydžovský, *Tento spis ukazuje, že Biskupové Biskupa, a Biskup kněží, a kněží od řádných Biskupů svěcení Těla a krve Boží posvěcovati mají [...]* (N.p., 1543) 11.

<sup>42</sup> Hooker, *Works* 1: 3 [LEP Preface 2.1].

<sup>43</sup> William P. Haugaard, "The Preface," in Hooker *Works* 6, part 1, 70. On Hooker and Calvinist orthodoxy see also Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988) 182-197.

<sup>44</sup> Hooker, *Works* 1:7 [LEP, Preface, 2.4].

<sup>45</sup> John Jewel, *Apologia, to jest: Dostatečná Obrana Víry a Náboženství Cýrkví Englických* (Prague, 1619) 65. On the Bohemian side, one may also refer to an earlier example of Jan of Přebor, the prominent Utraquist theologian, who despite his fundamental theological disagreements with Wyclif spoke of the English scholar in the 1420s respectfully as *doctor evangelicus* and *ille sanctus doctor*; see Kamil Krofta, "O některých spisech M. Jana z Přebora [On some texts of M. Jan of Přebor]," ČČM 73 (1899) 213. On the gentleness of Anglican polemics, see also Campbell, "A Diagnosis of Religious Moderation," 37.

<sup>46</sup> Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 8:81-82, 155-157, 202-211. On his influence in Bohemia see Jaroslav Kolár, *Návraty bez konce: Studie k starší české literatuře* [Returns without end: A study on older Czech literature], ed. Lenka Jiroušková. (Brno, 1999) 120, 141, 175-177.

<sup>47</sup> Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 8:203, see also *ibid.* 81-82, 155-157, 202-205; 9:398.

<sup>48</sup> See *ibid.* 8:203. For Erasmus's censure of Luther's arrogance and virulent style see also *ibid.* 9:392. On his part, Erasmus still in 1523 signaled his readiness to talk with Luther himself, with hope (in the spirit of St. Paul) that he might divert him from an erroneous course; *ibid.* 9:390, see also 389.

well, the Dutch sage may be considered partly responsible for the similarity between Utraquism and the *Ecclesia Anglicana* in their tradition of civility and tolerance.<sup>49</sup>

The third reason for the exceptional mildness of the Utraquists' theological discussions – in addition to the chastisement of war and the moderation of the *via media* – can be sought in their escape from the need of confessionalization in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.<sup>50</sup> They avoided the processes by which the Protestant groups had to define themselves against each other and against the Church of Rome, and by which the latter had to adopt its own demarcations against the churches of the Reformation. The Utraquists were already secure in their own delimitation vis-à-vis both Roman authoritarianism (since the period of Hus and the *Compactata*) and the Protestant-like biblical reductionism (through the fifteenth-century encounters with the Taborites and the Brethren). Moreover, they derived their self-definition from the standard Church of Western Christendom minus the papal monarchism and hence they were freed from defining themselves afresh. Therefore, in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, they were spared the process of differentiation, which often led others to cast anathemas against each other, and which was the reverse of adopting tolerant attitudes.

The avoidance of confessionalisation's travails can be also approached from the viewpoint of the scale of the Utraquist's reformatory action that, in fact, preserved the core doctrines of traditional Christianity intact. The Bohemian Reformation may have had the character of "a political or jurisdictional schism," but certainly not that of "a theological revolution."<sup>51</sup> Unlike the fully reformed denominations, the Utraquists did not feel the need of a demonstratively rigid orthodoxy on selected issues in order to counterbalance the rejection of a substantial part of the traditional fundamentals. Those who were fully reformed seemed impelled by a distinct fervour to draw rigid lines around the vestigial concepts of Christian orthodoxy: the Lutherans around the doctrine of real presence, for instance, and the Calvinists around that of the Trinity. In those regards, one may recall the harsh self-righteous stance of the Lutherans toward the Calvinists and the Zwinglians and that of the Calvinists vis-à-vis the Unitarians.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Concerning Erasmus's influence on Jewel see R. J. Schoeck, "From Erasmus to Hooker," in Arthur S. McGrade, ed., *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community* (Tempe, AZ, 1997) 66-67; 69-73. See also Bruce Mansfield, *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century, c. 1920-2000* (Toronto, 2003), which includes references to Erasmus's influence on John Jewel; and Robert K. Faulkner, *Richard Hooker and the Politics of a Christian England* (Berkeley, 1981) 53.

<sup>50</sup> On the concept of "confessionalization," see Robert Bireley, *The Refashioning of Catholicism, 1450-1700: A Reassessment of the Counter Reformation* (Washington, D.C., 1999) 6-8.

<sup>51</sup> For the distinction see also Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *JEH* 49 (1998) 634.

<sup>52</sup> On this syndrome, see John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York, 1998) 104. A similar phenomenon of anxiety and the need to affirm a stern orthodoxy was attributed to the Council of Constance in its treatment of Jan Hus. Challenging the power of the papacy with their conciliarism, the fathers of the Council felt compelled to counterbalance their daring departure – and the likely appearance of doctrinal impropriety – by the demonstration and reaffirmation of their doctrinal strictness in other respects. According to this view, it was this minefield that Hus had entered, and it was the defensive mentality of Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Gerson, and Francesco Zabarella, to which Hus owed to a large extent his martyrdom and subsequent fame. Paul de Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Huss*. 2 vv. (Louvain, 1975<sup>2</sup>) 1:502, 507-508.

The Utraquists' sense of preserving an integrity of the doctrinal fundamentals that released them from the compulsion of a militant assertion of orthodoxy, led them to acquire – in their relative serenity - the aura of flexibility, latitudinarianism and, perhaps, even a gentle bemusement and bonhomie with respect to what they regarded as the foibles of others.<sup>53</sup>

### Institutionalized Toleration

The non-bellicose and accommodating spirit of traditional Utraquism found its embodiment in a remarkable state of institutionalized religious toleration that prevailed in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century in Bohemia.<sup>54</sup> As noted earlier, the institutional milestones in the legal underpinning of the Bohemian toleration were – after the original acts of the Bohemian Reformation in the fifteenth century – the compromise around the Bohemian Confession in 1575 and the issuance of the Letter of Majesty of 1609. The Utraquist political leaders played a constructive role in both cases.

The reinforced and expanded tolerance, flourishing in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century, could build, in Bohemia's political culture, on the earlier legal coexistence of Utraquism and the adherents of the Roman Curia.<sup>55</sup> During the settlement of 1575 the Utraquist townsmen supported the Lutheran and the Unity nobles in obtaining freedom and protection for the practice, though a restricted one, of their religion. Except for a foothold in the Consistory, the Lutheran estates secured the practical aims of their campaign for the legalization of the Augsburg-like Bohemian Confession. At the same time, the Utraquist religion remained legally safeguarded in its existing form and extent.

---

<sup>53</sup> Although using nautical similes more suitable for seafaring Britain than for landlocked Bohemia, Diarmaid MacCullough has pointed out an analogous religious situation in England in the 1530s: "...evangelicals [Cranmerian Lutherans] were often more bitter about religious radicalism [the sectarians] than the traditionalists [high churchmen] were, because it revealed the insecurity of their own position: were not the radicals seeking to capsize a boat which the evangelicals themselves were already rocking?" MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer* 145.

