
Reform and the Lower Consistory in Prague, 1437–1497

Thomas A. Fudge
(*Christchurch*)

Not until 9 September 1437 did the spirit of radical Hussitism depart from the forefront of public affairs in Bohemia. On that date Jan Roháč of Dubá and the garrison of Sión Castle were hanged by King Sigismund on a three-story gallows in Prague. It was the end to a gallant struggle against the Roman Church and the Empire; a struggle which had spanned more than two decades.¹ Subsequent to the fall of Sión, Hussite religion lost the power to exist successfully alongside the Roman Church without concession and negotiation. The contours of Bohemian Reformation began to change. It is not possible to sustain the argument that the Poděbradian age was an integral continuation of revolutionary Hussitism. By the end of the 1430s the Hussite movement was in no danger of falling into oblivion. But the course of history had dictated a very different path to the one followed from the time of Jan Hus' death (1415) to the crushing of the Hussite "warriors of God". The glory of Tábor had faded, but the spirit of reform continued unabated. The revolutionary period of Hussite religion had begun in 1409 and essentially ended in 1437 at Sión. The Poděbradian-Jagellonian period constitutes the second stage in Hussite history and lasted until 29 August 1526 when the Bohemian King Louis Jagiellon fell in the Ottoman victory at Mohács. The final stage of Hussite history were the years under the Habsburgs. These were decades of rise and fall. In the end it took more than seven years to put an end to the heretics. On 8 November 1620 the Protestant Estates were routed at Bílá Hora. On 21 June 1621 the leaders of the revolt were executed. By early 1622 the administration of the Utraquist Church was dissolved and the practice of utraquism suppressed by Archbishop of Prague Johann Lohelius on the authority of Pope Gregory XV. The Letter of Majesty issued by Emperor Rudolf II in 1609 was slashed crossways by Ferdinand II, thus rendering the great charter of religious freedom null and void. By 1627 Ferdinand had driven the last nail into the Hussite coffin by promulgating the

1) The best source on Roháč is Petr Čornej and Bohdan Zilynskyj, "Jan Roháč z Dubá a Praha. Konec Jana Roháče – pověst a skutečnost" [Jan Roháč of Dubá and Prague. The End of Jan Roháč Legend and Reality] *Pražský sborník historický* 20 (1987) 35–60. In English, with references to the Czech sources, see Thomas A. Fudge, "Myth, Heresy and Propaganda in the Radical Hussite Movement, 1409–1437", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, (1992) 215–218.

Obnovené Zřízení zemské [Renewed Land Ordinance] which made Roman Catholicism the sole religion of Bohemia.

Between the fall of Sión and the fall at Bílá Hora there were two strands of Hussite belief and practice within Bohemia, the Utraquists and the *Jednota bratrská* [Unity of Brethren]. The latter group, founded in 1457, was formally illegal from its inception until 1609. The Unity of Brethren continued the sectarian emphases of the earlier radical Hussites and survived until the third decade of the seventeenth century as a significant minority religious option in the Czech lands. The larger and more influential Utraquists became the recognized Hussite church. Despite the obvious importance of the Utraquists in the post-revolutionary period, they have been largely ignored by historians who have instead favored the *Jednota bratrská*.² This posture has obscured the rôle of the Utraquists and left unexplored the place occupied by them in the religious history of Bohemia. One of the areas requiring exploration is that of the Lower Consistory, the administration of the Utraquist Church created at the end of the revolutionary period. This study proposes to look at the connection of religious reform in Bohemia with the Lower Consistory during its early years under the influence of Jan Rokycana and Václav Koranda the Younger.

Points of Departure

There has been the idea that later Utraquism was in some sense a fossilized remnant of the Hussite revolution; “eine eingestorbene Reformation”,³ a church which “bore within itself unmistakable marks of compromise and ambiguity”.⁴ Some interpreters would assert that by the 1480s “the lack of spiritual depth in the Utraquist church” ostensibly gave witness to the fact that “the heritage of the early Hussites had become to a large extent merely a lifeless tradition”.⁵ Whether these conclusions are correct is both an historical and historiographical problem.

