

---

## Sixt of Ottersdorf's Diarium of the Diet of 1575

---

James R. Palmitessa (Kalamazoo, Michigan)

The Diet of 1575 marked an important moment in the political and religious history of Bohemia.<sup>1</sup> The moves at the Diet to write and adopt a Bohemian Confession have been described as “a high point in the attempts to legitimise Lutheranism and the Unity of the Brethren.”<sup>2</sup> The drawing up of the Bohemian Confession has also been viewed as representing “the largest advance in the politics of estate opposition in Bohemia since the [estate] revolt of 1547... [which] called forth an extraordinary voice” of the estates.<sup>3</sup> The Diet of 1575 “was the most important Bohemian Diet in the second half of the sixteenth century.”<sup>4</sup>

The immediate impetus or rather the removal of a barrier for the writing of a Bohemian Confession dates back to 1567 when the estates ceased insisting in their negotiations that the Crown acknowledge the *Compactata*, a compromise agreement between the Utraquists and the Roman Church reached at the Council of Basel in 1436, which was one of the foundations of the religious-political order in post-Hussite Bohemia. Instead the estates replaced it with a general statement calling for the protecting of the religious order and the upholding of earlier agreements, traditions, and customs. At the Diet of 1571, a proposal was first put forward for the approval of the Augsburg Confession in Bohemia, but King Maximilian II closed down the discussions; temporarily, as was explained at the time. However, by 1575, the climate had changed. A growing crisis in state finances forced the king to go to the estates to approve tax reform and he was also eager to have his son Rudolf chosen as his successor as King of Bohemia before the upcoming Imperial Diet in Regensburg where Rudolf was expected to be elected Holy Roman Emperor. These pressing needs forced the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse, její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Praha, 1912); Hrejsa, IV:266–333; Gindeley, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, (Osnabrück: 1968<sup>2</sup>) II:109–229; Tomek, XII: 225–252; Josef Janáček, *Rudolf II. a jeho doba* (Praha, 1987) 98–113; Jaroslav Pánek, *Stavovská opozice a její zápas s Habsburky 1547–1577, K politické krizi feudální třídy v předbělohorském českém státě* (Praha, 1982) 101–19; David, *Finding*, 168–97.

<sup>2</sup> David, *Finding*, 168.

<sup>3</sup> Janáček, 128.

<sup>4</sup> Pánek, 101. See also Václav Bůžek, Josef Hrdlička, Pavel Král and Zdeněk Vybíral, *Věk urozených. Šlechta v českých zemích na prahu novověku* (Praha and Litomyšl, 2002) 86–108; and Bůžek, “From Compromise to Rebellion: Religion and Political Power of the Nobility in the First Century of the Habsburgs’ Reign in Bohemia and Moravia,” *JEMH* 8 (2004) 31–45.

king into a position where he needed to be receptive to estate demands.<sup>5</sup> By now, however, the demand had changed from the wholesale adoption of the Augsburg Confession to the approval of a Bohemian Confession which would be informed by and composed of elements of the Augsburg Confession, other confessional statements of the European Reformation, and Bohemian traditions.

The basic issues relating to the Confession and the Diet are fairly straightforward, but gaining an understanding of the negotiations and debates can be perplexing. This is due to the difficulties in identifying and sorting out the political and confessional motivations of both the participants of the time, which were intertwined and in flux, and those of nineteenth and early twentieth historians, which continue to influence our views today on the subject. For many scholars the outcome of the Diet of 1575 “meant the virtual demise of mainline Utraquism.”<sup>6</sup> Ferdinand Hrejsa, the author of the seminal work on the subject, wrote that the Diet brought about the beginning of a long-term “breakdown [or decay] of Old Utraquism.”<sup>7</sup> Zdeněk David has argued more recently that the rapprochement of the urban estate with proponents of the Bohemian Confession “should not be viewed as a theological stand or as an expression of sympathy for Lutheranism, but as a political stand to maintain a parliamentary alliance with the nobility.”<sup>8</sup> These and other questions can be explored thanks to a relatively larger and broader body of sources than exists for many other segments of the sixteenth century. These sources include letters and reports from estate representatives and individuals at large with various confessional affiliations, letters of the papal nuncios and foreign ambassadors, and two diaries, one by the Bohemian Brethren and another by Sixt of Ottersdorf, the spokesman of the estate of the royal cities at the Diet of 1575, the latter of which is the subject of study of this essay.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The Roman curia never reconciled itself with the *Compactata* and Pius II renounced them in 1462; Kamil Krofta, *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* (Praha, 1936) 337, 345–46; Janáček, 108–13; Pánek, 94, 101; David, *Finding*, 170.

<sup>6</sup> David, *Finding*, 169. For Anton Gindely, for example, the Diet of 1575 was the last time that the adherents of Old Utraquism come forward so prominently; Gindely, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, II:117.

<sup>7</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 533. According to Kamil Krofta, while the moves to create a Bohemian Confession were for some Utraquists (especially the “Neo-Utraquists”) an attempt at a reconciliation with the Bohemian Brethren and a break with tradition (specifically the *Compactata*) in order to gain religious freedom, the attempt failed because it was not approved by the Crown; Krofta, 338–48.

<sup>8</sup> David, *Finding*, 186.

<sup>9</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 86–94; “Diarium Sixta z Ottersdorfu o sněmu 1575, jenž zahájen byl 21. února a zavřin dne 27. září” [Sixt of Ottersdorf’s Diary for the Diet of 1575, which opened on 21. February and concluded 27. September] and “Diarum, zápisy o sněmování a listové o událostech za času sněmu r. 1575 zběhlých, napsaní od Bratří českých,” [Diary, Diet Records, and Documents, Concerning the Period of the 1575 Diet, Recorded by the Bohemian Brethren], SČ IV, 318–392, 392–464.

Although Sixt's *Diarium* is frequently mentioned as an important source on the Diet of 1575, most citations end there.<sup>10</sup> Even Ferdinand Hrejsa, who provides an extensive day-by-day synopsis of the proceedings and negotiations of the Diet, based on the full spectrum of available sources, draws on the *Diarium* basically for factual information and does not discuss Sixt's perspective – confessional or otherwise.<sup>11</sup> This is in stark contrast to the attention that has been devoted to Sixt of Otterdorf's chronicle on the Revolt of 1547, which has been comprehensively studied from a number of different angles and is viewed as one of the major sources of the history of Bohemia in the Pre-White Mountain Bohemian period.<sup>12</sup> This essays examines the information which the *Diarium* of the Diet of 1575 provides on urban religious life and society (vis-à-vis of the kind found in Sixt of Otterdorf's chronicle of 1547) and how Sixt's perspective might have changed over a twenty-five year period.