<sup>54</sup> This notable state of legalized religious pluralism has by and large escaped the attention of Euroatlantic historical literature. For instance, there is no mention of Bohemia in N. M. Sutherland's "Persecution and Toleration in Reformation Europe," in W. J. Sheils, ed. *Persecution and Toleration* [Studies in Church History, 21] (Oxford, 1984) 153-162; or in Randolph C. Head, "The Transformations of the Long Sixteenth Century," in John Christian Laursen, and Cary J. Nederman, eds., *Beyond the Persecuting Society: Toleration Before the Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 1998) 95-106; John C. Laursen, *Religious Toleration: "The Variety of Rites" from Cyrus to Defoe* (New York, 1999). For the late sixteenth century the emphasis has usually been placed on toleration in Poland, the Dutch Republic, and – 1598-1685 – in France. For instance, Ole P. Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke, eds. *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991) 1; R. Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop, eds., *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge, 2002); *Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*, ed. C. Berkvens-Stevelinck, J. Israel and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes (Leiden, 1997) especially 3-73. Perez Zagorin, *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (Princeton, NJ, 2003) limits his coverage to Britain, France, the Netherlands, and North America, except for a brief reference to Poland (p. 146).

<sup>55</sup> As noted, that was explicitly codified by the Peace of Kutná Hora of 1485, and had been informally observed since the adoption of the *Compactata* of Basel in 1436.

As noted earlier, the political cooperation of the Utraquist townspeople with the Lutheran nobles in the Bohemian Diet was motivated by a strategic need of common defense against the Habsburg royal government, which ultimately favoured the Roman Curia.<sup>56</sup> It is, therefore, incorrect to say that the Utraquists maintained their non-Protestant stance due to the pressure from the royal government; to the contrary, Utraquists sought the support of Protestant denominations to safeguard their *via media* against the royal government's pressures to make them recognize the jurisdiction of the Roman Curia as legitimate and supreme.<sup>57</sup> The alliance across class lines between the townsmen and nobles paralleled to some extent the Polish example of the union of Sandomierz of 1570,<sup>58</sup> and showed greater diplomatic skill and political savvy than their counterparts in Inner and Upper Austria, where social antagonism between the townsmen and nobles facilitated the suppression of religious dissent from Rome in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.<sup>59</sup>

In 1609, the Utraquists willingly advanced even further on the path of religious tolerance. Their representatives in the Bohemian Diet agreed to accord full legal status to the Lutherans and the Brethren, as well as to share with them the ecclesiastical administrative organization under the Consistory *sub utraque*. The Letter of Majesty, issued at the behest of the Bohemian estates, by Emperor/King Rudolf II, completed the framework of toleration. On its face, the edict seemed to disadvantage the traditional Utraquists by giving the impression of a universal acceptance of the Lutheran-inspired Bohemian Confession by all the dissidents from Rome. The continued existence of Utraquism, however, remained safeguarded. The Letter of Majesty assumed the coexistence of a variety *sub utraque*. The basic assurance came from the main architect of the new settlement, Václav Budovec of

---

<sup>56</sup> This consideration also motivated the Lutheran aristocracy to back up the Unity of Brethren. When Rudolf II attempted to proceed tentatively against the Brethren by issuing decrees against the *Pikarts*, in 1584 and 1602, the Lutheran noble estates came to their assistance, as they feared that their turn would come next, if the Unity were suppressed; Václav Novotný, "Náboženské dějiny české ve století 16. [Czech religious history in the sixteenth century]," in *Česká politika*, ed. Zdeněk V. Tobolka, 5 vv. (Prague, 1906) 1:635-636; *Sněmy české* 10:453; 11, pt. 1:41-42.

<sup>57</sup> Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. Karel Tieftrunk, 5 vv. (Prague, 1865-1870) 1:110-111; 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," SH 5 (1956) 230. A subsidiary motive for the inter-denominational political alliance was the fear of Moslem advance. See Jan Kocín in his introduction to Johannes Leunclavius, *Kronyka nová o národu tureckém na dva díly rozdělená* [A new chronicle on the nation of the Turk in two books], trans. Jan Kocín z Kocínětu and Daniel Adam z Veleslavína (Prague, 1594), f. \*)\*( 5r; Václav Budovec of Budov, *Antialkorán*, ed. Noemi Rejchrtová (Prague, 1989) 12, 364.

<sup>58</sup> *Consensus Sandomiriensis*, of 14 April 1570, brought the Lutherans, the Calvinists, and the Bohemian Brethren (exiled to Poland) together in peace, harmony, and a political alliance, while each of the three religious denominations preserved its distinctive organization and form of worship. The agreement resulted in a "confederation" rather than a "union." Hrejsa, 6:285, 287-288, 291; Jan Felin, *Rozebrání Obrany Samuela Martinia* [Spisy Jana Amosa Komenského, 6] (Prague, 1902) xx; Jerzy Kloczowski, *A History of Polish Christianity* (New York, 2000) 107; *The Cambridge History of Poland*, ed. W. F. Reddaway, 2 vv. (Cambridge, 1950) 1:345.

<sup>59</sup> On the predicament of Austrian Protestantism, see Robert A. Kann and Zdeněk V. David, *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands, 1526-1918* (Seattle, 1984) 50-51; Regina Pörtner, *Counter-Reformation in Central Europe: Styria, 1580-1630* (Oxford, 2001) especially 93-95; and Anton Mell, *Grundriss der Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte des Landes Steiermark* (Graz, 1929) 314-319; Alois Míka, "Z bojů o náboženskou toleranci v 16. století [From the struggles for religious tolerance in the sixteenth century]," ČČH 18 (1970) 375.

Budov, on 25 June 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.<sup>60</sup> Accordingly, the new Consistory, which replaced the earlier Utraquist one, did not turn into a Protestant Holy Office, enforcing doctrinal uniformity, but rather functioned as an ecumenical council, loosely confederating and serving the Lutherans, the Brethren, and the Utraquists.<sup>61</sup> As the Brethren were to testify in retrospect, the common Consistory was a sign of solidarity and compromise, not of amalgamation.<sup>62</sup>

As a postscript, it may be noted that the tolerant atmosphere survived even the stress of war during the uprising of the Bohemian estates against the Emperor/King Ferdinand II in the opening phase of the Thirty Years War (1618-1620). Despite the ascendancy of the Lutheran and Unity nobility in the leadership of the insurgency, the governments (both directorial and royal) did not interfere with Utraquist townsmen or with Utraquist clergy. Religious pluralism continued under the Consistory during the uprising, as evident from the Directors' orders of July 1618 which stipulated that the administrator should prevent clashes among clergy of different convictions.<sup>63</sup> Official restrictions affected only the extreme adherents of the Roman Curia; others who forswore the principle that "promises given to heretics need not be kept," as well as the Franciscan and Capuchin orders, were tolerated.<sup>64</sup> Thus the decency of religious toleration withstood even the test of war, and existed

---

<sup>60</sup> 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* [On the historical works of Vaclav Budovec of Budov from the years 1608-10 and its relation with Slavata, Skala and unknown diary of the Lutheran Karel Zikmund][Rozpravy české Akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění. Tř. I, č. 42] (Prague, 1911) 68. Admitting that there was "a triple difference in orders and ceremonies within the party *sub utraque* in Bohemia," Budovec 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..." *ibid.* 68. See also Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. Karel Tiefert, 5 vv. (Prague, 1865-1870) 1:108-109.