2) For example, “[o]ne of [Rudolf] Říčan’s most glaring deficiencies is his almost total lack of sympathy or appreciation for the Utraquists. There is a tendency to caricature the Utraquists, almost in the same manner that the Unity viewed them, as betrayers of the authentic Hussite heritage.” See the review of Říčan’s *The History of the Unity of Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, trans., C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem, PA/Winston-Salem, N.C., 1992) by Thomas A. Fudge in CV 36,1 (1994) 62–68. The comment is on 66.

3) See for example Georg Voigt, “Georg von Böhmen, der Hussitenkönig” *Historische Zeitschrift* 5 (1861) 468.

4) Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren* 12.

5) Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* (The Hague, 1957) 106.

One of the main players in the Hussite drama after 1434 was the enigmatic Jan Rokycana.⁶ He first appeared in Hussite history in June 1423 at a disputation among the Táborites and the Praguers concerning liturgy and the eucharist at Konopiště Castle.⁷ The next year in the fall of 1424 he served as a mediator between the city of Prague and the military commander Jan Žižka.⁸ By the summer of 1427 Rokycana was elected spiritual head of the Hussite church by a Prague synod and elevated to the position of senior preacher in the Týn Church. Rokycana was one of four delegates who presented the Hussite cause before the Council of Basel in 1433. In September, 1435 he was elected Archbishop of Prague by the Bohemian estates. This election caused Rokycana to be perhaps the most visible Hussite (aside from Jiří of Poděbrady) until 1471. The rise of the Prague consistories was predicated upon two considerations. First, the vacant See of Prague and second, the framing of the Basel *Compactata*. The *Compactata* were agreements declaring the legitimacy of Utraquist religion, particularly the practice of the lay chalice. The Catholic negotiators of the *Compactata* interpreted the phrase “men and women who practice such a custom” to restrict the provisions to one generation “to those who had been recipients of the custom at the time of the acceptance of the *Compactata*”.⁹ Moreover, priests who did dispense communion under both kinds were expected to remind the laity that Christ was fully present in each of the consecrated elements. The Hussites of course would have preferred the curia to make utraquism obligatory in the Czech lands. That desire, however, had absolutely no chance of fulfillment. Full renewed conformity to the Roman practice was expected to follow. The Utraquists, however, did not acquiesce in that expectation. The *Compactata*, then, designed as a compromise settlement aimed at reconciling Rome and Prague became a wedge of division. Archbishop Konrad of Vechta’s death in 1431 left a vacancy which Rome did not immediately fill. Indeed, Konrad had been something of a curiosity. His elevation occurred in the midst of reform fervor in Prague on the eve of the Council of Constance. For some years he faithfully represented the Holy See but then in 1421 abruptly converted to the Hussite cause. With the continued vacancy of the Prague archbishopric, and the failure to secure papal confirmation for the election of Jan Rokycana, a divided ecclesiastical bureaucracy emerged: the Upper (Roman) and Lower (Utraquist) Consisto-

6) The best source on Rokycana in English remains the study by Frederick G. Heymann, “John Rokycana – Church Reformer Between Hus and Luther” *Church History* 28 (1959) 240–280.

7) Rokycana’s name appears in a list drawn up by Jan Přebem and preserved in MS Prague Bib. Cap. D 74 f.109^a.

8) An account of this meeting appears in Frederick G. Heymann, *John Žižka and the Hussite Revolution* (New York, 1969) 426–427.

9) This nuance later was explained by Bishop Philibert of Coutances. See FRA 2:477.

ries. The terms “upper” and “lower” are purely geographical in nature. The Roman Consistory was situated in the cathedral on Hradčany while the Utraquist Consistory was headquartered in the Týn Church in the Old Town. There is little question that the religious situation in Bohemia had been transformed by the Hussite Revolution. The establishment of the official Hussite church increasingly began to look toward the Lower Consistory for spiritual direction. The consistory, headed by an administrator exercised jurisdiction and the disposal of offices, ecclesiastical discipline and the regulation of teaching quite independently of Rome. Behind the apparatus of the Lower Consistory were the secular estates of the nobility and the towns which held elective power in terms of the appointment of administrator and the constituency of the consistory itself. The estates also determined the organizational and theological parameters of the Utraquist Church as well as controlling parish properties and providing supervision for Utraquist priests. The estate nobility and the council of Prague chose a committee of *defensores* who represented the interests of the Utraquist church in matters pertaining to ecclesiastical politics.¹⁰ Both consistories were introduced on an interim basis but Rome’s continued non-recognition of Rokycana, combined with its reluctance of Rome to appoint a rival archbishop of Prague, ostensibly contributed to the evolution of both consistories into permanent institutions.