\* \* \*

A good place to start is by introducing Sixt of Ottersdorf and describing the structure and nature of the *Diarium* as an historical source. Sixt was born sometime between 1500 and 1502 in Rakovník in a relatively wealthy burgher family, the Šousters. He studied at the Philosophical (Arts) faculty of Prague University at the beginning of the 1530s and in 1533 went to Saxony where he matriculated at Wittenberg University. There he took an interest not only in Lutheran teachings, but also in the authors of antiquity and developed his humanistic training and Greek language skills.<sup>13</sup> In 1534 Sixt returned to

<sup>10</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 86–87.

<sup>11</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 94–255.

<sup>12</sup> Sixt of Ottersdorf, *Knihy památné o nepokojných letech 1546 a 1547* [Memoirs of the Turbulent Years 1546 and 1547], 2 vv., ed. Josef Teige (Praha, 1926); idem, *O pokoření stavu městského* [About Subduing the Estate of Towns], ed. Josef Janáček (Praha, 1950); Zdeněk Beneš, *Historický text a historická skutečnost. Studie o principech českého humanistického dějepisectví* [Historical Text and Historical Reality. A Study of the Principles of the Bohemian Humanist Historiography], Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et Historica, Monographia CXLI (Praha, 1992); "Akta aneb knihy památné čili historie Sixta z Ottersdorfu (Studie o genezi a struktuře jednoho historického textu), [Acts or Memoirs, otherwise a History, of Sixt of Ottersdorf (A Study of the Genesis and Structure of an Historical Text)]" ČČH 90/2 (1982), 188–203; Petr Vorel, ed., *Stavovský odboj roku 1547. První krize Habsburské monarchie* [The Estates' Uprising of 1547. The First Crisis of the Habsburg Monarchy] (Pardubice and Prague, 1999).

<sup>13</sup> Pánek, "Sixt z Ottersdorfu – mluvčí českého měšťanstva v dramatických počátcích habsburské monarchie [Sixt of Ottersdorf – A Spokesman of the Czech Burghers in the Dramatic Beginnings of the Habsburg Monarchy]," *Sixt z Ottersdorfu, rakovnický roddák a český humanista*, Katalog expozice věnované významnému kancléři Starého Města pražského Státní okresní archiv v Rakovníku, 25. březen 2004 [Sixt of Ottersdorf, A Native of Rakovník and a Bohemian Humanist, Catalogue of an Exhibition, Devoted to a Prominent Chancellor of the Old Town of Prague. The State Archive of the District of Rakovník, 25. March 2004] (Rakovník, 2004) 3.

Bohemia and in 1537 began working as a notary at the Hospital of St. Paul-before-the-Poříčská-Gate. In 1538, he became a burgher of the Old Town and a notary of its council. During this time, he continued as an honorary administrator of the properties of the Hospital of St. Paul. In 1540 he received a title of nobility – that is, became an *erbovník* [holder of a coat of arms] – of the Old Town, taking on the attribute “z Ottersdorfu [of Ottersdorf].” In 1543, during a turbulent period in communal politics, Sixt was removed from the council of elders by King Ferdinand I after being accused by a fellow elder of being a *pikhart*, but he was allowed to return to the council two years later. Between 1543 and 1545 Sixt also served as an administrator of the communal finances and in 1546 became Chancellor of the Old Town.<sup>14</sup>

During the Revolt of 1547, Sixt participated in estate negotiations as a representative of the estate of royal cities. At a number of important moments of the revolt he assumed the role as spokesman. After the defeat of the revolt he was imprisoned along with other “co-conspirators,” but was released after a few weeks. After this time he distanced himself from public life, working in the cloth business. When King Ferdinand I had put together a collection of sources on the Revolt, which he had ordered confiscated from the estates, Sixt began work on his own recollection of events, which exist in a number of editions. As mentioned above, it is for this chronicle that he is most commonly known. Shortly before 1570 he returned to public life when he was elected as a member of the Court of the Burgrave of the Prague Castle (*rada při soudu purkhrabství pražského*). At the Diet of 1575 he again became a spokesman of the urban estate. He died in August 1583.

In addition to his public service, Sixt was a member of a close circle of humanists and publishers in Prague. He was known in his day as one of finest translators of ancient Greek into Czech, including works on religion, public administration, and law. He also wrote his own epic poetry in Latin and commented on the works of Latin authors.<sup>15</sup> Jan Blahoslav called Sixt “the best Bohemian of all contemporary Prague doctors and masters.”<sup>16</sup>

It is not clear when Sixt wrote the *Diarium* of the Diet of 1575. It is structured like a diary containing entries for individual days beginning with the first meeting of estate leaders on the Monday after *Invocavit* 921 February] with the last official meeting taking place on the Monday before the Nativity of the BVM [5 September] when the estates discussed the conditions for the

<sup>14</sup> Josef Teige, “O životě a díle Sixtově [The Life and Work of Sixt],” *Knihy památné*, 2: 5–20; “z Ottersdorfu,” *Ottova encyklopedie obecných vědomostí* at [www.ottovaenczklopedia.cz](http://www.ottovaenczklopedia.cz); Josef Riss, “Život a literární působení Sixta z Ottersdorfu [The Life and Literary Activity of Sixt of Ottersdorf],” *ČČM* 35/1 (1861) 73–84, 159–70; Josef Hejnic, “Dvě poznámky o Sixtovi z Ottersdorfu [Two Remarks about Sixt of Ottersdorf],” *ČSPSČ* 69 (1961) 140–46.

<sup>15</sup> Riss, “Život ...,” *ČČM* 35/1 (1861) 73, 84, 159–70; Josef Hejnic, “O několika tiscích z knihovny Sixta z Ottersdorfu [Several Books in the Library of Sixt of Ottersdorf],” *LF* 83 (1961) 141–44, 280–85.

<sup>16</sup> Riss, 161.

election of Rudolf II as the successor to Maximilian II as King of Bohemia. Following the last entry is a description of Rudolf II's coronation and some entries dealing with final administrative matters. The last entry is dated as Wednesday, St. Wenceslaus' Day [28 September]. Thus, the *Diarium* spans a period of roughly seven months from February to September 1575 during which the Diet met with two interruptions.