<sup>61</sup> This, of course, corresponded to Budovec's definition of the groups under the Letter of Majesty as a league of three distinct and autonomous types of *sub utraque*. – Later four professors of the Prague University, as well as another Lutheran minister, were added, see Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 473-474.

<sup>62</sup> *Na spis proti jednotě bratrské od Samuele Martinia etc: sepsaný...Ohlášení* [On the writings against the Unity of Brethren by Samuel Martinus &c.](Lešno, 1635) 43.

<sup>63</sup> The proceedings against Locika of Domažlice in December 1618 seem to be an isolated case of persecution of Utraquist clergy; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536-537; František Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* (Prague, 1917-1925) 447.

<sup>64</sup> The punitive actions included the expulsion of the Jesuits and the exclusion of *sub una* from the councils of royal towns. Archbishop Lohelius also sought the security of refuge in Vienna. Bohemia. Kancelář českých direktorů. *Protokol vyšlé korespondence Kanceláře českých direktorů z let 1618 a 1619* [Protocol of the correspondence from the chancellery of the Czech directors from the years 1618 and 1619], ed. J. Prokeš (Prague, 1934) 20-21, 36 (no. 180), 76 (no. 890); Jan Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace* [The dreadful times of the Counter-reformation] (Heršpice, 1997) 68-69; Robert Kalivoda, "Husitství a jeho vyústění v době předbělohorské a bělohorské [The Hussite movement and its outfall in the times before and after the White Mountain]," *Studia comeniana et historica* 13 (1983) 18. A decree of the Directors requested in June 1618 the towns of Prague to prohibit songs, which disparaged the *sub una*; *Protokol vyšlé korespondence* 32 (no. 109).

in a stark contrast to what was to follow after the Battle of the White Mountain of 8 November 1620.

It is, therefore, wrong to portray the intellectual conditions of the sixteenth century as a debilitating state of religious hostility and strife. Such an image is drawn by Josef Pekař as a possible justification of the Counter Reformation as an intervention that, instituting religious uniformity, restored national unity.<sup>65</sup> Similar arguments had been speciously advanced by Roman apologists for the Bohemian Counter Reformation in the seventeenth century. In consequence, Jindřich Ondřej Hoffman in his *Ocularia. A neb oči sklenné starého čecha* (Prague, 1637), lauded the Counter Reformation for terminating the alleged strife of the Bohemian Reformation by bringing about general peace and tranquility.<sup>66</sup>

### Question of Religious Indifference

Hitherto, the argument was 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, or other, religious homogenisation. It is also important to address the opposite perception, namely that the Bohemian tolerance actually reflected a religious laxness, verging on indifference. 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.<sup>67</sup> The image of religious indifference, however, is not supported by contemporary evidence.

The religious groups, in fact, remained theologically differentiated, while coexisting within the political context of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This was shown by the continuing discussion of theological differences among the Utraquists, the Lutherans, and the Brethren. Each group defined its religious identity: the Utraquists in their programmatic statements of 1575 and 1609, the Lutherans in the Bohemian Confession of 1575, and the Brethren in their own

---

<sup>65</sup> Josef Pekař, "Tři kapitoly z boje o sv Jana Nepomuckého [Three chapters of the struggle over Jan Nepomuk]," *Postavy a problémy českých dějin* [Persons and problems of Czech history], ed. František Kutnar (Prague, 1990) 249.

<sup>66</sup> Jindřich Ondřej Hoffman, *Ocularia. A neb oči sklenné starého čecha, které podává čechu nynějšímu skrze něžby hleděl na předešlou staročeskou nábožnost [...]* (Prague, 1637) 210-211, 218-219, 262.

<sup>67</sup> Josef Válka, "Problémy syntézy moderních českých dějin [The problems of the synthesis of modern Czech history]," *Husitství, Reformace, Renaissance: Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek and others. 3 vv. (Prague, 1994) 3:1052; František Šmahel, "Svoboda slova, svatá válka a tolerance z nutnosti v husitském období [Freedom of speech, holy war and tolerance of need in the Hussite period] ," *ČČH* 92 (1994) 677; but see Noemi Rejchrtová, *Václav Budovec z Budova* (Prague, 1984) 170.

Confession, originally issued in 1573. Attachment to specific creeds was evident.<sup>68</sup> For instance, the prominent Utraquist theologian, Valentin Polon, who otherwise exemplified the spirit of forbearance, did not hesitate in 1589 to state clearly that his tolerance had not diminished his disapproval of those views which deviated from the beliefs of the “universal and apostolic” Church.<sup>69</sup> Czech Lutherans, for their part, while drawing a clear theological boundary between themselves and the Utraquists, also sharply differentiated themselves from other Protestants, including the Unity. Thus Jan Štelcar Čeletavský in 1589 sternly censured the eucharistic teachings of the Brethren, and claimed that in refusing to adore the Eucharist, they appeared to cast doubt on the divinity of Jesus. In their eucharistic stance, according to Štelcar, the Brethren opposed Luther and St. Augustine, and endorsed the Zwinglians, the Calvinists, and the Arians. He separately rejected the eucharistic teachings of Karlstadt, Zwingli, Oekolampadius and Calvin, and traced their denial of the real presence to an original error of Berengar of Tours.<sup>70</sup> Another Lutheran theologian, Václav Slovacius argued against the Brethren’s refusal to bow before the name of Jesus in his treatises of 1586 (republished in 1590), in which he also critically assessed the Calvinist view of predestination.<sup>71</sup> On the Protestant side, the theologian, Havel Phaëton [Čalanský], was free to denounce in about 1620 the Utraquist practice of eucharistic processions as the work of the Antichrist, and

---

<sup>68</sup> On the Utraquist attitude see Josef Vávra, “Katolíci a sněm český r. 1608 a 1609 [Catholics and the Czech council of 1608 and 1609],” *Sborník historického kroužku* Fasc. 1 (1893) 15; text of Thomas’s reply is in Slavata, Vilém, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého* [Memoirs of the highest chancellor of the Czech kingdom], ed. Josef Jireček, 2 vv. (Prague, 1866-186) 1:214-19; on the Lutheran attitude, Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 523-526; “Zdání o napravení spsobů církví evangelických českých a uvedení jich v jednotu [The dream of the correction of behaviour of the Czech evangelical churches and its unifying effect],” in Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, 2:43-49; see also Jan Štelcar Čeletavský z Čeletavy, *Knižka o pravé a falešné církvi* [A book on the true and false church] (Prague, 1589) f. M1r-M2v.

<sup>69</sup> He wrote “..and to this day – in his evil and perversity – the devil, God’s enemy and ours, incites many ferocious, angry and stormy, proud and conceited people so that several groups defend their own sects which they seek to disseminate and spread far and wide, and thus to humiliate the Christian universal and apostolic Church.” Valentin Polon, *Pomni na mne: Knižka obahující v sobě kratičká spasidedlná Naučení a sebrání...* [Remember me: A book containing short salutary teachings and collections ...] (Staré Město Pražské, 1589) f. A5a-A5b.