The Lower Consistory, by necessity and expedience, became closely linked with the Bohemian Diet, representing the three estates: barons, knights, and towns. At Utraquist convocations the clergy functioned as a separate group alongside the lay estates. However, the crucial decisions about political and ideological questions related to the church were taken mainly by the lay estates, though the clergy undoubtedly played an active lobbying rôle. Winfried Eberhard has insisted that Utraquism was a significant vehicle of the autonomy and self-consciousness of the estates. In other words, Utraquism was in some sense both the reality and the representation of the Bohemian estates. If this be true, then the Utraquist Church was much more intimately related to the Hussite estates than the Catholic Church was to the Catholic estates.¹¹ The Lower Consistory persisted in much the same fashion for nearly two hundred years.¹²

10) On these matters see the very fine work of Winfried Eberhard, *Konfessionsbildung und Stände in Böhmen 1478–1530* [Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, 38] (Munich/Vienna, 1981) 49–50 and 113–115. See also Eberhard, “Bohemia, Moravia and Austria”, in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed., Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge, 1992) 26.

11) Eberhard, “The Political System and the Intellectual Traditions of the Bohemian Ständestaat from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century”, in *Crown, Church and Estates Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed., R. J. W. Evans and T. V. Thomas (London, 1991) 35.

12) There have been suggestions that the consistory was probably in place as early as 1431. There is still research to be done in order to clarify the origins of the consistory and its

The other factor precipitating the rise of the Lower Consistory was the formulation of the *Compactata*. By 30 November, 1433 the first draft of the agreements had been worked out.¹³ In January, 1436 Sigismund agreed to the provisions of the *Compactata* and it seemed that the agreements for ending the ecclesiastical war had received both the approval of the state and the church. It was not to be quite that simple as subsequent history would demonstrate. Martínek Lupáč, one of Rokycana's suffragans, continued to regard the *Compactata*, together with the Judge of Cheb (1432) as a legal endorsement of the gains achieved during the years of the Hussite Revolution.¹⁴ Neither Sigismund nor his successors, nor indeed the Roman church, ever regarded the agreements at Cheb and Basel as anything more than a bargaining chip aimed at diffusing the unmanageable heretics and bringing them ultimately to submission to Rome.¹⁵ From the very beginning, the *Compactata* were fraught with incessant difficulties. The non-confirmation of the Basel agreements and the failure to secure consecration for Rokycana remained acute points of issue.¹⁶ This attitude, perhaps tempered some, would remain. In the end, the Utraquists rejected assimilation and refused to submit so long as the *Compactata* were ignored.¹⁷

While the Lower Consistory remained in Prague until the catastrophic events of the 1620s the same cannot be said for the Upper Consistory. In September 1448 when Jiří of Poděbrady and his Hussite troops entered Prague many priests and canons who had been in active violation of the *Compactata* fled fearing reprisals. The Upper Consistory escaped to Plzeň and the administration of the party *sub una specie* remained there until 1453. This was not the first time the representatives of Roman Catholicism had

early shape and authority. See the comment on 1431 in Zdeněk V. David, "The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517–1621" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995) 642.

13) The text of the *Compactata*, in Czech and Latin, appears in *Archiv český. Čili staré písemné památky české i Moravské* [Bohemian Records. Or the old Written Bohemian and Moravian Monuments], (Prague, 1844) 3:398–444. For the Hussites at Basel there are two collections of sources: *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, vv. 1–2, eds., František Palacký and Ernest Birk (Vienna, 1857, 1873) and Johannes D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova collectio*, vv. 29–30 (Venice, 1788, 1792).

14) Amedeo Molnár, "Martin Lupáč: Modus disputandi pro fide" *Folia historica bohemica* 4 (1982) 161–177.

15) See the note in Frederick G. Heymann, *George of Bohemia. King of Heretics* (Princeton, 1965) 9.

16) See, for instance, the Diet statements in 1450s by Beneš Mokrovouský of Hustiřany, former captain of the Orebiters, who had fought in the command of Jan Žižka and was one of those who had signed the latter's "Military Rule" in 1423, *ibid.* 106–7.