A printed version of the *Diarium*, based on a critical comparison of different manuscript editions in archives and rare book collections in Prague, Southern Bohemia and Moravia, was published in volume IV of the *Sněmy české* (1886).<sup>17</sup> In that edition, the *Diarium* comprises seventy-four single-spaced pages in small font. Individual entries are on the average from one paragraph to one page in length but there are a number of entries which are two to four pages long. One lengthier entry describes one of the initial discussions of the three estates which led to the election of a commission to draw up the Confession.<sup>18</sup> Another one describes one of the important meetings of this body in the Town Hall of the Small Side (*Malá Strana*).<sup>19</sup> And another provides the extended speech of the Emperor describing why he could not accept the Confession into law, but that he would be tolerant and respect the status quo.<sup>20</sup> Interspersed between the daily entries are copies of three important documents: an appeal of the Utraquist estates;<sup>21</sup> King Maximilian II's reply;<sup>22</sup> and a copy of an Utraquist Ecclesiastical Ordinance which was written up alongside the Confession.<sup>23</sup>

There are not entries for every day, but there are entries for many days when negotiations did not take place; noting, for example, when meetings were postponed and the reasons given for postponement. This illustrates Sixt's attention to detail and lends support to the accuracy of the reporting. Throughout the work, information is provided on the locations of meetings and negotiations: For example, the *diarium* identifies the Court Chamber (*Soudní svietnice*) of the castle where all the estates commonly met; the Green Chamber (*Zelená svietnice*) where the estates *sub utraque* frequently met; when estate representatives were called "upstairs" to the King; when representatives of the royal cities met in the Town Hall of the Old Town; and the commission drafting the Confession which met in the Town Hall of the Small Side.

The style and content of the entries show that Sixt of Ottersdorf was an eyewitness or close to the discussions, which is verified in other sources.

<sup>17</sup> The editors of SČ cite that their edition of the *Diarium* is the result of comparing an incorrect manuscript in the National Museum with the codex in the Bibliotheca kniž. Lobkovice in Roudnice and a correct manuscript in the Moravian National Archives, SČ IV, 318.

<sup>18</sup> SČ IV, 322–23.

<sup>19</sup> SČ IV, 328–330.

<sup>20</sup> SČ IV, 365–67.

<sup>21</sup> SČ IV, 343–44.

<sup>22</sup> SČ IV, 345–48.

<sup>23</sup> SČ IV, 334–38.

Sometimes statements or speeches are quoted directly; others times Sixt notes that “such and such was said in the sense of.” Sixt, himself, is only mentioned in the *Diarium* once or twice – and in the third person; and, on the whole, at first reading, the author’s views do not appear to be in the forefront. This seems very different from Sixt’s writings on the Revolt of 1547. In those writings, Sixt’s perspective is clear: stressing the importance of the urban communities in the events and highlighting events in the Prague cities and actions of city dwellers.

In the *Diarium*, Sixt refers to groups almost exclusively in the language of legally sanctioned estate politics; that is, as “estates” and “parties” (*stavů* and *strany*) “in-one-kind” and “in-two-kinds” (*pod jednou* and *pod obojí způsobou*). In the very few instances when he uses the terms “the Brethren” or “Catholics,” it is clear that he is referring to confessional groups.<sup>24</sup>

Zdeněk Beneš has described six major genres of historical literature in the period between the Hussite Revolution and the Battle of the White Mountain; including histories (*historie*), chronicles, historical calendars, registers, and annals.<sup>25</sup> He classifies Sixt’s writings on the Revolt of 1547 as a *silva rerum*, a composite genre containing a collection of documents, collected and commented on by a single author for a stated purpose.<sup>26</sup> Josef Riss, commenting in 1861 on the writings of the Revolt of 1547 noted the sharp division or dual nature of the writings about the revolt. According to Riss, part one contains more objective descriptions of events and the author’s views do not come to the forefront, whereas part two is livelier and the author uses colloquial phrases, even sarcasms at times, to show his own reflections.<sup>27</sup> After consideration, it is clear that the *Diarium* too is a *silva rerum* with the basic structure of the text into individual days – hence the title *Diarium* – rather than free text as in the writings on the Revolt of 1547. Most of the entries provide matter-of-fact reporting of discussions and negotiations. If one reads the *Diarium* more closely, however, one can identify here too Sixt’s perspective and opinions, though they are much more subtle than in the writings on the Revolt of 1547. Rather than being put in a separate section, they can be found interspersed throughout the *Diarium*.

This next section of the essay highlights events or issues in the *Diarium* that might support or be concordant with what others have written about the negotiation and which would stand out from those of a disinterested observer. It will be argued that Sixt is not a disinterested observer. His interest in urban and religious affairs, it will be shown, is just as strong in the *Diarium* of 1575 as it was in 1546 and 1547.

<sup>24</sup> In the quotations and paraphrases from the *Diarium* to follow in this essay, Sixt of Ottersdorf’s language is followed literally; referring to estates and parties “in-one-kind” and “in-two-kinds” and confessional groups (e.g. the Brethren).

<sup>25</sup> Beneš, *Historický text*, 18–22.

<sup>26</sup> Beneš, *Historický text*, 21.

<sup>27</sup> Riss, 163; Beneš, *Historický text*, 78.

\* \* \*

The first mention of the estate of the royal cities and urban affairs in general appears in the entry for Wednesday after *Laetere* Sunday [23 March] when, in preparation for the drafting of a Bohemian Confession, the estates in-two-kinds met to hear a reading of the Augsburg Confession and the Confession of the Bohemian Brethren. Sixt reports that a few representatives from the Old Town of Prague had to leave the meeting early and the discussion was postponed. When the commission met the next day “they gave their response,” which on which Sixt did not elaborate. The royal cities clearly had decided to participate since a commission, consisting of seven nobles, six knights, and six representatives from the estate of the royal cities was then set up to draft the Bohemian Confession. The representatives of the royal cities included Sixt and Matěj of Aventýn from the Old Town of Prague, Cyprian Lopatský, Mikuláš from the House-of-the-Red-Rose from the New Town, all individuals who were prominent leaders in Prague communal government, and two representatives from the royal cities of Žatec and Kadaň.<sup>28</sup>

At their next meeting on Monday, Jindřich of Valdštejn made a “friendly reminder to the group that he hoped that God would allow the Emperor to support the negotiations and asked that they take place in a friendly manner.” Michal Španovský, a knight then spoke, and after him “the Praguers and representatives of other royal cities”. In one of the only places where Sixt directly addresses the stand of the estate of the royal cities in supporting the Bohemian Confession, he reports that “[they] spoke that it had come to their attention that the lords and knights had the intent to create a new order ... and that they met and discussed the matter and their response, which was relayed by Sixt of Ottersdorf, was that, although they were at first afraid [or sceptical] of the plan, they are glad the lords and knights took this up and they would now like to be helpful in the work and everything that lies before them.”<sup>29</sup>

At a meeting the same day of the estate representatives as a whole, Sixt reports that representatives in-one-kind remarked to the party in-two-kinds that many parishes are in their hands and appointing priests in-two-kinds would be “hurtful” [*nemalé ublížení*] to them and they hoped that this would be avoided and there would be “friendliness and unity” [*dobré přátelství a svornost*] among them. The party in-two-kinds responded that they were grateful for the meeting and the agreement between them, but that they couldn’t respond to the complaint about the effect on parish priests until the articles had been written down. The party in-one-kind responded that ... they should have their own people present when the articles are written down and for reasons of fairness [*slusny*], the party in-two-kinds should wait with their plan to keep matters as they are.”<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> SČ IV, 327–28.