<sup>70</sup> Štelcar Čeletavský z Čeletavy, *Knižka o pravé a falešné církvi* (Prague, 1589) f. N1r - N2r. Surprisingly, the Lutheran Štelcar was willing, in this context, to even commend the Jesuit controversialist Šturm, who excoriated the Brethren’s refusal to bow before the name of Jesus, apparently in reference to Václav Šturm, *Krátké ozvání ... proti kratičkému ohlášení Jednoty Valdenské neb Boleslavské* [A short echo ... against a short notice of the Unity of Waldensians or Boleslavians] (Prague, 1584). Štelcar misdates to 1154 the error of Berengar, who lived c. 1000-1088. See his *Knižka o pravé a falešné církvi* f. M1r-M2v.

<sup>71</sup> Václav Slovacius, *O pokloně ve jménu Jesus, má-li činěna býti* [On bowing at the Name of Jesus: ought it to be done?] (Prague, [1586]) f. A2v, A8r; *ibid.* (Prague, 1590) f. A7v; A2r, (A)3r; Václav Slovacius, *Rozjímání o předzvědění a vyvolení božím lidí k věčnému spasení* [Contemplation on prescience and godly vocation of the people to eternal salvation] (Prague: n. p., 1615) see *Knihopis českých a slovenských tisků*, n. 15.515 (no known copy). Zacharyáš Brunčvík, in a treatise of 1607, strongly condemned Michael Servetus and the entire antitrinitarian movement, and linked the Arian heresy with Islam. He likewise endorsed Luther’s denunciation of Caspar Schenckfeld’s teaching for its monothelism; Zacharyáš Brunčvík, *Homilia de incarnati verbi massa: To jest, Kázání o vtělení, narození a předivném andělům, lidem pak spasitelném spojení podstatném dvojího přirození Božského a lidského v jednotu osoby Pána našeho Ježíše Krista [...]* (Prague, 1607) f. E2r-E3r, F2r.

condemn their religious *via media* in no uncertain terms.<sup>72</sup> It is unnecessary to speak about the Brethren's disdain for the beliefs of either the Utraquists or the Lutherans.

Thus the evidence indicates that the genuine cooperation of the lay leaders of Utraquism, Lutheranism, and the Unity for political reasons did not weaken or dilute their sense of profound religious distinctions. Indeed, 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 through his Epistles, such as the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians. According to Budovec, the Apostle combined a firm attachment to his own beliefs with a tolerance for what he considered the grievous errors of others. Although he detested, and also wept over, some of the customs of his correspondents, St. Paul placed love for others above all and rejected the use of force to achieve a singleness of rites, rules, and even doctrines.<sup>73</sup>

For the long run in Bohemia there was a pious wish, and possibly even a genuine expectation, that the religious divisions would not last forever. Some authors have designated the expectation of an eventual reunion of all Christians (rather than permanent division) as concordance.<sup>74</sup> The Letter of Majesty was formally regarded as a provisorium until a universal Christian Council would reestablish a unity of faith and practice.<sup>75</sup> In any case, for the time being in Bohemia, the spirit of genuine toleration was able to coexist with an undiluted, uncompromising, and fervent devotion to a particular church.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> He condemned the *via media* as follows: "Because Christ himself says that no one can serve two masters. And who does not gather with Christ, that one scatters... In sum: those who are neither hot nor cold have no share in Christ." See Havel Phaëton [Čalanský], *Kázání o velikých modlářských bludích, jimiž v církvi odporné nejsvětější Páně Večeře se zlehčuje a poškvřňuje [...]* (Prague, [1620?]) f. C6r.

<sup>73</sup> 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; Noemi Rejchrtová, *Václav Budovec z Budova* (Prague, 1984) 170.

<sup>74</sup> Thomas F. Mayer, "'Heretics be not in all things heretics': Cardinal Pole, His Circle, and the Potential for Toleration," in Laursen, John Christian, and Cary J. Nederman, eds., *Beyond the Persecuting Society: Toleration Before the Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 1998) 107-108.

<sup>75</sup> Krofta, *Majestát Rudolfa II* 37. For one, the Lutheran theologian, Zacharyáš Bruncvík in 1614 looked forward to such an ecumenical assembly that would reunite Christians; see his *Pravitatis et impletatis haereticae pia et fida ostensio. To jest: Zrcadlo Kacířství: Do něhož kdo zdravě nahlídne, Allegata, u Doktoůů Církve vykázaná, přeběhne, pozná, že my Katolíci pod obojí nevinně, a bez náležitého vši Svaté říše vyslyšání od některých se kaceřujeme [...]* (Prague, 1614) f. A3v. Abroad, a no lesser figure than James I of England believed in a policy of reunion first among the Protestants, then between them and the Church of Rome; see William B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997) especially 155-195.

<sup>76</sup> For comparative purposes, this position can be also illustrated by the views of Roger Williams, one of the prominent architects of religious toleration in North America; see 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. See also John Coffey, "Puritanism and Liberty Revisited: The Case for Toleration in the English Revolution," *Historical Journal* 41 (1998) 980.

## Question of Ethics

The virtues of intellectual openness and tolerance resulted in paradoxical charges of lack of moral fibre as well as intellectual vigour. Ironically, except for the legacy of the Unity of Brethren, the larger – mostly Utraquist – part of sixteenth-century literature has not received credit in Czech historiography for its seminal normative role in shaping the Czechs' political culture. The main reason for this blind spot was the relatively widespread view of Bohemian Utraquism's low moral threshold of the Utraquist clergy and laity,<sup>77</sup> as well as the imputed duplicity and toadyism of Utraquist administrators and Consistories toward the agents of the Habsburg kings and the Roman Church, especially on the issues of priestly ordinations, and of other relations with the Church of Rome.<sup>78</sup>

One may wonder whether the judgments of the nineteenth-century critics of Utraquism reveal more about the unrealistic standards of contemporary morality than about a sensitivity to the crude mores of the sixteenth century, when examples of questionable behavior abounded on all sides.<sup>79</sup> On the Roman side, they include Papal nuncios' bribes to the Utraquist leaders, their use of misleading statements, and their comments on the scandalous or cowardly behaviour of Bohemia's Roman clergy.<sup>80</sup> Kavka and Skýbová refer to the shocking findings of a papal

---

<sup>77</sup> Kamil Krofta, "Nový názor na český vývoj náboženský v době předbělohorské [A new opinion on Czech religious evolution during the time before the White Mountain]," in his *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* (Prague, 1936) 380-381. Kamil Krofta provides a comprehensive overview of these charges in his *Nesmrtelný národ: Od Bílé Hory k Palackému* [Immortal nation: From the White Mountain to Palacký] (Prague, 1940) 344-429. A recent writer has still characterized the period as one of "social and moral laxity and abulia," see Zdeněk Rotrekl, *Barokní fenomén v současnosti* [The baroque phenomenon in the present] (Prague, 1995) 129. See also František Kameníček, "Pod obojí (utrakvisté)," *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské*, 1526-1628 [State councils and Moravian meetings, 1526-1628], 3 vv. (Brno, 1900-1905) 3:418-19; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 58; Václav Novotný, "Náboženské dějiny české ve století 16.," in *Česká politika*, ed. Zdeněk V. Tobolka, 5 vv. (Prague, 1906) 1:634, 637.

