

---

# Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology: Utraquists and Anglicans in the Later Sixteenth Century<sup>1</sup>

---

Zdeněk V. David (Washington, DC)

In my past writings, I have emphasised the similarities between Utraquism and Anglicanism as they emerged respectively from the Bohemian and the English Reformation.<sup>2</sup> I have particularly called attention to the Bohemian theologians of the mid-sixteenth century, especially Bohuslav Bilejovský (ca. 1480–1555) and Pavel Bydžovský (1496–1559), and the aspects, in which they may be considered precursors of Elizabethan Anglicanism. This was, above all, evident from their consolidation of Utraquist theology in the second quarter of the sixteenth century, along the lines of a future shared middle way.<sup>3</sup> Their *via media* anticipated the features that subsequently emerged in England thanks to the Elizabethan Settlement. In England, this involved the repeal of Queen Mary's Counter Reformatory legislation (1553–1558) and the restoration of Henry's Act of Supremacy in 1558, and the process was crowned by the adoption of the Thirty Nine Articles in 1563. The main theological architects of the Settlement were Bishop John Jewel (1522–1571), and Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504–1575, in office: 1559–1575), followed by Archbishop John Whitgift (ca. 1532–1604, in office: 1583–1604) and the theologian, Richard Hooker (ca. 1554–1600). Hooker offered a near authoritative justification of the Anglican establishment in his multivolume *Ecclesiastical Polity*.<sup>4</sup>

While there were remarkable similarities between mature Utraquism and the Anglicanism of the Elizabethan settlement in the latter part of the sixteenth

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express thanks to Gergely Kovacs, Grace Leahey, and Brandon Preat, my research assistants at the Woodrow Wilson Center.

<sup>2</sup> Most recently in Zdeněk V. David, "Bohemian and English Reformations Compared," in *Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America*, Selected Papers from the Conference of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 8–10 June 2007, eds. Zdeněk V. David and Petro Nungovitch (New York, 2008) 7–16.

<sup>3</sup> On the roles of Bilejovský and Bydžovský see Zdeněk V. David, "Central Europe's Gentle Voice of Reason: Bilejovský and the Ecclesiology of Utraquism," *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997) 29–58; Zdeněk V. David, "Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism's Encounter with Luther," *CV* 38 (1996) 36–63.

<sup>4</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation: A History* (New York, 2004) 289, 382–389. On Parker as the founder of the Anglican *via media*, see DNB 15:257. On Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, see DNB 21:134.

century, there were likewise differences rooted in the concept of the Church's origins. The point of departure for this divergence was the role of the popes and the See of Rome in the establishment of the Church. The status of the episcopacy and the role of the monarch as the head of the Church (the problem of Erastianism) constituted related issues. Ultimately, the divergence could be subsumed under a distinction between universalism and nationalism in ecclesiology.<sup>5</sup> The Utraquists saw themselves as deriving from the see of Rome and in ecclesial communion with it, while the Anglicans saw their origins in the indigenous British Church and in an ecclesial separation from Rome.

### Bohemian Utraquism as an Anticipation of Elizabethan Anglicanism

Before exploring the issues, which separated the Utraquists from the Anglicans, let us first briefly outline the aspects, which made them alike. In the first place, in Bohemia, Bilejovský, in particular, may be seen as a precursor of John Jewel, whose objective was the daunting task of charting more clearly the correct path for the Utraquist Church between the biblical deviations of the Church of Rome and the stark biblicism of the full-fledged Reformation. The latter trend was exemplified in Bohemia by the Unity of Brethren and the Lutherans.<sup>6</sup> At the most basic level, the Utraquists shared with the *Ecclesia Anglicana* an opposition to the Protestant principles of *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*.<sup>7</sup> In the second place, Bilejovský shared at least with Hooker not only the grim view of what they considered the foibles of the Roman Church, but also the implied hope of its salvageability. Like Bilejovský (and the Utraquists in general), though in opposition to Rome, Hooker set out to justify the ancient principles of Christianity against the Reformed churches in his magisterial *Ecclesiastical Polity*.<sup>8</sup> In the third place, on the issue of the authority of the Church Fathers – challenging the *sola scriptura* principle – the Anglicans, like Hooker, surpassed even the Utraquists who seemed somewhat more cautious in endorsing the attainments of medieval scholastics. For instance,

<sup>5</sup> Concerning the universalist ideology of Utraquism, see Zdeněk V. David, "Universalist Aspirations of the Utraquist Church," BRRP 7 (2009) 194–212.

<sup>6</sup> David, *Finding*, 110. The text of Bilejovský's work is available in a nineteenth-century edition by Jozef Skalický (pseudonym for Josef Dittrich), *Kronyka církevní* [Ecclesiastical Chronicle] (Prague, 1816).

<sup>7</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (New York, 1990) 97, 99.

<sup>8</sup> This was his guiding position: "Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whome we much more affect leaving 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*. 7 vv. (Cambridge, Mass., 1977–1998) 2:121. See also John S. Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition* (Seawane, Tenn., 1963) 38–39; Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis, 1989) 51–52.

they took a dim view of Aquinas for his endorsement of lay communion in one kind.<sup>9</sup> Otherwise, unless a particular writer contradicted clear statements of the Scripture, Bílejovský did support the Christian authenticity of the recognised corpus of not only patristic, but also scholastic literature.<sup>10</sup>

In the fourth place, like the Utraquists, the Anglicans recognised their own continuity with the medieval church. On the Utraquist side, Bílejovský dwelt strongly on the virtual constancy of lay communion in both kinds in the Church in Bohemia from the times of Sts. Wenceslaus and Ludmila. Thus, he sought to refute assertions that the Utraquists' Church dated only from the time of Hus and Jan Žižka.<sup>11</sup> The Anglicans rejected similar questioning of their ecclesiastical origins, charging that their Church was only established by Henry VIII.<sup>12</sup> In the fifth place, another similarity between Utraquism and Anglicanism was an intellectual open-mindedness and moderation in theological discourse that can be attributed to their centrist positions. It is apropos to recall the mildness with which Bydžovský, the archetypal Utraquist, treated Luther's doctrines in the 1540s, or with which he chided the alleged errors of the Brethren.<sup>13</sup> One can cite, as a parallel with Bydžovský's treatment of Luther, Hooker's courteous treatment of Calvin, about whom he spoke with respect, while outlining or implying his profound disagreements with the great Genevan.<sup>14</sup> In the sixth place, the Utraquists, like the Anglicans, did not

<sup>9</sup> Marshall, *Hooker*, 38; and W. M. Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660–1700* (Athens, Georgia, 1993) 64–66; Václav Koranda the Younger, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* [Treatise about the Venerable and Divine Sacrament of the Altar] (Prague?, 1493), f. M7; Kamil Krofta, "Václav Koranda mladší z Nové Plzně a jeho názory náboženské" [Václav Koranda the Younger of Nová Plzeň and His Religious Views], *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* [Pages from Czech Religious History] (Prague, 1936), 275; Bílejovský, *Kronyka církevní*, 7–8.

<sup>10</sup> Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 51–53.

<sup>11</sup> Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, Introduction, 24. Bílejovský states literally: "... we Czechs *sub utraque* are the true Romans" [... my Čechové pod obojí jsme praví Římané], *Kronyka*, 27.

<sup>12</sup> They had to reject statements such as: "... the Church of England was founded at the Reformation by separation from the Catholic Church; ... its faith was then invented or changed by Henry VIII...; ... the Church of England was responsible for all the views, motives, acts of Henry, Edward, Elizabeth and their courtiers..." Protest by William Palmer, cited by Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 179. See also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (New York, 1995) 146–157.

<sup>13</sup> David, "Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism's Encounter with Luther," 42–53.

<sup>14</sup> Bydžovský's characterisation of Luther and Melancthon as "the most learned men in Germany [*nejučenější w niemczech*]" can stand side by side with Hooker's description of Calvin, whose doctrines he abhorred, as "I thinke incomparably the wisest man that ever the french Church did enjoy, since the houre it enjoyed him." See Pavel Bydžovský, *Tento spis ukazuje, že Biskupové Biskupa, a Biskup kněží, a kněží od řádných Biskupů svěcení Těla a krve Boží posvěcovati mají* [This Treatise Shows That Bishops Should Ordain a Bishop, and a Bishop Priests, and Priests (Ordained by Proper Bishops) Should Consecrate the Body and Blood of God] (N.p., 1543), 11. Hooker, *Folger Library Edition of the Works*, 1:3, see also 3–12; Arthur Dickens and John Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), 68.

embrace an ideal of moral perfectionism or rigorism. As a consequence, both experienced harsh criticism from the religious radicals among their compatriots, respectively the Brethren and the Puritans. The Brethren, despite their many virtues, were quite uncharitable toward their opponents and unsparing in their censure of alleged Utraquist amorality.<sup>15</sup> In England, the Puritans similarly attempted to undermine the reputation of their Anglican opponents by assailing the leaders of the Church of England as “worldlings, timeservers, pleasers of man not of God.”<sup>16</sup>

### The Utraquists on the Papal Origin of Churches

The Utraquists accepted the foundation of their Church under papal auspices. Bydžovský, in particular, attributed the same characteristic to the Church of England. In this respect, however, the Utraquist theologians did not properly anticipate, but rather distinctly misread the future evolution of the Anglican Church under Queen Elizabeth.