<sup>29</sup> SČ IV, 328–29.

<sup>30</sup> SČ IV, 329.

The next day, according to Sixt, with the deadline approaching to present the articles to the estates and the King, “the commission decided to write down first the general articles and not write any damaging ones.”<sup>31</sup>

On Tuesday after the Feast of the Holy Trinity [31 May], Sixt wrote that “it was heard that few kept the negotiations secret and they recommended to Jan of Huter, the mayor of the New Town of Prague, that he call his community together so that the articles could be read to them without any hindrance. However, a few prominent leaders did not want this to happen. The Chief Justice (*Nejvyšší Sudi*) even wrote a memorandum to the king stating that a meeting could be dangerous and should not take place.”<sup>32</sup>

On Friday after the Feast of St. Medard [10 June] the community of the New Town of Prague was called together in the New Town Hall to hear the religious articles read to them. After it was read Sixt reports that it was not clear if any objections had been raised other than from one person who had spoken against the case for married priests, “as if anything was new.” That person was reminded that it was not allowed to speak up and the meeting broke up. On Monday the meeting convened again. Sixt reports that at ten judges and communal officers had been specially summoned to appear that day in the New Town Hall and the elders, guild masters, and the *hejtman* of the New Town stood between them. Next to the *hejtman* stood the royal magistrate [*královský rychtář*], who had also been called to appear. The *hejtman* then began a speech and a dialogue ensued, much of which Sixt quotes directly.<sup>33</sup>

*Hejtman*: “Dear Praguers, elders! I do not doubt that some of you were here last week .... You can understand from my presence that his royal highness has loving and fatherly inclinations towards you .... so the articles will be read to you so you can determine if they would bring you any difficulties or if you have something to say about them. You should speak up and not be afraid. You asked that because some could not come last time and the meeting had to be postponed. I see that two controversial individuals are here, I think a tailor, who has a heathen name, Enoch...”<sup>34</sup>

And then Enoch, whose first name was Malina, stepped forward and asked the *hejtman* why he needed to speak in such a mad and frenzied [*zuřivý*] manner.

*Hejtman* replied: “[I]n order that you know his royal Majesty heard you when you behaved so naughtily/mischievously [*nezbedný*] last Friday when you made light of the salvation of the souls of this people here in this place as well as in people’s homes. In order that you know that his

<sup>31</sup> SČ IV, 330.

<sup>32</sup> SČ IV, 340–41.

<sup>33</sup> SČ IV, 349.

<sup>34</sup> Loc. cit.

royal Majesty orders that ‘you be taken upstairs’ [i.e. put under arrest]. Mr. Magistrate, I recommend that you bring him upstairs at once.”

Enoch: “Mr. Hejtman, I object to what you just said and, as I a member of the free urban estate and subject to its law, I ask your Majesty that you leave that risible suggestion aside, so I may not be bothered and ask that I be heard.”<sup>35</sup>

*Hejtman* replied, “I already told you to leave the speech aside and how you should behave and said that you be sent at once to the coat room.”

And then, according to Sixt, Enoch went with the magistrate to prison.<sup>36</sup>

*Hejtman* then told the elders: “...Yesterday I told his Majesty, as he was having lunch, about the meeting you requested and he agreed that a large number of elders and guild members should be read the articles and they should speak and not be afraid. His Majesty is interested in your desires concerning this matter, based on your long-established beliefs [*starobylé víře*] which you and your ancestors hold to.”<sup>37</sup>

With that, according to Sixt, someone next to the *hejtman* spoke into his ear that he had a few people next to him who wanted to speak, including Martin Masopust, Jana Příhod, a hat maker, Vít Vodička and Ambrož Selík, both butchers, who were all leading members of the community. The *hejtman* then asked that the ten judges and guild elders step forward. The judges said that they understood that the Majesty wants the community to live in unity and love and for that reason, for the articles to be read. However, if one of them, say an upstanding man, wanted to speak about the articles, he would be afraid to do so for fear that he would be taken away as just happened to one of our fellow citizens. So it was their wish that they return to their work and court.<sup>38</sup>

The *hejtman* replied: “... it was your wish to hear the articles read out.”

The judges responded: “in the past, articles of faith of the party in-two-kinds were read in the Diet, and the judges were sent to hear them from the Office of the Mayor, and they did not accept them until they were praise-worthy and pious and were rooted in both laws of our Lord, the old and the new...”<sup>39</sup>

*Hejtman* then said to Brikcí [Zvonař of Cimperk]: “I will not argue with you over the articles since this is not a court. If the members of the court don’t want to hear them, why do you say that those who already heard them can leave?”<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup> SČ IV, 350.

<sup>36</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>37</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>38</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>39</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>40</sup> SČ IV, 351.

With that the judges left the room and right after them the elders. The Magistrate then called for them to return. According to Sixt, “If the magistrate did not call after them, they would have all liked to have left.” The *hejtman* then continued to speak to those who remained, which, according to Sixt, “were not great in number.”<sup>41</sup>

*Hejtman*: “What more do you want to say about these articles, or was enough miscellaneous stuff said last week, or do you want to remain with what you said a week earlier?”<sup>42</sup>

Franc Mejsnar, a furrier then said that “he wanted to remain with his old faith and religious customs and laws which his predecessors in Prague lived by.”<sup>43</sup>

Melichar Křížek, another furrier: “Dear *hejtman*, the neighbours said that since the articles are pious and praiseworthy, they want to administer according to belief in-two-kinds as their fathers and predecessors did.”

Another asked the *hejtman*: “Tell me how I should answer His Imperial Majesty, whether you ask for these articles, or whether you ask to be left with the customary ancient orders?”

“But others in general made noise and all spoke at once that they accept those articles, because they recognise that they were written according to the Word of God, others again that they wish to retain the old faith, others again that they are [side] with the Estates [*při páních stavích*] because the mayor and barons [*pan purkmistr a páni*] on our behalf had agreed to them [i.e. the articles] and together decided.

The *hejtman* then said: “I will tell his Majesty that some want to take on the articles and others want to remain with their old faith and order.” One on[following] the order of the community spoke: “Your Grace, Lord *hejtman*! These neighbours have asked me to announce that they had observed and wish to observe the ancient faith which is written by the three estates in those articles and [which] is being submitted to His Imperial Majesty, and that is the true ancient faith and there is none other than this faith only.”

*Hejtman* replied: “However, I am also in [the party of] two-kinds and want to live according to the old beliefs rather than have my affairs administered along with some sects.”