17) For a list of the administrators and other members of the Lower Consistory in Prague from 1437 until its extinction in 1621, see Václav V. Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách, od r. 1415 až 1622", *ČČM* 22 (1848) 463–468.

forsaken Prague in search of safety elsewhere. During the Hussite revolution the chancery of the archbishop of Prague fled from the capital in 1419 to the Lusatian town of Žitava. By 1467 the consistory again had to seek the safety of Plzeň under its administrator Hilarius of Litoměřice (†1468). Hilarius had once been a Hussite and a disciple of Rokycana, but he converted to Rome and became a bitter enemy of Utraquism. There were similar such converts in the Cathedral Chapter. The consistory returned to Prague in 1478.

The continuing motif of ecclesiastical reform during the Utraquist Church years (1437–1621) took on a variety of features. When discussing reform within this context in the fifteenth century it is important to define the nature of reform. It is altogether inappropriate to judge the reforms within the Utraquist church by the criteria established by the European reformations of the sixteenth century. There is no good reason not to consider the Hussite period as the First Protestant Reformation. Therefore, it is consistent to view the Bohemian Reformation as something quite different from the movements inspired by Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, the radical reformers and others. By the same token it is necessary to distinguish carefully between the revolutionary era and that of later Utraquism. The nature of reform and the accompanying ethos on both sides of the divide are not the same. The most dramatic thrust of the Bohemian Reformation in its stage from the time of Hus to the fall of Sión may be summed up in a single word: Tábor. The necessary qualification is this: Tábor has nothing to do with geography; Tábor is then not to be exclusively related to that town in south Bohemia which existed so long as a center of radical Hussite religion. Indeed, Tábor is an idea, an idea encompassing a vigorous and vibrant agenda of ecclesiastical and social *renovatio* and *reformatio*. That idea could neither be contained in any one place nor identified with any particular creed or mandate. Tábor shifted and went wherever its adherents went. Tábor was Žižka. Tábor was Václav Koranda the Elder. Tábor was the “little bishop” Mikuláš of Pelhřimov. Tábor was Jan Čapek. Tábor was the priest Želivský. Tábor was the “warriors of God”. Tábor was an idea born in the ashes of Jan Hus, cultivated by the memories of Jan Milíč of Kroměříž and Matěj of Janov, and fuelled by the zeal of countless reluctant heretics. It has already been noted that the second Utraquist stage of Hussite history cannot accurately be described as a continuation of this earlier Táborite trend. Hence is it unwise to compare, without qualification, the Taborite idea of reform in the first period with the Utraquist idea in the second period. Failure to separate the nature of ecclesiastical reform in the Taborite and the later Utraquist periods can result in the sort of arbitrary judgments which ascribe to the post-1434 period the notions that Rokycana added nothing original to Hussite thinking,¹⁸ was void of the

18) František Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, 5 vv. (Prague, 1836–1867). See 4:444–449. This is the German translation of Palacký's, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* [The History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia].

significance of his predecessors,¹⁹ was “a selfish, ambitious, unscrupulous man of little merit as a religious thinker, reformer or leader”,²⁰ and who did nothing to reform the church.²¹ Or, beyond that, to the unfounded notions that the Utraquist Church was too secularized and directed by leaders of questionable morals²² which resulted in the aforementioned descriptions of Utraquism as ambiguous, compromised and fossilized. Reform during the later Utraquist years must be evaluated on its own merits with consideration to the contemporary context, not to the Taborite precedents or to developments in Christendom yet to come.

Centres and Peripheries of Reform

The Bohemian Reformation may be regarded in the first instance as focused on morals and sacraments. From beginnings in the 1360s until the end of the revolutionary period these two considerations figure prominently in the movement. Both remained central to the reforming agendas of the Lower Consistory. As early as 1434 a Prague synod recognized the seven ecclesiastical sacraments and made it obligatory both to hold and promote those rites,²³ and similar decrees were passed at subsequent Utraquist synods.²⁴ The eucharist, however, continued to dominate the discussions in the Utraquist period, as it had in the days of Jakoubek, Žižka, and Želivský. The Utraquists and the Taborites sought to compose their differences. While the Taborites failed to attend the synod at Kutná Hora in October, 1441,²⁵ the details of the “complete and perfect agreement” allegedly reached by the Utraquists with the radicals the following July at an assembly at Mělník have

19) See for example Ernest Denis, *Fin de l'indépendance bohême 2 vv.* (Paris, 1890) 1:18–19.

20) Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der Böhmischesen Brüder* [Böhmen und Mähren im Zeitalter der Reformation, volume 1], 2 vv. (Prague, 1861²) 1:21–40.

21) František M. Dobiáš, “Ecumenical Motifs in the Theology of the ‘Unity of Bohemian Brethren’” *The Ecumenical Review* 12 (1960) 465.

22) *Ibid.*

23) “Item credimus et tenemus, quod septem sacramenta, videlicet baptisma, confirmacio, penitencia, sacrosancta eukaristia, ordo, matrimonium, unccio sacra, sunt ex fide katholica saluberrima antidota animarum ab omnibus promovenda et tenenda.” The text is printed in Blanka Zilynská, *Husitské synody v českách 1418–1440* [The Hussite Synods in Bohemia, 1418–1440] (Prague, 1985) 113.

24) The synod of Kutná Hora on 4 October 1441 adopted similar terminology in Canon 2. See Zdeněk Nejedlý, ed., *Prameny k synodám strany pražské a tábořské v letech 1441–1444 (Vznik husitské konfesse)* [Synodal Sources for the Parties of Prague and Tábor in the Years 1441–1444 (Origins of the Hussite Confession)] (Prague, 1900) 32–33.

25) The resolution which was promulgated by the Kutná Hora diet on 4 October has been published in Nejedlý, *ibid.* 32–38.

not been preserved.²⁶ The synod, held at Kutná Hora in July 1443, has been called one of the “decisive events of Rokycana’s administration”.²⁷ As it turned out it was to be the last great gathering of the Hussite parties. Some of the grand old men of Hussite history were among the *dramatis personae*: Rokycana, Jan Příbram and Prokop of Plzeň, Peter Payne, Hynek Ptáček of Pirkštejn, Mikuláš of Pelhřimov Biskupec, Václav Koranda of Plzeň, Táborite veterans of the “magnificent rides” of the Hussite wars and many others.²⁸ The Kutná Hora synod convened with one purpose in mind: to establish yet again the true sense of *boží zákon* [the law of God].²⁹ With its significance as the symbol of Hussitism, the sacrament of the altar remained the greatest obstacle to unity.³⁰ By the time the formal sessions got underway, Václav of Dráchov and Peter Payne had been named to moderate between the factious Hussites. Jan Rokycana set forth his view of the eucharist which came within a hairsbreadth of admitting the dogma of transubstantiation.³¹ Jan Příbram’s view went even further and may be regarded as synonymous with the official view of Rome. The Táborites would accept none of it and with strong emphasis on the views of John Wyclif set forth their understanding of remanence. The Táborites argued for an understanding of the eucharistic presence in terms of *sacramentaliter* and *spiritualiter*.

Rokycana and his party held to an understanding of the presence of Christ in the sacrament along the lines of *essentialiter* and *naturaliter*. In this the Utraquist Church presented a eucharistic option counter to that put forth by their radical colleagues. Frederick G. Heymann has recounted the Kutná Hora debates and drawn parallels between them and the Marburg Colloquy of 1529 wherein Luther and his Wittenberg colleagues faced Ulrich Zwingli

26) See the comment made by an anonymous chronicler in František Palacký, ed., *Starší letopisové češti od r. 1378 do 1527* [Old Czech Annalists From 1378–1527] SRB 3:129.

27) Frederick G. Heymann, “The Hussite-Utraquist Church in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 52 (1961) 4.

28) Sources on the synod see Nejedlý, *ibid.* 42–44 and the *Chronicon Taboritarum* in Höfler 2:749–751 [FRA 6]. Four years later Příbram would be dead, Prokop gone from the center stage of Hussite history, Peter Payne’s last years would be lived in obscurity, Hynek had less than a year to live, Mikuláš the “little bishop” would end his life in the prisons of Jiří of Poděbrady, as would his colleague Koranda, the old Hussite warriors had already fought their last battle.

29) The idea of the “Law of God” is one of the central motifs in early Hussite history. See Thomas A. Fudge, “The ‘Law of God’: Reform and Religious Practice in Late Medieval Bohemia”, *BRRP* 1 (1996) 49–72.

30) Before the actual scheduled dialogue could get underway Jan Příbram assailed his implacable foe Václav Koranda of Plzeň with the accusation of holding two hundred heresies! A great debate then ensued; *Chronicon Taboritarum*, Höfler 2:746–748.