### Bílejovský on the Church of Bohemia

According to Bílejovský, the Church in Bohemia historically evolved in full harmony with the Church of Rome and was administered by bishops, often named by the popes. He expressed a high regard for the popes who had properly guided the general [*obecná*, i.e., catholic], holy church, and with a few exceptions, like that of Pope Liberius (AD 352 – AD 366), effectively opposed several heresies arising mainly in the East among the Greeks. He was not even disturbed by papal schisms. When there were two or three of them, the popes still continued to keep Christians correctly adhering to matters essential to salvation.<sup>17</sup> This was a traditional Utraquist attitude, expressed in the

<sup>15</sup> For instance, even the sympathetic Krofta demurs at the Brethren’s unsubstantiated characterisation of the Utraquist Administrator Martin of Mělník, as “a dishonorable man, a liar, a drunkard, an obvious whoremonger...”[...člověk nevážný, lhář, ožravec, kurevník zjevný...], see Kamil Krofta, “Boj o konsistoř podobojí v l. 1562–1575 a jeho historický základ” [Struggle for the Utraquist Consistory, 1562–1575, and Its Historical Basis], ČČH 17 (1911) 302, n. 2. The typical sources for the treatment of the Brethren have been *Akty Jednoty bratrské*, ed. Jaroslav Bidlo 2 vv. (Brno 1915–1923); Anton Gindely, *Quellen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder* (Vienna 1859); or “Diarium... Bratří českých,” *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* [Bohemian Diets from 1526 to the Present], vv. 1–11, 15 (Prague, 1877–1941) 4:392–464. On the Brethrens’ expressions of vengefulness, see Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách: Kulturně-historický obraz v XV. a XVI. století*. [Ecclesiastical Life in Bohemia: A Cultural and Historical Depiction from the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Century], 2 vv. (Prague, 1895) 1:495–496.

<sup>16</sup> Hooker, *The Folger Edition*, 1:18.

<sup>17</sup> Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 27.

fifteenth century, for instance, by Václav Koranda the Younger, Rokycana's successor as administrator of the Utraquist Church.<sup>18</sup>

Thus, the Utraquists acknowledged without hesitation the papal and Roman initiative in the original implanting of Christianity in Bohemia and Moravia. Historically, they recognised that the Church of Bohemia had been from the very beginning a part of the Western ecclesiastical jurisdiction (or patriarchate), based on Rome and, as Bílejovský explicitly – and correctly – pointed out, this was true despite the seemingly Eastern Orthodox character of the mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius of AD 863. For him, Sts. Cyril and Methodius were dispatched by the pope and the cardinals. The later Slavonic-rite monks of Emmaus were the spiritual progeny of St. Jerome, a distinctly Western/Latin Church Father, who moreover hailed for Bílejovský, like the monks, from the ultra-Catholic Croatia.<sup>19</sup>

### Bydžovský on the Church of England

As a Utraquist spokesman, Bydžovský inauspiciously, as it turned out, sought to apply the concept of the papal foundation also to the Church of England. This faux pas was included in his treatise, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, which focused on eulogising the memory of Bishop John Fisher and Sir Thomas More.<sup>20</sup> The treatise was published in 1554 during the period of brief Counter Reformation in England (1553–1558), conducted by Queen Mary and Reginald Pole, the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is likely that at this time England attracted special attention in Bohemia due to the Habsburg dynastic involvement in English affairs. This was highlighted by the marriage of Queen Mary in 1554 to King Philip II of Spain, nephew of the Bohemian King, Ferdinand I. In addition, Mary herself was a daughter of Henry VIII's wife Catherine of Aragon (1485–1536) who, in turn, was an aunt of Ferdinand (as well as of Emperor Charles V, and thus Philip II's first cousin once removed). A lively Bohemian interest in English affairs is also documented by

<sup>18</sup> Koranda, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltární*, f. A5v.

<sup>19</sup> Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 1:22. The image of Cyril and Methodius as agents of the pope may be found also in the *Kališnický pasionál z roku 1495* [Utraquist Passional from 1495], ed. Zdeněk Tobolka, [Monumenta Bohemiae typographica 2] (Prague, 1926) f. K9r. The attribution of Slavic script and liturgy to St. Jerome was widespread, see for instance the assertion of Šimon Lomnický of Budeč in the introduction to his translation of Eusebius Cremonensis, *Kšaft Sv. Jeronýma sepsaný od jeho žáka*. [The Testament of St. Jerome, Written by His Pupil] (Prague, 1613) f. A6r. On the papal character of the mission, see also Vladimír Vavřínek, *Církevní misie v dějinách Velké Moravy* [The Ecclesiastical Mission in the History of Great Moravia] (Prague, 1963) 115–124. For further discussion of the Utraquists' view of the papacy, see David, *Finding*, 147–150, 242–245.

<sup>20</sup> The treatise was dedicated to John the Elder of Lobkovice and Zbiroh, the Supreme Justice of the Kingdom of Bohemia; see *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est* (Prague: J. Cantor, 1554) f. A1v.

the use of the encyclopedist Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia*, as well as the histories of Johannes Carion and Johannes Sleidan.<sup>21</sup> References to events in England were likewise frequent in the chronicle of Johannes Cochlaeus, who was a familiar figure on the Bohemian scene.<sup>22</sup> In addition, Carion's chronicle was published in a Czech translation in 1541, and Münster's *Kosmografia* in 1554.<sup>23</sup> Finally, the knowledge of English affairs in Bohemia was summed later in the sixteenth century in Marek Bydžovský of Florentin's compendium, *Prima pars annalium seu eorum, quae sub Ferdinando rege contigerunt*.<sup>24</sup>

Concerning the establishment of Christianity in England, Bydžovský centered his attention on the missionary zeal of Gregory the Great, who dispatched his emissary Augustine (later Archbishop of Canterbury) in A.D. 597 to convert the Anglo-Saxons and to establish an ecclesiastical organisation for them.<sup>25</sup> In emphasising the crucial role of Gregory the Great, Bydžovský relied on the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* by the Venerable Bede (672/3–735), written about 731.<sup>26</sup> He referred to the book as *Historia Gentis Anglorum* and quoted from it verbatim by book (*liber*) and by chapter (*cap.*), although he did not name the author. In Bydžovský's time Bede's history was available in several editions: the first one was from Strasbourg in 1475; another edition also from Strasbourg (in 1500) combined Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* with Eusebius of Caesaria's *Ecclesiastica historia*; and

<sup>21</sup> Josef Hejnic and Jan Martínek, eds., *Rukověť' humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě od konce 15. do začátku 17. století* [Manual of Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia from Late Fifteenth to the Early Seventeenth Centuries], 5 vv. (Prague, 1966–1982) 1:245. See Sebastian Münster, *Cosmographia*, Beschreibung aller Lender (Basel, 1544); Johannes Carion, *Chronica durch Magistru Johan Carion, vleissig zusamen gezogen, mehiglich nützlich zu lesen* (Wittemberg, [1532]); Johannes Sleidan, *De statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo V, caesare commentariorum libri XXVI* (Strassburg: Erben des Edelin Rihel, 1555).

<sup>22</sup> Johannes Cochlaeus, *Commentaria Joannis Cochlaei de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri Saxonis, chronographice, ex ordine ab anno Domini M.D. XVII. usque ad annum M.D. XLVI. inclusive, fideliter conscripta: adiunctis duobus indicibus, et Edicto wormaciensi...* (Mainz, 1549) [Reprint: Farnborough, Hants., 1968], with references to England on pp. 47, 64–65, 68–70, 155, 232–233, 284–285, 288, 292–293.

<sup>23</sup> Johannes Carion, *Kniha Kronik o všelikých znamenitých věcech od počátku světa zběhlých* [A Book of Chronicles about Diverse Notable Matters Occurring Since the Beginning of the World], trans. Jan Burian Sobek z Kornic (Litomyšl, 1541), 349, 359, 362, 367–368, 368–369, 397–398, 404 (on Henry VIII), 347, 407, 412 (on Edward VI), 412, 415, 421 (on Queen Mary), 368–369, 415, 421 (on Queen Elizabeth), 367–368 (on Thomas More); see also Johannes Carion, *Dějiny evropského světa, 1453–1576* [A History of the European World, 1453–1576], ed. Petr Vorel (Prague, 2008) 87, 91, 92, 97, 131, 134, 141, 143, 150. Sebastian Münster, *Kosmografia česká* [A Bohemian Cosmography], trans. Jan z Puchova (Prague, 1554), for instance, f. 153v.