A blacksmith: “Dear *hejtman*! It is not belief but religion which we wish to observe”

Lastly, Matěj, a tanner: Your Grace, Lord *hejtman*! We met on Friday and heard the articles and we do not recognise in them anything that is heretical or misleading and yes, what the good lords wrote is good and praise-worthy, this we also – together with other gentlemen – accept.

<sup>41</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>42</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>43</sup> Loc. cit.

*Hejtman* replied: “Dear brother, you are hardly a Pikhart, if you speak so piously; perhaps you are a sectarian of the Pecínov community.”<sup>44</sup> And so the articles were not read and the people dispersed; also lord *hejtman* left the city hall.<sup>45</sup>

On Friday after the Feast of St. Vitus [17 June], the general articles were discussed by the estates in-two-kinds. At that meeting the Chief Justice brought to everyone’s attention that Zdeněk of Vartemberk, the *hejtman* of the New Town of Prague, who was involved in the incident I just related, had heard from a lord from the in-two-kinds party that the party wanted to expel the Jesuits from Bohemia, to destroy the in-one-kind party and wash their hands in their blood. A meeting was called in order that the Chief Justice could ask the *hejtman* in the presence of a few others exactly what he heard “in order to know how to behave in the presence of some disgraceful talk and with this meeting a friendly apology came from the second party; nothing, however, if they had heard some unfounded talk, they would not put any faith in it.”<sup>46</sup>

At that same meeting a second complaint came forward that a certain Father Franta from St. Vitus’s Cathedral preached a sermon in which he disparaged the in-two-kinds party and said the following, which Sixt paraphrases here but does not quote directly – namely, “that they [the party in-two-kinds] drew up a new confession based on the beliefs of Pikharts [a common pejorative term for the Unity of Brethren] and thieves and that the riotous, peace-breaking estates, which played such a nasty trick with them since they wanted a new belief ... and that the emperor did not want to hear from such sectarians and would not accept such a thing ... [Sixt goes on to report] and the party in-two-kinds brought to the attention of the other side their complaints and announced that they had no other interest than to maintain a good friendship in all respects with them, and advanced a request – since they had to notify His Majesty about the touchy sermon – that both parties would together beg His Majesty that His Imperial Majesty might deign to stop and seriously punish such scurrilous and incendiary preaching in order to prevent worse consequences.”<sup>47</sup>

Sixt also records that “on this day Zikmund Kurcpach was stabbed to death by some Frenchmen.”<sup>48</sup> Josef Janáček states that Kurcpach was a brother or a close relative of one of the estate representatives from the opposition and says that in addition to Kurcpach a few other Bohemian nobles were seriously injured in a wild fight with foreigners and that it was a Frenchman or Italian

<sup>44</sup> Loc. cit.; Editor’s note: “Pecínovští” also known as “Mikulášenci”, a sect concentrated in the town of Pecínov near Benešov; see *Ottův slovník naučný*, 19:381.

<sup>45</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>46</sup> SČ IV, 351–52.

<sup>47</sup> SČ IV, 352.

<sup>48</sup> SČ IV, 352.

who attacked Kurcpath.<sup>49</sup> Janáček does not cite where he got his information, but he must be getting it from another source because Sixt writes nothing more than the sentence I noted.

A day later, Sixt reports, “while most of the time [during the Diet] was spent discussing the general articles, the Praguers complained to the estates that the Italians [*Vlaši*] and other foreigners, of which there were a lot in Prague at this time, caused not a small amount of trouble [*protimyslnosti*], walking at night in gangs and their male and female servants cause trouble, so they [the Praguers] asked for some action. The lords and knights met to discuss the matter and decided that this naughtiness [*rozpustilost*] should be stopped ... the Praguers were advised to keep track of the number of Italians in their land.” On Wednesday after the Feast of St. John [29 June], the Chief Justice raised the complaints about the rumours of expelling the Jesuits and the preaching of Father Franta to the king and “his Majesty became upset and announced that it would be taken care of so that no more preaching of this kind would take place.”<sup>50</sup> Two days later, the King sent his heralds and twelve trumpeters into the Prague cities to announce that Italians and foreigners who come to his Majesty’s court are to behave properly so that no one will complain. However, if they do not, it is ordered that they be sent to jail. And if any foreigners are without work, they are to leave the Prague cities.<sup>51</sup>

Josef Janáček notes that a general sense of anger began to rise dangerously in the Prague cities after the celebration of Corpus Christi during which the Roman Catholics tried to demonstrate the power of their camp through a sizable procession.<sup>52</sup> Ferdinand Hrejsa reports that both Roman Catholics and Utraquists were interested in making public displays, but the Roman Catholic procession was especially noteworthy with the nuncio holding the monstrance surrounded by the Spanish ambassador and leading nobles.<sup>53</sup> Sixt’s entry on Corpus Christi is simply that “no negotiations took place, except that people were reminded by mayor Jan against showing up in ordinary clothes. The mayor invited a few people from the countryside, the administrator and leading lords to a procession until it rained and was stopped.”<sup>54</sup>

On the Tuesday after Corpus Christi [2 June] Sixt reports that “an issue came into the Chancellory that afternoon through officials and the estate judge about some miscellaneous affairs [*postranní věci*] of Masters Griespek and Mele” – that is, the Vice-Chancellor Dr. Jiří Mehl of Strehlic and the King’s advisor, Florian Griespek of Griespach – which Sixt similarly does not comment further on.<sup>55</sup> According to Janáček, the incident involved the two

<sup>49</sup> Janáček, 131.

<sup>50</sup> SČ IV, 352.

<sup>51</sup> SČ IV, 355.

<sup>52</sup> Janáček, 131.

<sup>53</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 183–85.

<sup>54</sup> SČ IV, 341–42.

<sup>55</sup> SČ IV, 349.

individuals committing an act of assault on a third person in the presence of the Court Chancellor.<sup>56</sup>

In addition to entries on the negotiations about the Confession, there are also entries on other issues, not related to the Bohemian Confession, which were discussed at the Diet; including territorial disputes of Bohemia with Electoral Saxony and Brandenburg over the Voigtland and Lusatia, and numerous tax concerns. A number of other entries address urban concerns which are not of a religious nature. For example, Sixt reports on a complaint brought forward to the Diet by the Prague Cities about labourers and skilled workers being hired without papers;<sup>57</sup> and another on a complaint by the New Town of Prague about regulations regarding boaters.<sup>58</sup> Another entry addresses the urban poor. When the estates of barons and knights began to discuss the general articles on the Thursday after Sunday *Cantate* [5 May], Sixt reports that “the estates discussed possible solutions for the problem of poor medlicants [*chudých žebravých lidí*] so that they would stop begging and would not be abandoned [*opuštění*]. And then it was said that the Prague lords had places [*obydli obmysliti*] where the poor could be and all the estates decided that they would give such places according to their means including even in inns.”<sup>59</sup> Also, on the Friday after the Feast of Saint Vitus [17 June], Sixt reports that a discussion took place about collecting donations for Prague educational institutions and two individuals were chosen from each of the estates to collect and administer the funds.<sup>60</sup>