31) For an explication of Rokycana’s views on the eucharist see Heymann, “John Rokycana – Church Reformer Between Hus and Luther”, 249.

and his Swiss supporters over the interpretation of the sacrament.³² At Kutná Hora (as at Marburg eighty six years later) neither side would yield. The vitriolic debates between Přebram and Koranda continued to underscore the margin of separation.³³ In January, 1444 a provincial diet decided the issue in favor of Rokycana against the extremes of both Táborites and Přebram. The diet determined that the moderate center represented a “safer, better and more reliable” option.³⁴ Táborite theology and liturgical practice was condemned and the recalcitrant radicals ordered to conform to the established Utraquist church. The theology of Rokycana certainly played a key function in the position of the Lower Consistory and the adoption of the resolution stemming from the 1443 Synod of Kutná Hora. A Catholic observer in Prague in November, 1431 had ascribed to Rokycana success in leading many of the Hussites from their errors and a satisfaction for utraquism as the sole eucharistic innovation.³⁵ In matters relating to the sacrament it may be instructive to follow František M. Bartoš who has pointed out that Rokycana identified himself with the position of Jakoubek of Stříbro set forth by the latter the year before his death.³⁶ As late as 1465 the Utraquist king Jiří of Poděbrady convened a religious disputation of the two Prague consistories. With the support of Zdeněk Kostka, Rokycana faced off against the administrator of the Upper Consistory, Hilarius of Litoměřice and his assistant Václav Křížanovský. The disputation provided the aging Rokycana with yet another public opportunity to underscore the Utraquists’ conviction about the necessity of the chalice.³⁷

32) “The Hussite-Utraquist Church in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries”, 4–5.

33) The *Chronicon Taboritarum*, Höfler 2:752. notes that Přebram argued against Payne in Czech, a language the Englishman had never learned, despite his long sojourn in the Czech lands. The chronicle states that Přebram did this because he was afraid to debate Payne in Latin. The bias of the chronicle is to be noted.

34) The decision of the provincial diet appears in Nejedlý, *ibid.* 107–116 and is dated 31 January 1444.

35) “Qui de multis haeresibus eos praedicendo eduxit, tenens tamen articulum de necessitate communicandi sub utraque specie.” cited in Amedeo Molnár, “Petr Chelčický’s ‘Instructions on the Sacraments’” CV 19,4 (1976) 180, 191. See E. F. Jacob, “The Bohemians at the Council of Basel, 1433”, in *Prague Essays*, ed., R. W. Seton-Watson (Oxford, 1949) 94–97 for a lucid summary of Rokycana’s presentation at Basel.

36) Bartoš, *The Hussite Revolution 1424–1437*, trans., J. Weir, ed., John M. Klassen (New York, 1986) 63.

37) See the brief account in Heymann, “John Rokycana – Church Reformer Between Hus and Luther”, 256. Hilarius wrote a report of the debate entitled, “Disputation with Rokycana before Jiří, king of Bohemia” while Rokycana took a more polemical tact with his report, “Against the frivolous propositions of the apostate doctors.” See Otakar Odložilík, *The Hussite King Bohemia in European Affairs, 1440–1471* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1965) 296 n.315 for details.

The other issue with respect to the eucharist was the Hussite proclivity for including children and infants in the liturgical celebration. The practice remained objectionable to the Roman Church and was not sanctioned by the *Compactata*. By the late 1440s Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini cited it to Jiří of Poděbrady as a major obstacle to having the doctrine of *communio sub utraque specie* sanctioned by the pope.³⁸ There is no evidence that the practice was abandoned during the course of the fifteenth century. In matters of liturgy, the Lower Consistory did not attempt to impose absolute conformity. Nevertheless, Rokycana himself declared that most Czechs did not appreciate the innovations and simplification of the liturgy introduced by the Taborites. With characteristic bluntness and zeal, the “little bishop” of the Taborites responded that it was natural for the carnal and worldly-minded people in Bohemia to prefer the Whore of Babylon with her golden cup to the pure simplicity of Christ and the apostles.³⁹