<sup>24</sup> Marek Bydžovský z Florentina, *Prima pars annalium seu eorum, quae sub Ferdinando rege contigerunt*. MS. Prague, NK XXII A 6, esp. ff. 49b–50a, 145a, 149a, 165b–166a, 168a, 172b–175b, 186a. Note: the author is not related to Pavel Bydžovský.

<sup>25</sup> On Augustine of Canterbury see, for instance, DNB 1:727–729.

<sup>26</sup> A modern bilingual edition is available in Bede, *The Venerable, Saint, 673–735, Baedae Opera historica*, with an English translation by J. E. King (London, 1930).

finally an edition of his *Opera* appeared in a six volume edition in Paris (in 1544–1545).<sup>27</sup> There is also a record of a manuscript of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* in Prague.<sup>28</sup>

Why Bede? Bydžovský's choice of Bede as his authority was not accidental. In fact, judging from the publication record up to mid-sixteenth century, it appears that Bede's writings were more popular on the Continent than in England. Specifically in sixteenth-century Bohemia, the interest in Bede covered not only his *Ecclesiastical History*, but his exegetical and homiletical works as well. In particular, Bílejovský in his *Bohemian Chronicle* (1537) referred to Bede's discussion of Luke's gospel in the context of affirming the seven sacraments. Bede's commentaries on the New Testament were available in his *Opera*, published in Paris in 1521, of which the second volume covered the all four gospels.<sup>29</sup>

Beyond this, the knowledge of Bede's writings went back to the beginnings of the Bohemian Reformation. Thus, Jakoubek of Stříbro referred to Bede in 1414 as an authority on lay communion *sub utraque* in his treatise of 1414, "O Boží krvi." Subsequently, in the fifteenth century, Jan Příbram, Jan Rokycana, and Václav Koranda the Younger also cited Bede.<sup>30</sup> Above all,

<sup>27</sup> Bede, the Venerable Saint, [G]loriosissimo regi. Cioluuleo Beda famulus Cristi et presbiter: historia[m] ge[n]t[is] angloru[m] eccl[es]iasticam qua[m] nup[er] edidera[m] libentissime tibi desideranti rex et pri[us] ad legendu[m] ac p[ro]bandu[m] tra[n]smisi. [Strasbourg, not after 1475] [Otto Vollbehr Collection (Library of Congress)]; Eusebius, of Caesarea Bishop of Caesarea; Bede, the Venerable Saint; Ecclesiastica historia diui Eusebii [books 10–11 written by Rufinus, of Aquileia]; et, Ecclesiastica historia gentis Anglorum Venerabilis Bede (Strasbourg, 14 Mar. 1500). (John Davis Batchelder Collection [Library of Congress]); Bede, the Venerable Saint, *Opera*. 6 vv. (Paris, 1544–1545, reprint 1554). DNB, 2:102.

<sup>28</sup> Prague, St. Vitus Chapter 27 (Archiv IX [1847], 474), listed in Max L. Laistner, *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, NY, 1943) 101. I wish to thank Gergely Kovacs for calling my attention to the record of this manuscript. The manuscript is now held by the Library of the Strahov Monastery in MS Prague, Strahov DF III 1.

<sup>29</sup> Bílejovský, *Kronyka církevní*, 99; Beda, Venerabilis, *Opera Venerabilis Bedæ Presbyteri, Secvndvs Operum... Tomvs, in quo subsequentes continentur eiusdem Commentarii. In Euangelium Marci Lib. IIII... In Euangelium Lucae Lib. VI... In Acta Apostolorum Lib. I... Expositio nominum locorum in Actis contentorum, siue eiusdem, siue alteri[us] auctoris... In Epistolas Catholicas... In Apocalypsim B. Ioannis Apostoli... Premisso verborum sententiarumq[ue] insignium indice literario* ([Paris], 1521); new edition in Bede, the Venerable, *Bedæ Venerabilis Opera*, Pars II: Opera exegetica, v. 3: In Lucae Evangelium expositio; In Marci Evangelium Expositio, ed. D. Hurst (Turnholti, 1960). See also DNB, 2:103; David, *Finding*, 15.

<sup>30</sup> Jakoubek ze Stříbra, *Dvě staročeská utrakvistická díla* [Two Old Czech Utraquist Works], Masarykova univerzita v Brně, Filozofická fakulta, Spisy, no. 379, eds. Mirek Čejka and Helena Krmíčková (Brno, 2009) 58–59. The editors trace Jakoubek's reference to Beda Venerabilis, "Homiliae," in PL 94:col. 74–75. For Příbram's, Rokycana's, and Koranda's citations of "Beda Venerabilis," see Jan of Příbram, *Liber de professione fidei catholicae, et errorum revocatione*, in Johannes Cochlaeus, *Historiae Hussitarum* (Mainz, 1549) 504, 506, 518, 522; Jan Rokycana, *Postilla* [Homiliary], 2 vv., ed. František Šimek (Prague: Komise pro vydávání pramenů českého hnutí náboženského ve stol. XIV a XV, 1928–1929) 2:983; idem, *Tractatus m. Ioannis Rokyzanae Bohemi. De septem sacramentis ecclesiae*, in Cochlaeus, *Historiae*

Jan Hus appears to have been especially fond of referring to Bede's exegetical writings in his own homiletical works. In his Czech sermons, the references to Bede are exceeded only by those to Augustine and Jerome.<sup>31</sup> Within the broader context of the Bohemian Reformation, it may be noted that Wyclif and his followers likewise attached a major importance to Bede's exegesis of the gospels.<sup>32</sup> Bydžovský's interest specifically in Bede's history may have also been stimulated by the appeal of the *Ecclesiastica historia* of Eusebius of Caesaria (the fourth c.) in sixteenth-century Bohemia. After Gregory the Great, Eusebius was probably the greatest non-biblical influence on Bede.<sup>33</sup> As noted earlier, the histories of Bede and Eusebius were issued together in the Strasbourg edition of 1500, and Eusebius's *History* would be eventually published in a Czech translation in Prague late in the sixteenth century.<sup>34</sup>

Bydžovský proclaims the papal foundation of English Christianity in the very beginning of his treatise. He cites from Bede's *Historia gentis Anglorum* II:1, which gives credit to Gregory the Great for having converted the English nation from the "power of Satan to the faith of Christ" [*de potestate Satanae ad fidem Christi*].<sup>35</sup> He then amplified further Gregory's merits by a long citation from Bede, which stresses two facts. In the first place, thanks to

---

*Hussitarum*, 457, 459, 497; František Šimek, ed., *M. Jan Rokycana, obránce pravdy a zákona Božího: výbor z kázání, obrany kalicha a z listů* [Master Jan Rokycana, Defender of Truth and the Law of God: Selection from Sermons, Defense of the Chalice, and Letters] (Prague, 1949) 157; idem, *Učení M. Jana Rokycany* [The Teaching of Master Jan Rokycana], *Rozpravy České akademie věd a umění, třída III, číslo 77*, (Prague, 1938) 30; and Václav Koranda, Jr., *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* [Treatise About the Venerable and Divine Sacrament of the Altar] (Prague, 1493) f. B8a, C7a.

<sup>31</sup> In Hus's *Česká nedělní postilla* [Czech Sunday Homiliary] and *Česká sváteční kázání* [Czech Feast Day Sermons] the number of references to Bede equals those to Bernard of Clairvaux and Gregory the Great, and exceeds those to Ambrose, Anselm, Aquinas, Chrysostom, Remigius, or Origen; see MIHO vv. 2–3. See Bede, the Venerable, *Homilies on the Gospels*, vol. 1, [Cistercian Studies Series, 110], trans. Lawrence T. Martin and David Hurst (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1991).

<sup>32</sup> Ann Hudson, "Wycliffism in Oxford, 1381–1411," and "Wyclif and the English Language," in Anthony Kenny, ed., *Wyclif in his Times* (Oxford, 1986) 79, 99.

<sup>33</sup> It was thanks to Eusebius's example that Bede was able to escape the ethnocentrism that characterised the *History of the Franks* by Gregory of Tours. "Bede, St," *Oxford Companion to British History*, ed. John Cannon (New York, 1997) 91; George H. Brown, *Bede, the Venerable* (Boston, 1987) 84–86. See also L. W. Barnard, "Bede and Eusebius as Church Historians," in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Gerald Bonner (London, 1976) 106–124; and George H. Brown, *A companion to Bede* (Woodbridge, U.K., 2009) 99, 102–103.