\* \* \*

How do we understand Sixt’s entries: those issues and events which he includes and those which he omits, those which he just briefly mentions, and those which he underscores and comments on? It is noteworthy that despite the predominant focus on the nobility’s activities, the royal cities, especially the Prague cities, appeared in Sixt’s discussions of developments in and beyond official negotiations. In the official negotiations, Sixt captures the tension that existed between the estates; especially the cities vs. the upper and lower nobility and between the confessionally based factions (or “parties”) which went across estates lines. Sixt does not just relate or describe relations, but also subtly comments on the temperature of them. As Sixt describes, we see an attempt by different estates and factions (parties) to keep their plans and negotiations secret. Some estate representatives at times feared the common people in the cities and we saw at least one attempt by a royal

<sup>56</sup> Janáček, 131.

<sup>57</sup> SČ IV, 357, 359.

<sup>58</sup> SČ IV, 349.

<sup>59</sup> SČ IV, 331.

<sup>60</sup> SČ IV, 352.

official – the *hejtman*, who was appointed from among the nobility – to intimidate them. The description of the meeting in the New Town Hall is quite striking. It provides an excellent example of a successful attempt by a royal official – in this case, a royal *hejtman* – to intimidate urban leaders and ordinary citizens.

While Sixt does provide an extended description of this encounter, in other cases he goes out of his way *not* to play up the murder of Kurcpach, *sub una / sub utraque* rivalry over Corpus Christi processions, and the physical assault between two high government individuals. It is sometimes noted that the St. Bartholomew's Massacres, which took place in France in 1572 following the assassination attempt on Huguenot prince Henri de Navarre at his wedding to the daughter of reigning French Catholic King Charles IX, were mentioned at the Diet of 1575; and that there was a fear that a "Parisian-style bloodbath" would break out in Bohemia and other parts of central Europe.<sup>61</sup> Sixt has nothing to say about that, but there is a small reference to the massacres in a speech of the King to the estates, which is easy to overlook even when reading the *Diarium* closely.<sup>62</sup> Likewise, Sixt does not mention another incident, described by Ferdinand Hrejsa, during the night of 12–13 June 1575 in which people became terrified when monks at St. James's Cloister, reportedly all Italians (*Vlaši*), rang the bell three times after someone fired a shot. According to Hrejsa, city elders questioned the monks afterward who said that the bell-ringer was drunk and did not know what he was doing.<sup>63</sup>

Instead of underscoring or commenting on disagreement, Sixt stresses instead "*láska, svornost, přátelství*." [love, solidarity, friendship] Recent scholarship has pointed to the use of emotions in the construction of social and political relations, especially in the Middle Ages but also the early modern period.<sup>64</sup> There is a distinctive emotional language used to describe social relations here, which would seem to represent, in some cases, the views of Sixt's contemporaries, captured by Sixt; and, in other cases, the feelings of Sixt himself, which are different than those we find in Sixt's writings about the Revolt of 1547.

In addition to showing that emotion was a fundamental element in the negotiation of estate politics, the *Diarium* also reveals a focus on, or rather an

<sup>61</sup> Janáček writes that "Prague was gripped by a panicky fear of violence between Catholics and Protestants and all of them made direct reference to the violence in France a few years earlier; Janáček, 131. Hrejsa talks about a fear of a "Parisian-style bloodbath" (*krvavá lázeň pařížská*); Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 193. See also Josef Dostal, "Ohlas Bartolomějské noci na dvoře Maximiliána II. [Response to St. Bartholomew's Night at the Court of Maximilian II]," *ČCH* 37 (1931): 335–49.

<sup>62</sup> *SČ* IV, 378–79.

<sup>63</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 193.

<sup>64</sup> Barbara Rosenwein, "Worrying about Emotions in History," *The American Historical Review* 107, 3 (June 2002) 821–45; Rosenwein, ed., *Angers Past. The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London, 1998). On emotion in early modern politics see Stephen D. White, "The Politics of Anger," *Anger's Past*, ed. Rosenwein, 131–51.

attempt to uphold order and discipline in religious and church affairs. As mentioned above, the *Diarium* contains a full transcription of an Utraquist Church Ordinance which was composed at the same time as the Confession.<sup>65</sup> The Ordinance, which is just as interesting a document as the Confession, outlines the need for a “good, useful and lasting order... [without which] no administration in God’s church could take place.” It calls for a commitment from the Utraquist Consistory and administrators to uphold “good faith” and for their rights over the apostolic office so that they can care for the church and community by watching over the preaching of the pure word of God and the proper celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>66</sup> The Ordinance stresses that the Consistory has the spiritual-judicial power to deal with marriage cases “as it was in the days of our ancestors” and that this “should take place nowhere else than at the College of Emperor Charles IV in the City.” Furthermore, if matters of dispute arise among priests over matters of belief, the Ordinance calls for the Consistory and its administrators to step in and “join [the disputants] in a brotherly fashion.” In difficult cases, the Consistory should call on the rector of Prague University and its doctors in the party in-two-kinds for advice, but “nothing should be appealed to anywhere from the Prague Consistory Court, [which is] the highest spiritual court.”<sup>67</sup> The Ordinance also states that all priests, whether married or not, should be able to draw up a will over the property of his own estate; and if the priest has no children or is not married, the estate should be equally divided and distributed to the Consistory, the priest’s friends, and the community. Lastly, the Ordinance calls for the Consistory to give careful consideration to assigning clergy to parishes and states that German priests who want to have their own parish need to come to the Consistory to be assigned one.<sup>68</sup> These last two stipulations surely influenced Ferdinand Hrejsa’s view that the Ordinance, like the Confession, was “Neo-Utraquist” in conception.<sup>69</sup> Whatever confessional group was responsible for the Ordinance, it should encourage one to look more widely for other examples of church and social disciplining in Bohemia as scholars have done who have studied ecclesiastical ordinances in other areas of Europe.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> SČ IV, 334–38.

<sup>66</sup> SČ IV, 335.

<sup>67</sup> SČ IV, 336.

<sup>68</sup> SČ IV, 337.

<sup>69</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 340–46.

<sup>70</sup> See Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford, 1991) 213–61; R. Po-chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550–1750* (London and New York, 1989); Heinz Schilling, *Civic Calvinism in Northwest Germany and the Netherlands, Sixteenth to Nineteenth Centuries* (Kirksville MO, 1991) especially 41–68; Martin Brecht, *Kirchenordnung und Kirchenzucht in Württemberg* (Stuttgart, 1967); and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, “They Have Highly Offended the Community of God’: Rituals of Ecclesiastical Discipline and Pastoral Membership in the Community in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century German Parishes,” *Between the Middle Ages and Modernity. Individual and Community in the Early Modern World*, eds. Charles H. Parker & Jerry H. Bentley (Lanham MD, 2007) 211–29.