<sup>78</sup> On the Consistory's abject and evasive dealings with archbishops Brus and Medek, and with papal nuncios see, for instance, Krofta, "Boj o konsistoř," 386, 391, 401-3; Josef Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř pod obojí za administrátora Rezka [The curia and the struggle of the Utraquist consistory under the administrator Rezek]," *ČČH* 37 (1931) 23, 27-8, 31, 252, 274, 281; Karel Stloukal, "Počátky nunciatury v Praze: Bonhomii v Čechách, 1581-84 [The beginnings of the nunciature in Prague: Bonhomii in Bohemia]," *ČČH* 34 (1928) 15-6, 256; Winter, Zikmund, *Život církevní v Čechách: Kulturně-historický obraz v XV. a XVI. století*. 2 vv. (Prague, 1895) 1:182-3, 330-4. On the topic of diplomatic deception see Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way* 156-158.

<sup>79</sup> Krofta, for instance, chides Ernst Denis for such a misplaced perspective in the latter's seminal *Fin de l'indépendance bohème*. See Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ* 385-386. Ernst Denis, *ibid.* 2nd ed. 2 vv. (Paris, 1930).

<sup>80</sup> On nuncio John Bonhomini, see Stloukal, "Počátky nunciatury v Praze," 242, 251-2, 260, 264-5; on nuncio Cesare Speciano, see Josef Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř pod obojí za administrátora Rezka," *ČČH* 37 (1931) 252, 254, 262, 267, 275, 284-5; and *Epistulae et acta nuntiorum apostolicorum apud imperatorem, 1592-1628. Tomus 4, Epistulae et acta Antonii Caetani, 1607-1611*, ed. Milena Linhartová (Prague 1932) 1: 324. Within the Bohemian context, Bílejovský recalls a house in Prague in which Roman priests allegedly consorted with prostitutes; Bílejovský, *Kronyka Cýrkevní* 26. A priest of the Roman Church, Tomáš Bavorovský, in his *Postila česká*, (Olomouc, 1557), chastises the priests of his denomination who "do not let the faithful read religious books... so that the latter would not note the priests' ignorance and careless indifference; the clergy toady up to the nobles and minimize their sins." Cited by Jan Jakubec, *Dějiny literatury české*, 2d ed.,

commissioner's inspection of Bohemian monasteries in 1574.<sup>81</sup> In a similar vein, Zikmund Winter cites examples of coarse manners and moral lapses among Lutheran (Czech, as well as Bohemian German) clergy in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.<sup>82</sup> Additionally, period memoirs attest to the violence permeating the ordinary human existence and threatening life and property in the sixteenth century.<sup>83</sup> Comparing the Bohemian situation with another region, we find that in an area of exemplary Protestant virtue, such as the Swiss canton of Zurich, there were large numbers of defaulting clerics with thirty-five to forty percent of the ministers disciplined in 1532-1580.<sup>84</sup>

Even more important is the problem of the types of sources that have been used. The Utraquists have been traditionally depicted on the basis of the Consistory's administrative and court records, revealing primarily the seamy side in the behaviour of their clergy and laity. Their historical self-descriptions, like Bílejovský's work, have been almost routinely dismissed.<sup>85</sup> In contrast, the Bohemian Brethren have been assessed on the basis of their historical self-descriptions. Reliance on the Brethren's accounts of events has tended to skew the record not only in favour of the Brethren, but also against the Utraquists, since the Brethren, despite their many virtues, were notoriously uncharitable toward their

2 vv. (Prague, 1929-1934) 1:713, 721. See also Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ* 393; Hynek Hrubý, *České postilly: Studie literární a kulturně historická* (Prague, 1901) 182-189.

<sup>81</sup> František Kavka and Anna Skýbová, *Husitský epilog na koncilu tridentském a původní koncepcie habsburské rekatolizace čech* [The Hussite epilogue at the Council of Trent and the original conception of Habsburg re-catholicisation of Bohemia], (Prague 1968) 183-4; Václav Novotný, "Náboženské dějiny české ve století 16.," in *Česká politika*, ed. Zdeněk V. Tobolka, 5 vv. (Prague, 1906) 1:631-632. In 1585, Bohemian nobles adhering to Rome complained to Nuncio Sega about the "immoral and scandalous" behaviour of the Roman clergy, and Nuncio Caetano confirmed this state of affairs in a letter to his successor Nuncio Speciano in 1592; *Sněmy české* 11, pt. 1:43; Alena Pazderová, "Instrukce pražského nuncia Caetaniho pro jeho nástupce Speciana," in *Facta probant homines: Sborník příspěvků k životnímu jubileu prof. dr. Zdeňky Hledíkové*, ed. Ivan Hlaváček a Jan Hrdina. (Prague, 1998) 358-59. In neighboring Moravia, a colourful priestly conflict involved in 1575 the seizure of the deanery of the Olomouc Chapter by Jan Dambrowski "with the assistance of henchmen with rifles" to prevent his rival, Jan Mezoun, from assuming the deanship. Two years later, the same Mezoun, now bishop of Olomouc, was labelled perjurer and usurper in an official document by another canon, Pawel Zajęczkowski See Bohumil Navrátil, *Biskupství olomoucké 1576-1579 a volba Stanislava Pavlovského* [The Diocese of Olomouc 1576-1579 and the election of Stanislav Pavlovsky](Prague, 1909) 68, 83.

<sup>82</sup> Winter, *Život církevní* 1:245-6, 281, 340-1; on dissolute lives of monks 2:811-17.

<sup>83</sup> For instance, Ferdinand Menčík, ed. *Zápisky kněze Václava Rosy* [The notes of the priest Vaclav Rosa](Vienna, 1879) 19-23.

<sup>84</sup> Their transgressions included: adultery; abuse of wife; neglect of: wife, children, household, parish, the poor, the ill, child instruction, preaching, study and learning, admonishing parishioners; drinking, fighting, misbehaviour, unseemly appearance, abuse of the sacraments; conflict with parishioners, other ministers, civil officials; absenteeism; blasphemy, slander and gossip; financial malfeasance; see Bruce Gordon, *Clerical Discipline and the Rural Reformation: The Synod in Zurich, 1532-1580* (Bern, 1992) 209-215.