<sup>34</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea [Pamphilus]. *Historia Cýrkevní* [Ecclesiastical History], trans. Jan Kocín of Kocinét (Prague, 1594). See also David, *Finding*, 102, 243. Because the Czech translation of Eusebius's history appeared substantially after Bydžovský's treatise, the relationship, however, may have been the other way around with Bede's history stimulating an interest in Eusebius's.

<sup>35</sup> Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A1v; cited verbatim from Bede, see Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:184.



Gregory the English nation was converted to a Church of Christ, while previously it had been held in bondage by a worship of idols. In the second place, Gregory deserved to be called an Apostle. Although he might not have been an Apostle universally, he was an Apostle for the English. Through the seal of his apostolate the English nation was united with God. The identical statement of Bede and Bydžovský is as follows:

... he made our nation a Church of Christ, which had been ever till that time the bond-slave of idols, so that we may lawfully pronounce of him that saying of the apostle: that if he be not an apostle to others, yet he is so to us; for the seal of his apostleship are we in Christ [... nos-tram gentem eatenus idolis mancipatam Christi fecit Ecclesiam, ita ut Apostolicum illum de eo liceat nobis proferre sermonem. Quia & si aliis non est Apostolus, sed tamen nobis est; nam signaculum apostolatus eius nos sumus in Domino...]<sup>36</sup>

Bydžovský's knowledge of Bede's history is further confirmed by his relating of episodes from the lives of famous English rulers following Pope Gregory's intervention. Again citing verbatim from Bede, he tells the story of the goodness of St. Oswald, King of Northumbria (c. 604–642), who was famous for his charity to the poor and pilgrims, quoting from Bede's *History* 3:6. At a feast, Oswald not only gave away all the food served to him, but also ordered a large silver dish broken up and the fragments distributed among the indigents. Impressed by his magnanimity, a present bishop bestowed a special blessing on the King's charitable right hand, which then never decayed even after his death.<sup>37</sup> Concerning Oswald, Bydžovský then cites the story

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. The English translation here and in the subsequent notes follows that of J. E. King in *Baedae Opera historica*.

<sup>37</sup> "[Oswald was] lowly, gracious and bountiful to the poor and strangers. In short, it is reported that at a certain time when on the holy day of Easter the king with the foresaid bishop were set down to dinner and a silver dish replenished with princely dainties was set on the table before him, and they were now at the point of putting forth their hands to bless the bread, suddenly there entered in his officer to whom was committed the charge to relieve the needy, and told the king that a very great number of poor people arriving from all places did sit in the public ways, desiring some alms from the king: who by and by gave commandment that the delicacies which were set before his own person should be bestowed on the poor, and moreover the dish of silver be broken and piecemeal parted among the same. At the sight whereof the bishop set by the king, being delighted with such an act of goodness, took him by the right hand and said: "May this hand never wax old." Which thing came even so to pass according to the prayer of his blessing." The Latin text, identical in Bydžovský and Bede, is as follows: "... pauperibus et peregrinis semper humilis, benignus et largus fuit, et quod tempore quodam cum die sancto paschae cum Episcopo consedisset ad Prandium: Positusque esset in mensa coram eo discus argenteus, regalibus epulis refertus: etiamque iam essent manus ad Panem benedicendum missuri: intrasse subito ministrum ipsius, cui suscipiendorum inopum erat cura delegata: et indicasse regi, quia multitudo pauperum undecumque adueniens maxime per plateas sederet: postulans aliquid elemosinae a rege. Qui mox dapes sibimet appositas deferri Pauperibus: sed

from Bede *History* 4:14 about the holy king's stopping a deadly plague.<sup>38</sup> Next, Bydžovský quotes from Bede's *History* 3:18, the eulogy of another English ruler, Sigeberht, King of the East Angles (c. 630–635), who was not only saintly, eventually preferring a life of heavenly warfare in a monastery to a secular one in the outside world, but was also a lover of learning, who established an exemplary school for boys.<sup>39</sup> Bydžovský further lifts out of Bede's *History* 3:19, the story of a saintly man in the reign of Sigeberht, whose soul would leave the body during the night and join a company of angels, listening to their songs glorifying the holy men and "the God of gods" on Sion.<sup>40</sup> Bydžovský seems to imply that this saintly man was Sigeberht, while Bede identifies him as a close friend of Sigeberht, the Irish monk St. Fursa, who had crossed to East Anglia in c. 633 and erected a monastery near Yarmouth.<sup>41</sup> Perhaps as a curiosity, Bydžovský finally retells (*History* 3:21) Bede's characterisation of the King of Mercia, Penda (d. 655) who, although a convinced pagan and responsible for the death of several Christian kings in battle (including St. Oswald), still permitted Christian missionaries to preach in his lands and convert both nobles and commoners.<sup>42</sup>

---

et discum confregit: atque eisdem minuatim diuidi precepit. Quo viso pontifex qui assedebat delectatus tali facto pietatis apprehendit dexteram eius et ait. Nunquam inueterescat hec manus. Quod et ita iuxta uotum benedictionis eius prouenit ut ibidem dicitur." Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2r; Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:352.

<sup>38</sup> The parallel text is in Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2r; and Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 2:80, 82.

<sup>39</sup> "[Sigbert] set up a school in which the boys should be instructed in letters, by the help of bishop Felix, whom he had gotten from Kent, and who appointed them masters and teachers after the manner of the men of Kent. And so deeply was the king a lover of the heavenly kingdom, that leaving at the last the affairs of his realm and entrusting them to his kinsman Egric, who also before held part of the same kingdom, he entered to a monastery which he had made for himself, where being shoren in he labored rather to make war for the everlasting kingdom." The Latin text, identical in Bydžovský and Bede, is as follows: "[Sighbert] instituisse Scholam in qua Pueri literis erudirentur iuuante se Episcopo Foelice, quem de Cantua acceperat: eisque Pedagogos ac Magistros iuxta morem Cantuariorum praebente. Tantumque ille Rex coelestis regni amator factus est, ut ad ultimum relictis regni negociis et cognato suo Ecgrice commendatis: qui et antea partem eiusdem regni tenebat: intraret monasterium, quod sibi fecerat: atque accepta sibi tonsura pro eterno magis regno militare curaret, haec ibi." Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v; and Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:412

<sup>40</sup> "... and from evening until cockcrow being out of the body he was thought worthy to behold the sight of the angelical company, and to hear their blessed thanksgivings. Further, he was wont to tell that among other things he openly heard them sing; "Holy men shall go from virtue to virtue." And again: "The God of gods shall be seen in Sion." The Latin text, identical in Bydžovský and Bede, is as follows: "... fuisse, et a Vespera usque ad gallicantum corpore exutum. Angelorum agminum atque aspectus intueri et auribus percipere laudes beatas, meruisse scribit. Referre autem erat solitus, quod aperte eas inter alias resonare audiret, scilicet, ibunt Sancti de virtute in virtutem, et iterum, Videbitur DEVS Deorum in Syon." Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v; and Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:418.

<sup>41</sup> Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:417, 419. See also *Oxford Companion to British History*, 398.

<sup>42</sup> "... [thanks to the priests] many daily, as well noble as of the base sort, renouncing the filth of idolatry were cleansed in the font of faith. [Penda] did not prohibit the preaching of the

## Early Anglican Views of England's Christianisation

From the viewpoint of anticipating the arrival of Elizabethan Anglicanism, less than ten years after publishing his treatise *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum* (1554), Bydžovský's choice to eulogise Gregory the Great's missionary activity turned out to be most inappropriate. It was particularly so because this episode was seized upon by the English Romanist opponents of the English Reformation, who vainly sought to discredit the ecclesial break with Rome after 1558. The lead in this campaign was assumed by Thomas Stapleton (1535–1598), Richard Bristow (1538–1581), and Nicholas Harpsfield (1519–1575), and it was later joined by Nicholas Sander (1530–1581) and Richard Broughton (d. 1635). On the other side of the ledger, the papal claim to ascendancy, based on the mission of St. Gregory, was rebutted by such stalwarts of Elizabethan Anglicanism as the Archbishops of Canterbury Matthew Parker (1504–1575) and John Whitgift (1530?–1604), as well as the key theologian John Jewel (1522–1571). The objections against Augustine centred on his treatment of the Celtic British bishops. On the positive side, the opposition to the papal claims focused on tracing the roots of the English Church to the founding role of the Celtic British King Lucius in the second century.