Outside of the formal estate negotiations and church affairs, we see a different picture of relations and a much different language of emotions. In place of “*láska, svornost, přátelství*” [love, solidarity, friendship] we encounter “*nemalé ublížení, protimyslnost, a rozpustilost*” [not a little of harm, contrary mindedness, and naughtiness]. Josef Janáček has written that “the course of the negotiations of the Bohemian Confession, the meetings of Catholics and later Old Utraquists, contributed in a substantial way to the culmination of hateful relations in the cities.”<sup>71</sup> That may be true but it had to draw on existing tension. I think that it is interesting that we see this as a problem among residents of the city eight years before Rudolf II moved the imperial court to Prague. It is also interesting that Sixt does not equate foreigners with Roman Catholics. Sixt’s comments about anti-Roman Catholic feelings, which refer largely to Bohemian Roman Catholics, are separate. According to Hrejsa and others, there were a small, modest number of Roman Catholics in the Prague cities and in Bohemia at the time.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, the rumours about an alleged attack against the Jesuits and complaints against Father Franta show that a sensitive nerve was touched that raised fear, irrational or not, among some segments of the population.

Sixt’s *Diarium* suggests that at the beginning of the fourth quarter of the sixteenth century there was not exactly a “peaceful coexistence of confessions” in the Prague cities and Bohemia, which is sometimes described.<sup>73</sup> But when we read the *Diarium*, we are clearly viewing events in 1575 through the eyes of Sixt of Ottersdorf.

\* \* \*

What can we say about Sixt’s perspective and what informed that perspective in 1575? Zdeněk Beneš writes that one can see in Sixt of Ottersdorf’s writings on the Revolt of 1547 the work of a notary wanting to record and preserve events for historical memory, as well as someone motivated by humanist literary interests and deep faith.<sup>74</sup> Sixt himself wrote that he “executed these memorial books (*knihy památní*) ... to record correctly [everything that happened] along with the causes, as the Latins say with ‘notable circumstances’ (*s circumstanciemi poznamenávají*) ... in order that they could serve as an example to the famous Prague cities and also through these books serve for good memory in this Bohemian Kingdom and in neighbouring lands ....”<sup>75</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Janáček, 131.

<sup>72</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 48.

<sup>73</sup> Josef Válka, “Tolerance či koexistence? (K povaze soužití různých náboženských vyznání v českých zemích v 15. až 17. století) [Toleration or Coexistence? (The Character of Cohabitation of Diverse Religious Denominations in the Bohemian Lands from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century)],” *Studia Comeniana et Historica* 18, (1988), č. 35, příloha, 63–75.

<sup>74</sup> Beneš, *Historický text*, 82–85.

<sup>75</sup> In original introduction to the chronicle, according to Riss, 162.

Daniel of Veleislavín described Sixt and two others in the Prague humanist circle, Jiří Melantrich of Aventín and Matěj Bydžovský of Aventin, as "... three men not only of great learning and piety, but who also acquired great artistic talent while having a conscience .... They feared God, felt his authority, loved their homeland, worked for the common good ... in order to leave something better to their descendants than their ancestors did."<sup>76</sup> We can see these same motives and influences in 1575 as well.

Any apparent continuity in perspective between 1547 and 1575 should not be taken for granted and deserves some explanation. Much had changed in the twenty-five years that elapsed since the Revolt of 1547: the nobility achieved a stronger place among the estates, the struggle between the crown and estates was in a different phase, the Jesuit College had been established and a number of cloisters and monasteries and the seat of the archbishop were renewed. After all this, unlike some of his contemporaries, Sixt of Ottersdorf remains tolerant of the nobility and tolerant of various religious views, especially Roman Catholics.

In the entry on "the Ottersdorfs" in the 1908 edition of *Ottův slovník naučný*, Josef Teige describes Sixt categorically as an Old Utraquist who was not hated by the Lutherans and who in earlier years showed a curiosity for the ideas of the Brethren.<sup>77</sup> Václav Vladivoj Tomek describes Sixt as being initially undecided in his stance towards the Bohemian Confession and who, in doing so, provoked the Lutherans and met resistance from his own estate. The remainder of Tomek's discussion of the Diet implicitly suggests that Sixt was manipulated or out-manoeuvred by the Lutherans and the Brethren.<sup>78</sup> Ferdinand's Hrejsa classifies Sixt's final support for the Bohemian Confession as "Neo-Utraquist" in direction and Sixt personally as a "moderate Neo-Utraquist who put emphasis on the Bohemian national tradition."<sup>79</sup> The *Diarium* is not fundamentally in conflict with, but does not definitely support any one of these interpretations.

A closer look at Sixt's religious convictions and sympathies can perhaps be gained by a study of his personal library, which was one of the most interesting belonging to one of Prague's burghers.<sup>80</sup> The library was broken up and its contents dispersed after Sixt's death in 1583, but a number of volumes from this collection have been identified in libraries today. According to Josef

<sup>76</sup> Riss, 159.

<sup>77</sup> Teige.

<sup>78</sup> Tomek, XII: 225–252, esp. 230.

<sup>79</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 86.

<sup>80</sup> Josef Hejnic, "O několika tisících z knihovny Sixta z Ottersdorfu [Some Imprints in Sixt of Ottersdorf's Library]," LF 83 (1960) 141–44, 280–85 and LF 84 (1961) 109–112. See also Jaroslava Kašparová, "Příspěvek k rekonstrukci osobních knihoven humanistů předbělohorského období [A Contribution to the Reconstruction of Private Libraries of the Humanists in the Pre-White Mountain Era]," *Miscellanea oddělení rukopisů a starých tisků, Národní knihovna v Praze* 8 (1991) 159–75.