<sup>85</sup> The typical sources for the treatment of the Utraquists have been Klement Borový's *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické a utrakvistické* (Prague, 1868) or Julius Pažout's *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících, 1562-1570* (Prague, 1906) see especially p. v. The lurid cases of clerical transgressions were dredged up with great diligence and colorfully presented with definite *Schadenfreude*, for instance, by Zikmund Winter in *Život církevní v Čechách*; and by Antonín Podlaha in "Úpadek strany podobojí na sklonku XVI. století," *Sborník historického kroužku* 5 (1904) 29-36, 65-9, 161-4, 219-27.

opponents.<sup>86</sup> One is tempted to apply to them the critical characterisation of the Puritans as those “who delighted in nothing so much as the contemplation of their own virtue and the condemnation of the supposed vices of others.”<sup>87</sup> For instance, even the sympathetic Krofta demurs at the Brethren’s unsubstantiated characterization of the Utraquist Administrator Martin Mělnický, as “a dishonourable man, a liar, a drunkard, an obvious whoremonger...”<sup>88</sup> One is almost forced to assume that Jan Augusta, Bishop of the Brethren, was exercising poetic license in 1543 in his sweeping judgement of the Utraquist clergy when he escalated his charges from relatively innocent playfulness and epicureanism – albeit offensive to sectarian gravity and asceticism – to outright criminality:

All the Utraquist priests are dishonourable, immoral, proud, conceited, avaricious, cruel, merciless, slanderers without goodness or holy obedience, discordant, disorderly, simoniacal, ignorant, unclean, fornicators, adulterous, luxurious, banqueters, worthless, impious, clownish, jokers, lazy, vagabondish, tavern seekers, gamblers, gluttons, imbibers, drunkards, flirtatious, living with concubines, mockers, rumourmongers, detractors, thieves, murderers, insubordinate to the ordinances of manorial lords and of municipalities, self-willed, unmannerly, restless, stormy, vengeful, envious, and in brief accustomed to many sins, devoid of Christ’s ecclesiastical discipline, and incorrigible, etc.<sup>89</sup>

Similarly, the charge that the ordination of Utraquist priests involved a double apostasy (from Utraquism to the Roman Church and back) seems to have originated from Jan Blahoslav, who was a bishop of the Unity.<sup>90</sup> Although the Brethren’s negative comments on the character and motives of the Utraquist ecclesiastics should not be accepted without a sizable grain of salt, historians like Václav Tomek

<sup>86</sup> In addition, the Brethren carried much of their documentation into the safety of exile, while material favourable to the Utraquists tended to perish during the Counter Reformation in Bohemia and Moravia. The typical sources for the treatment of the Brethren have been *Akty Jednoty bratrské*, ed. Jaroslav Bidlo (Brno, 1915-23) vv. 1-2; Anton Gindely, *Quellen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder* (Vienna, 1859); or “Diarium... Bratří českých,” *Sněmy české* 4:392-464. On the Brethren’s expressions of vengefulness, see Winter, *Život církevní* 1:495-6.

<sup>87</sup> Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London, 1988) 5. On Puritan invectives against the Church of England clergy, see Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England, 1547-1603* (Oxford, 1995) 481. Hooker, *Works* 1:18; 6:14; see also John S. Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican tradition: an historical and theological study of Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Polity* (Sewanee, Tenn., 1963) 32-3.

<sup>88</sup> “...člověk nevážný, lhář, ožralec, kurevník zjevný...,” see Krofta’s “Boj o konsistoř,” 302, n. 2.

<sup>89</sup> “Všichni kališní duchovní jsou nečtní, nemravní, hrdí, pyšní, lakomí, ukrutní, nelítostiví, hánci bez dobrotivosti, bez sv. poslušnosti, nesvorní, neřádní, svatokupečtí, neumělí, nečistí, smilní, cizoložní, rozkošní, hodovní, lehčí, nepobožní, šaškovní, žertýři, zahálaví, toulaví, krčmenníci, hráči, žráči, zlolepci, opilci, frejři, kuběnáři, posměváčci, přemělači, utrhači, zloději, mordéři, vrchnostem a ustanovením jejich, též i obecním nepoddání, svévolní, nezvedení, nepokojní, bouřliví, mstiví, závistiví a krátce mnohým hříchům přivyklí, kázně Kristovy v církvi zbavení a netrestatelní atd.” Cited by František Kameníček, *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské* 3:414.

<sup>90</sup> Jan Blahoslav, *O původu Jednoty bratrské a řádu v ní*, ed. Otakar Odložilík (Prague, 1929) cited by Josef Janáček, *Jan Blahoslav* (Prague, 1966) 160-161. In another context, the Brethren did not hesitate to slander such a staunch and upright Lutheran as Václav Mitmánek; see Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 6 n. 1; Kamil Krofta, *O bratrském dějepisectví* [On the Brethren’s historiography] (Prague, 1946) 55-56; Bohuslav Souček, “Rukopis pražské universitní knihovny VII C 3,” *RS* 1 (1921) 55-56. See also Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ* 367.

and Anton Gindely (and after them, Ernest Denis) tended to take at face value the parodies and caricatures of the Brethren's historiography.<sup>91</sup>

Aside from the Brethren, the adherents of the Roman Curia had a special reason to depict Utraquist priests in an uncomplimentary way. The Utraquist Church received a steady supply of priests by transfers from the Roman obedience, and in the eyes of those sub una such converts were ipso facto tainted morally or intellectually. The blanket and unsubstantiated charges from the Roman side, which ordinarily might be dismissed as self-serving, gained in credibility when they were reproduced, for reasons of their own, by Protestant and secular historians.<sup>92</sup> Finally, some of the disparaging characterizations of the Utraquists have in all likelihood stemmed from the reports of papal nuncios, like Cesare Speciano and Giovanni Dolfino, who from the vantage point of Italian cultural refinement marveled at the crude manners and behavior of the transalpine central Europeans.<sup>93</sup> This may have been already sensed from Aeneas Sylvius, who provided in his famous *Historia bohémica* the following description of the proud Bohemian warriors who had defeated five crusades launched against their country in the 1420s and 1430s: "...people of dark complexion, sunburnt and lashed by wind, ugly and terrible to behold, who hitherto have lived around campfires, people with eagle eyes, uncombed hair, long beards, large stature, hairy limbs and skin so hard that it appeared able to deflect the sword like a metal shield."<sup>94</sup>

As for the willingness of historians to accept at face value the slanderous assertions against the Utraquists, Kamil Krofta supplies an intriguing insight in this area. Krofta has traced this image of Utraquism to nineteenth-century historians, particularly Tomek and Kalousek who mistakenly assumed that sixteenth-century Utraquism became synonymous with Lutheranism, and that Luther's solafideism fostered immorality.<sup>95</sup> This view passed through the prestigious work of Ernst Denis to Tomáš Masaryk and his interpretation of the "Czech question."<sup>96</sup> For Masaryk the

<sup>91</sup> Krofta, *O bratrském dějepisectví* 54; Souček, "Rukopis pražské universitní knihovny VII C 3," 57. Nevertheless not even Tomek could give credence to the the Lutheran estates of Bohemia, who charged in 1575 that the celibate Utraquist priests routinely rented wives of their parishioners for periodic cohabitation; see Tomek, *Dějepis* 12:243.

<sup>92</sup> František Kameníček, *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské, 1526-1628* 3:419.

<sup>93</sup> Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř," 31, 267; *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*. Dritte Abteilung, 1572-1585, 8. Band: Nuntiatur Giovanni Delfins, 1575-1576, ed. Daniela Neri (Tübingen, 1997) 74; also Anna Skýbová, "Cesta po Čechách v roce 1561," *Český lid* 63 (1975) 99; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 58.

<sup>94</sup> "...homines nigri, ad solem et ventum indurati, aspectu taetri atque horribiles, et qui circa fumum in castris vixissent, aquilinis oculis, impexo crine, promissa barba, corporibus proceris, membris hispidis, cute adeo dura, ut ferrum quasi lorica videtur." Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II), *Historia Bohemica/Historie Česká*, tr. and ed. Dana Martínková, Alena Hadravová, and Jiří Matl (Prague, 1998) 163.