## Augustine and the British Bishops

Unfortunately, for Bydžovský, once the Counter Reformation ended with Queen Mary's death in 1558 and on the accession to the English throne of Queen Elizabeth, the English Romanists seized upon Bede's *History* to justify the papal headship of the Church of England, and to oppose the English Act of the Monarch's Supremacy, first issued under Henry VIII in 1534. Above all, the distinguished scholar and theologian, Thomas Stapleton, for that purpose, translated and published Bede's work in English in 1565.<sup>43</sup> In the dedication, Stapleton appealed to Queen Elizabeth I in the hopes of diverting her from the anti-papal path:

---

word even in his own nation, that is to say the Marchmen, if any would hear it. Nay, he rather hated and despised those instructed in the faith of Christ, whom he had discovered to have not the works of faith, saying that such men were worthily to be spited and wretched, which regarded not to obey their God in whom they believed." The Latin text, identical in Bydžovský and Bede, is as follows: "... nobilium et infirmorum abrenunciatis a forde idolatrie, fidei fonte ablutos scilicet per iacerdotes! non prohibuit quin etiam in suo regno hoc et Mertiorum natione Verbum Dei si qui vellent audire predicaretur. Quin potius odio habebat et despiciebat eos quos fide CHRISTI imbutos opera fidei non habere deprehendit dicens contemnendos esse eos et miseros qui Deo suo in quem crederent obedire contemnerent." Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v; and Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:432–433.

<sup>43</sup> As Bede, the Venerable Saint, *The History of the Church of England*, trans. Thomas Stapleton (Antwerp, 1565).

In this history it shall appear in what faith your noble Realm was Christened, and has almost these thousand years continued, to the Glory of God, the enriching of the Crown, and great wealth and quiet of this realm. In this history your Highness shall see in how many and weighty points the pretended reformers of the Church have departed from that sound and catholic faith planted first among Englishmen by Holy St. Augustine, our apostle, and his virtuous company, described truly and sincerely by Venerable Bede, so called in all Christendom for his passing virtues and rare learning, the author of this history.<sup>44</sup>

In the following “Preface to the Reader,” Stapleton again stressed that, according to Bede, the English were taught at the start “to submit themselves to one supreme head in Christ’s Church, the Apostolic Pope of Rome, Peter’s successor...”<sup>45</sup> Subsequently, Stapleton was one of the English writers on whose information Pius V mainly relied when he issued his famous bull against Queen Elizabeth in 1570, excommunicating her as an heretic and absolving her subjects of allegiance to her.<sup>46</sup> In addition to Stapleton, Richard Bristow, another exiled Catholic theologian, in 1574 highly praised Bede, “our own countryman,” who had written in his *Ecclesiastical History* about “our Apostle St. Augustine, the holy monk, that St. Gregory sent unto us about a thousand years ago, at which time we Englishmen were first made Christians, being before, as other pagans and heathens, without hope or knowledge of Christ and salvation...”<sup>47</sup>

The leaders of Elizabethan Anglicanism, in particular Archbishop Matthew Parker and his circle, adopted the view that the Celtic British were in the process of converting the Saxon English before Augustine’s mission on behalf of Pope Gregory. Parker stressed the missionary activities from the Celtic north and especially those from France. In addition, he appealed to the witness of German histories.<sup>48</sup> The high-level Anglicans tended to concentrate on Augustine’s deficiencies.<sup>49</sup> Most strikingly, the particularly mild mannered

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Stapleton, “Letter to Queen Elizabeth,” in Bede, the Venerable Saint, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, trans. Thomas Stapleton, ed. Philip Hereford (London, 1935) xxxiv-xxxv. Stapleton left England shortly after the accession of Elizabeth I (1558–1603) to the throne and settled at Louvain. His definite break with the Elizabethan regime came early in 1563 after Bishop Barlow required him “to abjure the authority of the pope, and acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the queen.” “Stapleton, Thomas,” DNB 18:989.

<sup>45</sup> Thomas Stapleton, “Preface to the Reader,” in Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (London, 1935) l-li.

<sup>46</sup> “Stapleton, Thomas,” DNB 18:990.

<sup>47</sup> Richard Bristow, *A briefe treatise of diverse plaine and sure wayes* 1574 ([Ilkley], 1974) 80b-81a; see also 17a, 100b.

<sup>48</sup> Matthew Parker, *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae et privilegiis ecclesiae Cantuariensis cum archiepiscopis ejusdem* 70 ([London], 1729) 12.

<sup>49</sup> Felicity Heal, “What can King Lucius Do for You?” *English Historical Review* 120 (2005) 597n21.

John Jewel claimed that those who really knew Augustine considered him: “neither of apostolic spirit, nor any way to be called saint, but an hypocrite, a superstitious man, cruel, bloody, and proud above measure.”<sup>50</sup>

The Anglican opponents of Gregory’s role as the founder of English Christianity paradoxically received some support from Bede’s discussion of Augustine’s two conferences with the Celtic British bishops. According to Bede, at the first gathering Augustine requested that the British bishops conform to the Roman Church in the date of Easter, the ritual of baptism, and join in the conversion of the Saxon English. At the second conference, Augustine offended the British bishops by not rising in their presence and they rejected his requests. He prophesied their death for disobedience, and the prophecy was fulfilled when the pagan, Saxon king Ethelfrid slaughtered 1200 Celtic monks at the large abbey of Bangor.<sup>51</sup>

Sixteenth-century Anglican theologians could further rely on a sinister interpretation of Augustine’s role in the Bangor incident from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia regnum Britanniae* (1147). Geoffrey, Bishop of St. Asaph (1100?-1154), as a Welshman, wished to portray the Celtic British as victims of Roman ambition, and had Augustine induce his patron, King Ethelbert, to ally with the pagan King Ethelfrid and thus cooperate in the massacre of the Celtic monks at Bangor. According to Geoffrey,

To Augustine’s request for the submission of the British bishops and his suggestion that they should share in his efforts to convert the English [i.e., the Anglo-Saxons], Dinoot [the Abbott of Bangor] replied with various objections to the effect that they owed no obedience to him, since they had their own archbishop, nor did they preach to their enemies, since the Saxons persisted in depriving them of their country; and for that reason the British [i.e., the Celts] detested them, despising their faith and beliefs and shunning them like dogs.<sup>52</sup>

Jewel, in particular, accepted the story of Augustine’s perfidy: “As for our Augustine..., neither was he so godly a man...; for as it may appear by that Galfridus (i.e. Geoffrey) writeth of him, he was cruel, disdainful, proud, and

<sup>50</sup> John Jewel, *The works of John Jewel*. 4 vv. (Cambridge, 1845–50) 1:299–300.

<sup>51</sup> Bede, The Venerable, “How Augustine exhorted the bishops of the Britons in behalf of Catholic peace, with a heavenly miracle done before them; and what vengeance fell upon them after for despising his words,” in Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:205–213 (Book 2, Chapter 2). See also Felicity Heal, “Appropriating history: Catholic and Protestant polemics and the national past,” in *The uses of history in early modern England*, ed. Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA., 2006) 121.

<sup>52</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The history of the kings of Britain*, an edition and translation of *De gestis Britonum (Historia regum Britanniae)*, ed. Michael Reeve; trans. Neil Wright. (Woodbridge, UK; Rochester, NY, 2007) 258–260.

arrogant, and no way meet to be called an apostle.”<sup>53</sup> About the Celtic monks, who became victims of Augustine’s alleged treachery, Jewel writes: “Of the innocent Christian monks that were slain Galfridus saith thus: ‘... being that day honoured with martyrdom, obtained a seat in the kingdom of heaven.” Jewel then asks rhetorically: “... what saint then was your Augustine, that was the raiser and procurer of murder?”<sup>54</sup> Parker strengthened the accusation of Augustine’s complicity in the murder of the Bangor monks. He appealed to the Anglo-Saxon version of Bede’s history (translated from Latin by King Alfred the Great), which implied that Augustine was alive at the time of the monks’ slaughter. The Latin original of Bede clearly stated that the killings occurred after Augustine’s death, which would have made Augustine’s direct involvement in the outrage much less plausible.<sup>55</sup> Jewel explained that the phrase in Latin concerning Augustine’s death (prior to the Bangor massacre) was not written by Bede himself, but forged, “lest Augustine, so holy a man, should be found guilty of so great a cruelty.”<sup>56</sup>

### The Founding Role of King Lucius

To further discredit the papal role in the Christianisation of England, which Bydžovský had inauspiciously adopted from Bede’s history, Anglican theologians of the late sixteenth century stressed the foundational role of Celtic British Christianity, implanted under Roman occupation, which had ended in A.D. 410. This explanation of the extra-papal national derivation of English Christianity tended to focus (in the latter sixteenth century) on the role of the British King Lucius, who as an alleged sovereign of Britain, son of Coilus, converted his kingdom to Christianity in the middle of the second century A.D. The story of conversion was based on an account of Bede and a later, and more elaborate one by Geoffrey of Monmouth.<sup>57</sup> While from the Anglican point of view, it had the advantage of upstaging Pope Gregory’s initiative, the downside of the chronologically earlier tale was another papal involvement

<sup>53</sup> Jewel, *The works of John Jewel*, 3:164.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:164–165.