The Utraquist church proceeded to reaffirm other beliefs and practices that were objectionable to the Taborites, despite the Taborites’ resistance charging the Utraquists with subservience to Rome. The synod of 1443 at Kutná Hora may be regarded as an expression of this policy. The observation of traditional feasts were affirmed by the Utraquist church at the St. James’s Day Synod in 1434 and reaffirmed by the Kutná Hora assembly in 1441.⁴⁰ The latter gathering likewise affirmed the veneration of the saints. Converts to Utraquism in 1466 were required to recite the following declaration in the Týn Church: “The Virgin Mary and other heavenly saints, also praying to the Lord Jesus Christ ..., help the sinful penitents ... and it is proper and worthy to ask for their assistance.”⁴¹ Further, the Utraquist church acquiesced in the idea of purgatory, as well as the efficacious benefit of praying to the saints.⁴² On the matter of images the Utraquist church appealed to the traditions espoused by Hus and synodal rulings during the revolutionary era to support their acceptance of a *via media* with respect to the usefulness of images. Both administrations of the Lower Consistory, under Rokycana and Václav Koranda, conceded modified acceptance of the devotional uses of images.⁴³

38) See the narrative account in Odložilík, *The Hussite King* 56.

39) Höfler 2:698.

40) See Zilynská, *Husitské synody v českých 1418–1440* 74–76.

41) Cited in Zdeněk V. David, “Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism’s Encounter with Luther” CV 38,1 (1996) 50.

42) An assembly held in Prague on 6 January 1432 ratified thirteen elements of agreement. See Archiv český 3:268.

43) Jan Hus had accepted the Gregorian postulate that pictures were the books of the illiterate. *Expositio decalogi* in Flajšhans 1:7–8. The St. Wenceslas Day Synod of 28 September 1418 had favorably ruled on images. See the text of the canons in Documenta 677–681. See also František Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce* [The Hussite Revolution], (Prague 1993) 4:104–105. On the period from 1471–1497 see Noemi Rejchrtová, “Czech Utraquism at the Time of Václav Koranda the Younger and the Visual Arts” CV 20,3 (1977) 157–170 and

One of the chief aims of the early Bohemian reformers, which became codified in the famous “Four Articles of Prague” was a correction and punishment of sins. Not later than 1427 the Táborites and the Pragueres had agreed upon the establishment of an appropriate office to deal with the punishment of sins.⁴⁴ The Utraquist Church continued to regard this element of the Four Articles of Prague with singular importance. Archbishop-elect Rokycana should be regarded as the chief exponent of the correction of sins among the theologians of the Utraquist church.⁴⁵ After his return to the pulpit of the Týn Church in 1448 Rokycana fulminated against what he termed a persistent degeneracy within the church.⁴⁶ The ongoing reform of the clergy and the question of clerical worthiness remained a constant theme with the Utraquist church.⁴⁷ There was corruption to be sure, as the dissident Jednota bratrská never hesitated to point out. There may be some doubt, however, about the charges that certain Utraquist administrators were “dishonorable, liars, drunkards and whoremongers”.⁴⁸

Situated to the left of the Lower Consistory was a strand of reform more akin to the spirit of the Táborites and the Jednota bratrská than the mediating, *via media* of Rokycana. The more radical vein found its enthusiast and proponent in the person of Martin Lupáč, Rokycana’s unconsecrated suffragan. Lupáč denied the need of a papal confirmation for the *Compactata*. Like his predecessors Želivský, the priests of Tábor and Oreb, and even Jakoubek, he condemned the pope as “antichrist”. Since the Hussites were to be considered the elect of God, they should separate themselves clearly

20,4 (1977) 233–244 and more recently her “Obrazoborecké tendence utrakvistické mentality jagellonského období a jejich dosah” [The Impact of the Iconoclastic Tendency in the Utraquist Mentality During the Jagiellon Period] *Husitský Tábor* 8 (1985) 66–67.

44) Archiv český 3:263.

45) See Rokycana’s *Postilla*, ed., František Šimek, 2 vv. (Prague, 1928–1929) 1: 240, 609; Šimek, *Učení M. Jana Rokycany* [The Teaching of Master Jan Rokycana] (Prague, 1938) 175–178; and Šimek, *Mistr Jan Rokycana, výbor z kázání a dopisů* [Master Jan Rokycana Selections From His Sermons and Correspondence] (Prague, 1949) 13, 37. See also Marianka S. Fousek, “The Pastoral Office in the Early Unitas Fratrum” *Slavonic and East European Review* 40 (1962) 444–457. See the note with reference in Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* 68 n.136.