<sup>95</sup> Otakar Josek, *Život a dílo Josefa Kalouska* [The life and work of Joseph Kalousek] (Prague, 1922) 292, cited by Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ*: 350-351; Jaroslav Čechura and Jana Čechurová, eds. *Korespondence Josefa Pekaře a Kamila Krofta* [The correspondence of Josef Pekař a Kamil Krofta] (Prague, 1999) 87; František Šamalík, *Úvahy o dějinách české politiky: Od reformace k osvícenství* [The reflections on the history of Czech politics: From the Reformation to the Enlightenment], 2d ed. (Prague, 1996) 79.

<sup>96</sup> Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize. Jan Hus* [The Czech question. Our present crisis. Jan Hus] [Spisy 6] (Prague, 2000) 150-155. [Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka*, 6th ed. (Prague, 1948) 210-211].

Bohemian Reformation ended in a moral morass and chaos in the sixteenth century. This led him to conclude that only the radical Taborites and the Unity of Brethren, not the mainline Utraquists, represented the worthy legacy of the Bohemian reform movement.<sup>97</sup>

On a theoretical level, recent research has questioned the identification of late Utraquism with Lutheranism or the emergence of a syncretistic religion, combining Utraquism and Lutheranism under the label of Neo-Utraquism.<sup>98</sup> On a practical level, Utraquist theology and homiletics, in fact, ran counter to the charges of Utraquism's inherent immorality. The exhortation to good deeds in fulfilment of the "Law of God" was one of the leitmotifs of Utraquist teaching. If Luther indeed had taught his followers not to worry – because of Christ's redemptive sacrifice – about observing religious laws and commandments, the Utraquists to the contrary held the observance of the Law of God among their highest priorities. Responsible Utraquist ecclesiastics looked askance at Lutheranism's denial of the soteriological value of works.<sup>99</sup> Consequently, the charge of immorality or Epicurean-like licentiousness on the basis of solafideism was not applicable to Utraquism at all. Far from indifference to moral values, examples of fervent exhortation to virtue and good works can be found in surviving homilies from each of the three centuries of Utraquist preaching.<sup>100</sup> Contrary to the Brethren's assertion, Utraquist priests held a particularly high view of their calling and duties.<sup>101</sup>

On the issue of deception, a strict formalist might censure in particular the Utraquist ordinations by Roman bishops. As for the recourse to the Roman bishops as such, the Utraquists always thought of themselves as an integral part, not a

<sup>97</sup> In other words, the famous Czech philosopher-statesman adopted the Tomek-Kalousek-Denis line about the morally corrupt Bohemian Quasi-Lutheranism; *Sto let Masarykovy české otázky* [A hundred years of Masaryk's Czech question], ed. Eva Broklová (Prague, 1997) 54-55. Despite his opposing view on the Bohemian Reformation, Josef Pekař agreed with Masaryk that sixteenth-century Bohemia was morally corrupt except for the Unity of Brethren; see Josef Pekař, "Tři kapitoly z boje o sv. Jana Nepomuckého," in *Postavy a problémy českých dějin*, ed. František Kutnar (Prague, 1990) 249.

<sup>98</sup> See the evidence presented in Zdeněk V. David, "Celistvost české církve pod obojí a otázka novoutrakvismu [The integrity of the Czech Utraquist church and the question of neo-utraquism]," ČČH 101,4 (2003) 882-910; and idem, "The Integrity of the Bohemian Reformation: The Problem of Neo-Utraquism," BRRP 5,2 (2005) 329-351; also in *The Transformation of Czech and Slovak Societies on the Threshold of the New Millennium and Their Role in the Global World* [Selected Papers from the 21<sup>st</sup> World Congress (SVU), University of West Bohemia, Plzeň, Czech Republic, 23-30 June 2002] eds. Jan P. Skalný and Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr. (Plzeň, [2004]) 167-198.

<sup>99</sup> On the Utraquist views of the good works, see the attitudes of Pavel Bydžovský and Vavřinec Leander Rvačovský of Rvačov in Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way* 118-119, 223-224.

<sup>100</sup> For instance, Václav Koranda the Younger, in 1489 to Valentin Polon in 1589 and Jan Cykáda in 1607; see Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ* 381-382; Jan Cykáda, *Hody křesťanské* [Christian feasts] f. B1(r)-(v); Valentin Polon, *Pomni na mne*, see his exhortations to priests f. A6-2a-b, parents and youth f. K5-3a - L5-1a, and to laity in general f. B2a-b.

<sup>101</sup> Polon summed up his view of the glory and duty of priesthood stipulating the following for the clergy: "...they should conscientiously tend to their office, remain steady in their calling, lead the people in goodness and morality, follow Christ in his footsteps and [follow] the holy Fathers in their salvific teachings, point the way to good order and Christian piety, provide examples of virtue, avoid scandal, shine like lights and radiate virtue among the faithful (Matthew 5), and resist the sins and temptations of the world..." Valentin Polon, *Pomni na mne* f. A7r; see also A8r-v. Regarding the priests' duty to set a good example by deeds, not only by words, see Vavřinec Leander Rvačovský of Rvačov, *Masopust* [Lent] (Prague, 1580) f. D2v.

severed branch, of the traditional Church of Western Christendom.<sup>102</sup> Moreover, their ordinations had been approved by the Council of Basel, the ecumenical character of which the Roman Church did not doubt. The sternest charge, cited earlier, that this process involved a double apostasy on the part of the candidates for priesthood, however, seems to be based on an isolated instance. The consternation, which this one event caused in the Utraquist circles, would indicate that an absolution from a promise to administer *sub una* was not a routine practice, but an extraordinary occurrence.<sup>103</sup> Another charge was that the Utraquist Church willingly accepted any priest, no matter how unworthy, who was ready to shift allegiance from the Roman Curia. The actual record indicated that the Consistory was rather careful in examining the record of such candidates and by no means accepted anybody who presented himself.<sup>104</sup>

The image of cowering deference of the Utraquist ecclesiastics toward the Habsburg monarchs and their officials, as well as the Roman Curia's agents, also needs to be qualified by the fact that, when the need and opportunity arose, the Consistory could assert its independence with firmness and dignity. Thus in 1549 Ferdinand I failed to pressure the Utraquist church into concessions to the Roman Curia, especially on the issue communion for infants. The Consistory was able to mobilize the support of the Bohemian Diet for its resistance to the royal will.<sup>105</sup> Similarly, during the 1560s, the Consistorians returned papal missives unopened to the Roman Archbishop of Prague, and declined to meet the Curia's emissaries.<sup>106</sup> In fact, in a refreshing change of pace, František Kameníček chides the Utraquists for their disruptive and unnecessary displays of insolence toward Roman clergy and laity.<sup>107</sup>

If despite all, the Utraquists did not quite measure up to the moral rigorism and perfectionism of the Unity of Brethren, it is relevant to recall Ernst Troeltsch's famous ecclesiastical topology, according to which a sect composed of those

---

<sup>102</sup> See, for instance, Bílejovský, *Kronyka Cýrkevní* 27.