<sup>55</sup> Heal, “Appropriating history,” 122; Parker, *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae*, 12. The Latin version stated: “And so in this manner was fulfilled the prophecy of the holy bishop Augustine (**though he himself long before had been raised to the heavenly realms**), so that these heretical men learnt by the vengeance also of temporal death, that they had despised the counsels of eternal salvation offered to them.” Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:213 (Book 2, Chapter 2).

<sup>56</sup> “... it appeareth plainly by the true Beda indeed, translated above seven hundred years ago into Old English, or Saxon tongue, by Alfredus, or Aluredus, then king of this land, that the same Augustine was yet alive after the same war was ended, and that he afterward consecrated two bishops...” Jewel, *The works of John Jewel*, 4:779.

<sup>57</sup> Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:29–31, 2:375; Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The history of the kings of Britain*, 86–88.

in the work of conversion. According to Bede, King Lucius turned to Pope Eleutherius in A.D. 156, seeking help in the conversion of the British. Britons subsequently kept the Christian faith in purity and fullness until the time of Emperor Diocletian.<sup>58</sup> Geoffrey related that the Roman emissaries, sent to Britain by Pope Eleutherius at the request of Lucius, converted the entire population. They had also found in Lucius's kingdom twenty-eight pagan priests [*flamines*] and three pagan high priests [*archflamines*]. On conversion, *flamines* turned into bishops and *archflamines* into archbishops.<sup>59</sup>

The Anglican interpretation focused on minimising the papal involvement in the conversion of King Lucius. According to Parker, Lucius was devoutly anxious to lead his realm to true Christianity and the papal mission performed only an auxiliary and low level function. The papal emissaries were called in primarily to refute the native priesthood, the Druids.<sup>60</sup> Jewel in *Defense of the Apology* (1570) argued that the Christian Church and faith had been planted in Britain long before Pope Eleutherius sent his emissaries: "either by Joseph of Arimathaea, or (as Theodoretus writeth) by St. Paul the apostle, passing this way into Spain, or (as Nicephorus saith) by Simon Zelotes, or by the Greeks, or by some others."<sup>61</sup> Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester, compared Lucius to Constantine in winning his subjects to Christianity; he did this before approaching Rome; in any case, eventually even Eleutherius advised him to draw laws directly from the Scripture, instead of relying on the advice from Rome.<sup>62</sup>

On the Romanist side, Stapleton denounced as lies Robert Horne's claim that the Britons under Lucius were baptised "without any authority, knowledge or consent of the Pope."<sup>63</sup> Subsequently, Robert Parsons stressed that Lucius, in his wish to convert, was not satisfied with the Christianity he found at home, nor with the teaching of Celtic bishops in France, and sent directly to Rome for proper instructions.<sup>64</sup> A favourite method to appropriate the early ecclesiastical British history by the Romanists (without detracting from the mission of Augustine) was to create an organisational or ideological gap between the early centuries of Lucius and Augustine's era. As early as 1554, Archbishop Pole had adopted this approach under Queen Mary, when he spoke in the Parliament in November about the early conversion of Britain

<sup>58</sup> Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1:29–31, 2:375.

<sup>59</sup> Thus, a number of bishoprics was established, as well as three archbishoprics in London, York, and Caerleon; Geoffrey, of Monmouth, *The history of the kings of Britain*, 88.

<sup>60</sup> Parker, *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae*, 6–7.

<sup>61</sup> Jewel, *The works of John Jewel*, 3:163–164.

<sup>62</sup> Robert Horne, bishop of Winchester, *An answer made by bishoppe of Winchester to a booke... touching on the supremacy... [of] M. John Fekenham* (London, 1566) f. 94–4v. See also Heal, "What can King Lucius Do for You?" 605.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas Stapleton, *A counterblast to M. Hornes vayne blast against M. Fekenham, 1567* (Ilkley, 1976) preface, f. \*\* iii–r.

<sup>64</sup> Parsons, Robert, *A treatise of three conversions, 1603–1604*, 3 vv. (Ilkley, 1976) 1:78, 90, 98–100.

under Lucius and the prosperity due to the favour of the papacy, including the gain of Ireland. Then, however, the people in England and Britain departed from full obedience to the papacy – a situation comparable to the reign of Edward VI (1537–1553) in the modern period – and the Pope did not abandon England, but wished to save the country from error by dispatching Augustine.<sup>65</sup>

### Early Conversion and the “Cyprian Privilege”

As a postscript, one can add that by the early seventeenth century, Anglican writers tended to abandon the view of King Lucius as the founder of the Church on the British Isles.<sup>66</sup> There was also less admiration for the Britons and less castigation of the Anglo-Saxons as brutal pagan invaders.<sup>67</sup> Instead of crediting Lucius, an autonomy of the British Church from the papacy was asserted on the grounds that churches were established, in early times, on the basis of the so-called “Cyprian privilege.”<sup>68</sup> Accordingly, the Celtic British Church was now considered jurisdictionally separate from Rome because all the early plantings of the Christian Church had this autonomy. The acceptance of papal emissaries was merely a matter of good manners. An early source of this approach was Matthew Sutcliffe, who claimed in 1606 that Britain and England had bishops from the earliest times of conversion since the first introduction of Christianity by Joseph of Arimathea and other missionaries of apostolic times, who had direct knowledge of the faith and the sacraments, as instituted by Jesus Christ.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>65</sup> See also Heal, “What can King Lucius Do for You?” 600–601.

<sup>66</sup> The very existence of King Lucius, however, was not fully discredited until the nineteenth-century; see H. Hallam, “Observations on the Story of Lucius, the First Christian King of Britain,” *Archaeologia*, 33 (1849) 308–335; T. Mommsen, “Die Historia Brittonum und König Lucius von Britannien,” *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Geschichtskunde*, 19 (1894) 283–293; L. Duchesne, “Eleuthère et le roi Breton Lucius,” *Revue Celtique*, 6 (1883–1885) 491–493.

<sup>67</sup> Donna Hamilton, “Richard Verstegan’s *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605): A Catholic Antiquarian Replies to John Foxe, Thomas Cooper, and Jean Bodin,” *Prose Studies* 22 (1999) 5.

<sup>68</sup> The treatise “On the Unity” by Church Father Cyprian (also known as Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus), bishop of Carthage (c. 205–258), was interpreted as teaching that all Christian bishops shared equally the power of Peter (Mt 16:18), which was not attached to any particular see like Rome; see “Cyprian,” *Encyclopedia of Religion* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Lindsay Jones, ed., 15 vv. (Farmington Hills, MI, 2005) 3:2113. See also *The King’s book; or, A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man, 1543*, with an introduction by T. A. Lacey (London, 1932) 71.

<sup>69</sup> Matthew Sutcliffe, *The subversion of R. Parsons his worke entitled, A treatise of 3 conversions* (London, 1606) 81, cited by Heal, “What can King Lucius Do for You?” 611. As noted previously, Jewel, in his *Defense of the Apology* (1570), had broached the subject of Britain’s conversion before Lucius by St. Paul, Simon Zelotes, the Greeks, “or by some others.” Jewel, *The works of John Jewel*, 3:163–164.



A mature Anglican view of the conversion of Britain and the origins of English Christianity was presented by George Smith (1693–1756).<sup>70</sup> His book is tellingly entitled, *The Britons and Saxons not converted to popery; or, The faith of our ancestors shewn to have been corrupted by the Romish church, and restored to its ancient purity by the reformed church of England*. In it, Smith maintains that Christianity with priests and bishops was planted in Britain probably in the second century independently of Rome. Ecclesiastical records were destroyed by the invasion of the barbarian Anglo-Saxons, yet the participation of Celtic British bishops at Council of Arles of 314 is well-known.<sup>71</sup> Smith then argues consistently and persistently against any suggestions that the bishops of Rome ever held any power in the British Church.<sup>72</sup> In the first centuries of Christian era, in any case, the pope's jurisdiction was limited to the Roman patriarchate which did not cover Spain, France and much less Britain.<sup>73</sup> It was also certain that Celtic British bishops both at home and in exile did not recognise the right of the Bishop of Rome to exercise any authority, either divine or canonical, over their Church.<sup>74</sup>

### Two Other Consequent Differences between Utraquism and Anglicanism

In addition to the Anglicans' failure to follow the Utraquists concerning the papal foundation of their Church – and in at least a minimal recognition of papal primacy – two other major differences emerged between the two denominations in part as consequences of the divergent views on the role of the papacy. The first difference concerned the role of the bishops in the church with Utraquists not adopting the Anglicans' administrative episcopalism. The other concerned the role of the secular sovereign in the Church with the Anglicans accepting, and the Utraquists shunning, the idea of him as God's vicar on earth.