Hejnic, who has studied the composition of the library, Sixt's library included books on public service, law, and religion, some of which were bound together with Sixt's commentaries and poems which can also be found in the margins.<sup>81</sup> Among the religious books were works by Luther and other reformers of the evangelical movement, but none by Hus, Jerome or other major Bohemian reformers. Nor did Sixt make reference to Bohemian reformers in his writings.<sup>82</sup> Sixt also wrote poems to close friends who are known to have had Lutheran sympathies, one with whom he studied in Wittenberg, leading Hejnic to classify Sixt as a "Neo-Utraquist."<sup>83</sup> Furthermore, Hejnic notes that Sixt also comments on political questions in a religious way; drawing models of the concepts of tyranny and rule in his writings on 1547 from religious works not ancient writers. Sixt, according to Hejnic, was primarily a *homo religious*, not a *homo politicus*.<sup>84</sup>

Describing Sixt of Ottersdorf's confessional affiliation is a difficult task. That Sixt was well informed about Lutheranism from his studies in Wittenberg, books from evangelical reformers, and from contact with people with decidedly evangelical convictions is clear, does not speak to conviction or affiliation. (In defending himself after being accused of being a "pikhart" in 1543, Sixt came forward and defended himself saying that he did indeed visit the Brethren community in Brandýs nad Labem at the invitation of its leader, but did so out of curiosity and was not accepted among them.<sup>85</sup>) Regarding his book collection, we have only a small fragment of the original collection. Even so, studies of book collections of Prague burghers of the period, including Utraquist clerics, show that Lutheran literature was widespread.<sup>86</sup> While his Latin poems and inscriptions may certainly show sympathies with the evangelical movement (at least in the 1540s), the *Diarium* shows a clear focus on connecting with the Bohemian past. Hrejsa captured the difficulty of determining confessional affiliation by calling Sixt "a moderate Neo-Utraquist who emphasised connections to the past."<sup>87</sup> Alternatively, wouldn't it be just as accurate to classify Sixt as a liberal Old Utraquist who went with the changing times?

Just as difficult as identifying Sixt's confessional affiliation, is to analyze the motives behind his actions. Like many of his contemporaries Sixt was

<sup>81</sup> Hejnic, "O několika tiscích," 141–44.

<sup>82</sup> Hejnic, "O několika tiscích," 283.

<sup>83</sup> Hejnic, "O několika tiscích," 282–83.

<sup>84</sup> Hejnic, "O několika tiscích," 283–85 and LF 84 (1961) 109–11.

<sup>85</sup> Jireček, "K životopisu Sixta z Ottersdorfu [For Sixt of Ottersdorf's Biography]," ČČM 35,1 (1861) 363.

<sup>86</sup> Jiří Pešek, "Protestant literature in Bohemian private libraries circa 1600," *The Reformation in Eastern and Central Europe*, ed. Karin Maag (Aldershot, 1997) 36–49; idem, "Knihovny pražských předbělohorských farářů [Libraries of Prague Parsons in the Pre-White Mountain Period]," *Documenta Pragensia* IX/II (1991) 417–38.

<sup>87</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 287–88.

both and perhaps equally a religious and a political man, and the boundaries between these two spheres were not as firm or the same as they are in the modern world. Zdeněk David's argument that that the urban estates's shifting of position on the Bohemian Confession was a political stance to maintain a parliamentary alliance with the nobility is a convincing one that seems to make more sense than attributing it to a theological shift, if one does not preclude that religious factors may have played a role. On the one hand, one could view the absence of the coherent narrative or explanation for the urban estates confession and the absence of almost any mention of Lutherans and the Brethren as a strategy by Sixt to avoid revealing that the decision was politically motivated and not consistent with their confessional sympathies. On the other hand, while the decision of the royal cities to support the Confession may have been largely or solely political, that does not preclude the possibility that the cities saw an opportunity to to realign and to play a role in religious affairs in the future (e.g. through work in the Consistory) that would be consistent with their convictions. (Sixt's description of the wide spectrum of opinions among burghers in the dialogue at New Town Hall – even those contrary to the position finally taken by the urban estate – could be seen as subtle, politically correct attempt to acknowledge the dilemma.)

Many of the discussions of the confessional direction of the negotiations revolve around the Bohemian Confession itself.<sup>88</sup> The confessional content of the Bohemian Confession is clear; drawing on, according to Hrejsa, the Augsburg Confession (1530), the Confession of the Brethren, the Confessio Saxonica (1551), the Consensus Sandomiereus (1570), and the decisions made at various Diets.<sup>89</sup> However, while Confessional statements are powerful theological treatises addressing matters of belief and once established are set; church Ordinances speak to religious practice and administration and open more to interpretation and change. Unlike the Confession, the Church Ordinance does not appear to be confessionally specific, and could offer numerous opportunities for Utraquists and even Brethren to get affairs in order that would benefit them in the future.

What is perhaps most interesting in Sixt of Ottersdorf when we consider the *Diarium* alongside Sixt's writings on the Revolt of 1547 is the encounter of experiences and views of a man who studied at Prague University during the tumultuous years of the 1520s, when he was in his twenties; and then went to study for year in neighbouring Saxony in Wittenberg, still a centre of the evangelical movement; before returning to Prague in his thirties and forties to lead an active public life, committed to service to his community and Utraquist parish, based on the traditional beliefs of estate privileges and rights and communal administration of ecclesiastical property. Sixt was

<sup>88</sup> The text of the Bohemian Confession can be found in F.M. Bartoš et al, eds., *Čtyři význání* [Four confessions] (Prague, 1951) 269–306.

<sup>89</sup> Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 287.

someone who was aware and committed to noting the changes and tensions in his society without seeking to drum up trouble, and kept up his beliefs into his seventies when he returned to public life in the 1570s.

Sixt's view is a personal one and not representative of all his contemporaries. I also think that it would be difficult to find similar perspectives among others after Sixt's death in 1583, the year when the Imperial Court moved from Vienna to Prague. Those generations, born in the first quarter of the sixteenth century and which came of age in 1547, faced different challenges and would view city, church, and the world differently.

Lastly, the discussion of Sixt's confessional perspective opens up and sheds light on the issue of the place of the *Diarium* within the broader history of confessional writing in Bohemia. In a similar way to which one can speak of the *Diarium* as being of mixed genre, one can recognise it as having a less than focused confessional perspective. Some might say that this is representative of a long-standing tradition of stressing continuity and reconciliation; others that it is exemplary of the decay in Utraquism in the late sixteenth century. Another explanation could be that it reflects the tension in this multi-confessional society in an important transition period; representative of the early stages of confessionalisation. In any event, one does not see confessionally polarised language that one finds during the early sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>90</sup> František Kutnar & Jaroslav Marek, *Přehledné dějiny českého a slovenského dějepisectví* (Prague, 1997), 61–130; Hsia, 174–85; Schilling, “Konfessionalisierung im Reich. Religiöser und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Deutschland zwischen 1555 und 1620,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 246 (1988) 1–45; Joachim Bahlcke and Arno Strohmeyer, eds., *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa. Wirkungen des religiösen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur* (Wiesbaden, 1999). See also Norbert Kersten, “Reformation and the writing of national history in East-Central and Northern Europe,” *The Reformation in Eastern and Central Europe*, ed. Karin Maag (Aldershot, 1997) 51–71; and Matthias Pohligh, *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit und konfessioneller Identitätsstiftung: Lutherische Kirchen- und Universalgeschichtsschreibung 1546–1617* (Tübingen, 2007).