<sup>103</sup> For the generalized accusation see Zikmund Winter, *Zlatá doba měst českých* [The golden age of Czech towns] (Prague, 1991) 167; Blanka Zylinská, "Svěcení kněžstva Biskupem Filibertem v Praze v letech 1437-39 [Presbyteral ordinations of Bishop Philibert in Prague during the years 1437-39]," *Documenta Pragensia* 9 (1991) pt. 2, 369; Ernest Denis, *Fin de l'indépendance bohème*, 1:286-287. I could find only one specific reference to such an incident, involving three ordinands in 1543, in Borový *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické a utrakvistické* 1:189. The resulting consternation in the Utraquist circles indicated that such a "double apostasy" was neither a habitual nor a normal occurrence. See also Klement Borový, "Die Utraquisten in Böhmen," *AÖG* 36 (1866) 264.

<sup>104</sup> Julius Pažout, *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících, 1562-1570* (Prague, 1906) 136.

<sup>105</sup> Klement Borový, ed., *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické a utrakvistické*. v. 1: *Akta konsistoře utrakvistické* (Prague, 1868) 251-253. See also František M. Bartoš, "Katolický vládní spis proti utrakvistickému podáváníí dítkám z kalicha z r. 1549," *ČČM* 92 (1918) 70-72.

<sup>106</sup> Klement Borový, *Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, arcibiskup pražský; Historicko-kritický životopis* (Prague, 1873) 176; and Krofta, "Boj o konsistoř," 385. On the alleged sycophancy of the Utraquists see also Josef Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba*, 4 vv. (Prague, 1927-33) 3:327.

<sup>107</sup> František Kameníček, "Pod obojí (utrakvisté)," *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské, 1526-1628* 3:407.

specially “elect” can, as a rule, establish and maintain higher moral standards for its members than a church charitably open to those simply baptized.<sup>108</sup>

### Question of Intellectual Rigour

In addition to the charge of questionable morality, the Utraquists’ relatively open intellectual world that acknowledged the principles of questioning and discussion created a problem. While at the opening of the third millennium tolerance and freedom of expression would be considered distinct virtues, these very qualities were paradoxically held against them in modern historiography.<sup>109</sup> The Utraquists’ intellectual orientation contributed to the harsh judgments passed on Utraquism by the nineteenth and early twentieth-century historians who tended to expect a clear-cut, unambiguous categorisation of concepts or phenomena. From the vantage points of Hegelian rationalism, Comtean positivism, or Marxist dialectics, the relatively open-ended intellectual outlook of the Utraquist theologians and other intellectuals would appear as something marked by a lack of discipline or rigour, and by intellectual instability and indolence.<sup>110</sup> It is paradoxical, even amusing, to see agnostic and secularist critics in modern times pick up on the theme of laxity, and see them chastize the Utraquists for their “low level of religiosity” or their lack of “higher religious feelings.”<sup>111</sup>

From the present-day viewpoint, the Utraquists’ intellectual openness or latitudinarianism, combined with liberal ecclesiology, is likely to be perceived as a sign of positive distinction rather than one of degradation. In the sixteenth-century context, this outlook was a crucial mark of differentiation from the Post-Tridentine Roman Church with its relatively closed intellectual world and institutional authoritarianism. It also tended to distance them further from the Lutheran and Calvinist denominations that evolved in the direction of increasing dogmatisation as the process of confessionalisation advanced during the sixteenth century.<sup>112</sup> At the opposite side of the ledger, the Utraquists’ attitude of tolerance did not signify

---

<sup>108</sup> See his dry, but learned, disquisitions comparing the *Sektentypus* with the *Kirchentypus*, in *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* in his *Gesammelte Schriften* 4 vv. (Tübingen, 1912) for instance 1:407, 834-5, 967, 980. On the Brethren’s moral rigorism see, for instance, Jan V. Novák, “Spor Bratří s p. Vojtěchem z Pernštejna a na Prostějově r. 1557 a 1558,” *ČČM* 65 (1891) 52.

<sup>109</sup> Jan Mukařovský, ed., *Dějiny české literatury*, 4 vv. (Prague, 1959-1995) 2:114.

<sup>110</sup> Josef Hanzal, *Od baroka k romantismu: Ke zrození novodobé české kultury* [From the baroque to romanticism: Towards the birth of modern Czech culture] (Prague, 1987) 100. On the stern critique aimed by historians at the Utraquist Church, see David, “The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism,” 644-52. The critics may be characterized in John Rawls’s apt phrase as adherents to “comprehensive doctrines” both religious and secular; see Bernard G. Prusak, “Politics, Religion and the Public Good: An Interview with Philosopher John Rawls,” *Commonweal* 125 (25 September 1998) 14. This same line of thinking has also led to the criticism of Dobrovský as a person devoid of firm principles for his admiration of the Utraquist century; Jan Lehár and others, *Česká literatura od počátků k dnešku* (Prague, 1998) 162.

<sup>111</sup> For instance, Josef Janáček, *České dějiny: Doba předbělohorská*, 2 vv. (Prague, 1971-1984) 2:191.

<sup>112</sup> Zdeněk V. David, “Utraquists, Lutherans, and the Bohemian Confession of 1575,” *Church History* 68 (1999) 331-335.

intellectual nihilism or a lack of commitment, as has been charged. Rather it could, and did, coexist with firm adherence to specific religious and ethical principles.<sup>113</sup>

Looking back from the threshold of the third millennium, it is exactly the sixteenth-century Bohemia's liberalism and toleration that contradicted the debunking image of Utraquism. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, Utraquism (possibly with the germinating Anglicanism of England) stood as a beacon of light in the descending darkness of intellectual rigidity and intolerance. In the seventeenth century, religious fanaticism would extinguish the lights of toleration in both countries. While relatively brief in England under Oliver Cromwell, the hiatus would extend in Bohemia from the suppression of intellectual freedom after the Battle of the White Mountain in the 1620s until the restoration of religious liberty by the Austrian Enlightenment in 1780s.

Freedom of thought, dispassionate discussion and tolerance of diverse views are among the notable legacies of the Utraquist Church to the Bohemian Enlightenment and, largely through it, to the subsequent Czech political culture. Once more drawing a parallel between Utraquism and Anglicanism, the following statement about Richard Hooker, the seminal spokesman for the Church of England, could also be applied to Jan Hus and his Utraquist successors, adhering to the principles of the Judge of Cheb: "Hooker maintained continuity with the past, looked at the old ways as preferable, would maintain the historic episcopate and traditional worship, but with his views of the freedom of reason he opened a door to the future..."<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> Zdeněk V. David, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609–1620," *BRRP* 3 (1998) 185-188. We find a recognition of this exceptional status of Utraquist Bohemia in the late writing of Robert Kalivoda; see Robert Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský* (Prague, 1992) especially 9-60, 189-202; idem, "Husitství a jeho vyústění v době předbělohorské a bělohorské," *Studia comeniana et historica* 13 (1983) 3-44. The remarkable level of intellectual life in sixteenth-century Bohemia is highlighted in Zdeněk V. David, "Národní obrození jako převtělení Zlatého věku [The national awakening as the reincarnation of the golden age]," *ČČH* 99 (2001) 503-505. Concerning the high intellectual standards of Utraquist theologians, despite the church's orientation toward the urban and rural commoners, see idem, *Finding the Middle Way* 15-17, 331.

<sup>114</sup> John E. Booty, "Hooker and Anglicanism," *Studies in Richard Hooker*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Cleveland, 1972) 211.