<sup>70</sup> Smith prepared with his father John Smith (1659–1715) the first critical edition of the Latin text of Bede's history, published as Bede, the Venerable Saint, *Historiae ecclesiasticae gentis Anglorum libri quinque*, eds. John Smith and George Smith (Cambridge, 1722). See also Terence Towers, "Smith and Son, Editors of Bede," in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration*, 357–365.

<sup>71</sup> George Smith, *The Britons and Saxons not converted to popery; or, The faith of our ancestors shewn to have been corrupted by the Romish church, and restored to its ancient purity by the reformed church of England* (London, 1748) 282–283.

<sup>72</sup> Thus, the pope neither presided over the Council of Arles in 314, nor did he validate its decisions; *ibid.*, 283–284.

<sup>73</sup> Smith, *The Britons and Saxons not converted to popery*, 286–287. French bishops sent missionaries to Britain independently of the Pope, hence missionary activity was not a special right of the pope, *ibid.*, 294.

<sup>74</sup> Hence, according to Smith, it was false to maintain that from the time of King Lucius to that of the Saxons the "Pope's Authority had gained a full Establishment in this Island." Smith, *The Britons and Saxons not converted to popery*, 296. Smith, in fact, doubted the very existence of King Lucius, *ibid.*, 282

## Ecclesiology: The Bishops

One line of development in the history of Utraquism was a gradual de facto modification of their view of ecclesiastical government. The initial rejection of administrative popes was extended to also cover administrative bishops who had been originally condoned, as witnessed by the retention of Archbishop Konrad of Vechta in 1421–1431, and the subsequent election of Rokycana and his suffragans in 1435. Less than a hundred years later, the Utraquist view restricted also bishops to sacramental functions, as it had initially done to the popes, fearing the bishops' administrative power as a potential threat of bureaucratic coercion. The informal turning point in the Utraquist attitude was apparently the clash in 1505 between the Consistory and Philip de Nova Villa (formally the titular Bishop of Sidon) who, as the resident bishop from Italy, served the Utraquists.<sup>75</sup> All important to them, as reaffirmed by Pavel Bydzovsky in 1543, was the availability of priestly "power" flowing through the bishops as authentic historical successors of the Apostles, and thus guarantors of a true "apostolic" [historic] succession of the priesthood.<sup>76</sup> This stand led to a rather unusual separation between jurisdiction and ordination (or between the administrative and sacramental powers) at the diocesan level. While the administrative power rested with the Utraquist Consistory (a collegium of priests), the sacramental power – the ordination of clergy – was furnished by random bishops, provided that they were in communion with the bishop of Rome.

The Anglican view, as it was asserted in the latter part of the sixteenth century, diverged from the Utraquist pattern and stressed the bishops' administrative function, by which the prelates maintained doctrinal orthodoxy and, by which the bishops particularly kept Puritan doctrines and practices out of the Church.<sup>77</sup> The principle of historical apostolic

<sup>75</sup> Bishop Philip wished to declare an interdict in Prague because of a priest's arrest by the town government. Pavel of atec, the Utraquist Administrator, assisted by his retired predecessor Koranda, overruled the bishop's anathema which was a weapon in the Roman Church's arsenal, particularly distasteful to the Utraquists. It reminded them of the church's claims to the exercise of temporal power and the resulting heavy-handed proceedings against the Bohemian Reformation in the fifteenth century, such as the imposition of interdict on Prague by Archbishop Zbyněk Zajc in 1411. Krofta, "Vaclav Koranda mladší z Nove Plzne," 258; Vaclav Tomek, *Dejepis*, 10:225; *Ze starych letopisu ˇeskych* [From the Old Bohemian Annals], trans. Jaroslav Porak and Jaroslav Kaspar (Prague, 1980), 290–291. On Zbyněk see Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Brookfield, Vt., 1998) 75–76.

<sup>76</sup> Bydzovsky, *Tento spis ukazuje, e Biskupove Biskupa*. See n. 13.

<sup>77</sup> John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–1689* (New York, 1998) 51. At Hampton Court in 1604 James I epitomised the Anglican view of bishops by his dictum "no bishop, no king," signifying his belief that monarchy and episcopacy stood or fell together, *ibid.*, 60. On bishops in Anglicanism see also Ephraim Radner, "Bad Bishops: A Key to Anglican Ecclesiology," *ATR* 82 (2000) 321–341; MacCulloch, *The Reformation: A History*, 509–510.

succession seemed secondary. Archbishop Parker was deeply interested in the first centuries of episcopal power, including the period of King Arthur. In his church history, *De antiquitate Britannicae* (1572), he paid much attention to Geoffrey of Monmouth's story of *flamens* turned into bishops during the time of King Lucius.<sup>78</sup> Archbishop John Whitgift was particularly enthusiastic about Geoffrey's story of the *archflamens* who turned into archbishops under "King Lucie," and thus the importance of specifically the archbishops was stressed from the very beginnings of Christianity on the British Isles. Whitgift also considered early British bishops to have been created by a royal initiative and endowed with special authority to maintain social order.<sup>79</sup> Even Richard Hooker, who was not particularly interested in historical arguments to justify the independence of the English Church, referred to the establishment of bishops from the time of "King Lucie."<sup>80</sup> Later in 1606, Sutcliffe also stressed the importance of bishops and their long tradition in England from the earliest times of conversion, writing: "the Bishops of Britain and England... have continued since the first plantation of religion..."<sup>81</sup> Soon after, in 1613, Francis Mason, Archdeacon of Norfolk, accepted the foundation of the bishoprics by King Lucius independently of the pope and stressed the importance of the episcopate for the maintenance of order, as well as the royal power of appointing the prelates, since the king was "the supreme governor, even in religious causes, within his own kingdom."<sup>82</sup>

## The Question of Erastianism

On the issue of the relationship between the church and the state, there were in Bohemia only echoes of the royal supremacy over the church (sometimes called Caesaropapism) so ardently advocated in England, especially by Hooker. In a way, the Utraquists' relative dependence on state authority was the natural consequence of the Wyclifite opposition to the political and economic power of the church. If the clergy were to abstain from financing and maintaining judicial and executive agencies, there had to be a high degree

<sup>78</sup> Parker, *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae*, 11.

<sup>79</sup> John Whitgift, *The works of John Whitgift*, ed. J. Ayre. 3 v. (Cambridge), 2:129.

<sup>80</sup> Richard Hooker, *Works*, ed. J. Keble, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 3 vv. (Oxford, 1841) 3:143.

<sup>81</sup> Matthew Sutcliffe, *The subversion of R. Parsons his worke entituled, A treatise of 3 conversions* (London, 1606) 81, cited by Heal, "What can King Lucius Do for You?" 611.

<sup>82</sup> Francis Mason, *Of the consecration of the bishops in the Church of England: with their succession, jurisdiction, and other things incident to their calling: as also of the ordination of priests and deacons. Five booke: wherein they are cleared from the slanders and odious imputations of Bellarmine, Sanders, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Evdemon, Becanus and other Romanists* (London, 1613) 54, see also 51–54, cited by Heal, "What can King Lucius Do for You?" 610.

of reliance on the state to protect the church and to enforce its decrees.<sup>83</sup> In addition, for the Utraquists, as for the Anglicans, state power filled, to an extent, the vacuum left by the repudiation of the papal authority, especially for appointments in the ecclesiastical apparatus.<sup>84</sup> However, Bilejovský's and Bydžovský's Utraquism clearly parted ways with Elizabethan Anglicanism in their respective perceptions of the monarch's ecclesiastical role. The king in Bohemia could be said to act as a defender of the faith for the Utraquist Church, but the Anglican concept of the monarch as the supreme governor of the church was alien to the Utraquists.<sup>85</sup>

The Anglican theologians of the latter part of the sixteenth century again resorted to historical literature to find signs of royal supremacy in the primeval Celtic Church. Among the major historical documents was the letter, allegedly written by Pope Eleutherius to King Lucius (apparently forged in the thirteenth century), which was employed to bolster the king's authority over the Church, since it called the king "God's vicar in his kingdom." The document was used by supporters of Henry VIII with some caution since it allegedly came from the pope. Apparently relying on Archbishop Matthew Parker's history – as noted by Felicity Heal<sup>86</sup> – Sergeant Wray as Speaker of the House of Commons in 1571 reminded the members that the sovereign had the highest authority in both spiritual and temporal matters since the time of Lucius, who could make "lawes by his own good discretion, for that hee was the vicar of Christ over the people of Brittain."<sup>87</sup> In addition, Jewel pointed out in his *Defense of the Apology* (1570) that a letter from Pope Eleutherius acknowledged that Lucius had sufficient authority in his Kingdom without the pope, and was to act there as God's vicar.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>83</sup> *Sněmy české*, 11, part 1:72–73, 79; Julius Pažout, *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících, 1562–1570* [Protocols and Letters of the Utraquist Consistory, 1562–1570] (Prague, 1906) 374; Vilém Slavata, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého* [Memoirs of the Supreme Chancellor of the Bohemian Kingdom], ed. Josef Jireček, 5 vv. (Prague, 1865–1870) 1:216, 219; and Karel Stloukal, "Počátky nunciatury v Praze: Bonhomí v Čechách, 1581–84" [Beginnings of the Nunciature in Prague: Bonhomí in Bohemia, 1581–84], *ČČH* 34 (1928) 13.

<sup>84</sup> Pažout, *Jednání a dopisy*, 431–432; Krofta, "Boj o konsistoř" 283–286; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, Conn., 1996) 151.

<sup>85</sup> See, for instance, H. C. Porter, "Hooker, the Tudor Constitution, and the *Via Media*," in *Studies in Richard Hooker*, W. Speed Hill ed. (Cleveland, Ohio, 1972) 77–78. The view of royal supremacy, however, was far from clear cut in the English Church; see Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London, 1986) 166–169.

<sup>86</sup> Heal, "What can King Lucius Do for You?" 607; see also 598–99 for the text of the letter from Pope Eleutherius Parker cites the letter in Parker, *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae*, 7.

<sup>87</sup> T. E. Hartley, ed., *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols. (Leicester, 1981) 1:198; see also 1:28.

<sup>88</sup> Jewel, *The works of John Jewel*, 4:1124. Another line of approach, to assert royal supremacy over the church, was to regard Henry VIII and Elizabeth I as direct descendants of the Roman emperors; Hamilton, "Richard Verstegan's *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605)," 7.

However, as amplified later by George Smith (1748), the Anglican concept of royal supremacy, as involving administrative rather than purely religious matters, brought it closer to the Utraquists' view of royal power. Relying on *The King's Book; or, A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man* (1543), Smith maintained that the sovereign had no purely spiritual or sacerdotal power. The authority of the sovereign was "specifically and principally to defend the Faith of Christ and his Religion, to conserve and maintain the true doctrine of Christ, and all such as be true Preachers and Setters forth thereof, and to abolish all Abuses, Heresies and Idolatries, and to punish with corporal Pains such as, of Malice be the occasion of the same..."<sup>89</sup> According to Smith, the king's power was only external – coercive over all subjects, both clergy and laity whether ecclesiastical or temporal; "and this with an intent to exclude all that pretended Power and Jurisdiction, which the Bishop of Rome exercised in these realms by mere Usurpation and Sufferance."<sup>90</sup>

A comparable dismantling of Rome's administrative authority, occurred as a sequel of the Bohemian wars of religion, It was put on the record by Emperor/King Sigismund's imperial charter of ecclesiastical liberties, dated 6 January 1436, which reaffirmed a virtual jurisdictional independence of the Utraquist Church in Bohemia and Moravia from the Roman See. The document excluded non-residents from appointments to ecclesiastical offices and dignities. 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 from the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts located abroad.<sup>91</sup> This last provision renewed, in part, a decree by Wenceslaus IV of 9 June 1418 that protected inhabitants of Bohemia from summonses to ecclesiastical courts abroad.<sup>92</sup>

Although this legislation foreshadowed the separation of the Church of England from the See of Rome, it was not so drastic, recognising Rome's power to confirm appointments of episcopal rank.<sup>93</sup> The Utraquists still upheld the pope as necessary for the transmission of the historic (apostolic) succession of ministry and, hence, a valid priesthood in the Western Church, although he was not held to be the supreme judge or teacher. The Anglicans eliminated the pope entirely from the ecclesiastical life of England. Thus Francis Mason, in his authoritative treatise, *Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England* (1613), pointed out the king's absolute authority in the appointment of bishops, citing the foundation of the bishoprics by King Lucius independently of the pope: "The king being supreme governor, even in religious causes, within his own kingdom, and assisted by learned preachers,

<sup>89</sup> Smith, *The Britons and Saxons not converted to popery*, xi.

<sup>90</sup> Smith, *The Britons and Saxons*, x; *The King's book*, 70–77.

<sup>91</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* (Munich, 1981) 44–45.

<sup>92</sup> Tomek, *Dějepis*, 3:622.

<sup>93</sup> MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 116.

established such government and in such places as was most convenient.”<sup>94</sup> The elimination of even the papal role in the transmission of the historic (apostolic) succession of the episcopate and, derivatively, the priesthood defined the major difference in the concept of royal sovereignty between the Utraquists and the Anglicans.

### Parochialism and Globalism in England and Bohemia

On the whole the churches of Bohemia and England showed a great similarity in theology and in liturgy in the latter part of the sixteenth century, essentially seeing the model of Christianity in the first millennium of the Christian era. Their political situation, however, was very different. England, in the Elizabethan era was a great sea power, poised on launching spectacular global ambitions. Landlocked Bohemia was confined to a rather parochial existence in the midst of the Central European Empire of the Habsburgs. Yet, in ecclesiology, the opposite was the case. The Utraquist, not even politically prevalent in their homeland, turned their vision toward Roman universalism. The Anglicans, dominant in their own country – without abandoning the idea of Christian catholicity – focused on their own national church.<sup>95</sup>

A Czech religious messianism had glowed fiercely in the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation and, indeed, in the convictions of Jan Hus himself.<sup>96</sup> Mature Utraquism, at the time of Bilejovský, had still retained, the messianic inspiration, albeit in a rather muted form. Aiming at cleansing the historical church of its late medieval corruption, its goal was relatively modest compared to the Taborites’ expectation to establish the apocalyptic Kingdom of God on earth. Nevertheless, in its own terms, it was ambitious enough.<sup>97</sup> The Utraquists remained convinced that their church preserved, on behalf of all Western Christianity, the true traditional catholic and apostolic faith against the deviations of the Roman Curia, which eventually would come around to the Utraquists’ point of view.<sup>98</sup> The stirring of religious messianism, viewing the English as the people chosen by God to purify entire Christendom, was also present in the English Reformation. This aspiration, however, was

<sup>94</sup> Francis Mason, *Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England* (London, 1613) 54, also 51–54. Cited by Heal, “What can King Lucius Do for You?” 610.

<sup>95</sup> On Bohemia, see Zdeněk V. David, “Universalist Aspirations of the Utraquist Church,” *BRRP* 7 (2009) 194–212.

<sup>96</sup> Rudolf Urbánek, “Český mesianismus ve své době hrdinské” [Czech Messianism in Its Heroic Era], *Od pravěku k dnešku: Sborník k 60. narozeninám J. Pekaře* [From Antiquity to the Present: Festschrift for the Sixtieth Birthday of J. Pekař], 2 vv. (Prague, 1930) 1:262–284, especially 263–264; Božena Kopiczková, *Jan Želivský* (Prague, 1990) 20.

<sup>97</sup> Bilejovský, *Kronyka*, 39–41; Krofta, “Slovo o knězi Bohuslavu Bilejovském,” 296–297.

<sup>98</sup> František Palacký, *Obrana husitství* [A Defense of Hussitism], trans. and ed. František M. Bartoš (Prague, 1926) 41.

less pronounced in Anglicanism than in the works of Puritan writers, such as John Foxe and John Bale.<sup>99</sup> In Hooker, as well as in his Anglican successors like Archbishop William Laud, the focus on the contemporary national church tended to mute the global emphasis on ecclesiastical reform.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, because of their, albeit minimalist, recognition of the papacy, and insistence on clerical ordinations by bishops in communion with the Roman See, the Utraquists were better positioned to interact with the central organs of Western Christianity. One might say that, while the *Anglicana Ecclesia* chose the left side of the *via media*, the Utraquists processed on the right side and that the Utraquists' situation *vis-à-vis* Rome resembled more a qualified union with a high degree of autonomy, than a full-fledged separation.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation*, 17, 20.

<sup>100</sup> MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England*, 99; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 303.

<sup>101</sup> In that sense the Utraquists similarly differed from other later churches, like the Dutch and German Old Catholics or the Polish National Catholics who, although embracing the apostolic and sacramental principles, would maintain a full separation or schism from the Roman See. – The Utraquists' esteem for Thomas More and John Fisher offers a striking reflection of this distinction. See, especially, Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*.