46) See the comment in Murray L. Wagner, *Petr Chelčický. A Radical Separatist in Hussite Bohemia* (Scottsdale, PA, 1983) 150.

47) David R. Holeton, “Church or Sect?: The Jednota Bratrská and the Growth of Dissent from Mainline Utraquism” *CV* 38,1 (1996) 26–7. On the question of punishing sins using the death penalty, Petr Chelčický noted ruefully that if all sins were summarily dealt with it would not be long before Bohemia was virtually uninhabited. *Sít víry* [The Net of Faith], ed., František Šimek (Prague, 1950) 175. See also the discussion in Amedeo Molnár, “The Ideological Significance of Hussitism”, *CV* 31,2 (1988) 119.

48) See the reference in David, “The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517–1621”, 650.

from the apostate Roman Church. Here, Lupáč is somewhat closer to the spirit of the Hussite revolutionary movement than to the spirit of Rokycana, King Jiří and the Utraquist *via media*.⁴⁹

The rise of the Jednota bratrská exacerbated problems for the Utraquist Church and the Lower Consistory.⁵⁰ It was symptomatic of the failure of the Utraquists to secure doctrinal conformity which, in turn, may be traced primarily to the crisis of authority which long existed in the administration of the Lower Consistory. In theological matters the Utraquists in much the same fashion as the earlier generation entrusted important decisions to the masters of the university.⁵¹ The fact that the functioning administrator of the Lower Consistory, and acknowledged head of the Utraquist church, was also an elected but unconsecrated archbishop only further exacerbated the magisterial problem. This meant, that the maintenance of authority in the Utraquist church was left in the hands of the secular powers. From the perspective of the Jednota and those yet imbued with the ideals of the Táborites, this led to a serious contaminating of the Utraquist church.⁵²

One of the most serious problems facing the Lower Consistory was the issue of the ordination of Utraquist clerics. Despite his rank and acknowledged rôle, Rokycana could not validly confer holy orders. Throughout its history the Lower Consistory specifically, and the Utraquist Church generally, refused to break the chain of apostolic succession. Even the Táborites who, in 1420, elected their own bishop apart from the historic

49) For Lupáč, see František M. Bartoš, "Cusanus and the Hussite Bishop M. Lupáč", CV 5,2 (1962) 35–46. The Latin text of the letter to Nicholas of Cusa appears on 41–44. For the Czech version see Amedeo Molnár, ed., *Husitské manifesty* [Hussite Manifestos] (Prague, 1986) 218–25. See also Bartoš, "Martin Lupáč a jeho spisovatelské dílo" [Martin Lupáč and his Written Work] *Reformační sborník* 8 (1939) 115–140.

50) Molnár's suggestion that the Jednota never acquiesced in the assumption of dogmatic immutability is well supported by the presence of anywhere from seventeen to forty confessional statements, depending upon the criteria, in the history of the Unity of Brethren. See Miloš Štrupl, "Confessional Theology of the Unitas Fratrum", *Church History* 33 (1964) 279–293.

51) See Howard Kaminsky, "The University of Prague in the Hussite Revolution: The Role of the Masters", in *Universities in Politics*, eds., John W. Baldwin and Richard A. Goldthwaite (Baltimore, 1972) 79–106.

52) There is an excellent and succinct overview of the crisis of authority within the Utraquist church in David R. Holeyton, "Church or Sect?: The Jednota Bratrská and the Growth of Dissent from Mainline Utraquism", 12. It is also instructive to note that the radical Hussites of the revolutionary era posited the Law of God over against secular laws and indeed called for an end to observing human laws. The apparent capitulation of the Utraquists to an inferior legal code represented to the radicals a compromising of gains made in the struggle against Rome and the empire in the revolutionary days. There are several texts extant reflecting this Hussite stance. Note the Táborite demands of August, 1420: "Item quod iura paganica et theutonica, que non concordant cum lege dei, tollantur et iure divino ut regatur, iudicetur et totum disponatur." Vavřinec of Březová, *Historica Hussitica*, FRB 5:398.

succession, were not eager to disregard ecclesiastical tradition as their participation in the negotiations at Basel showed.⁵³ The idea of Christian pluralism was a difficult conception indeed. The *Compactata* obligated the bishops neighboring Bohemia, including the Bishop of Olomouc, to ordain Utraquist priests, but the relevant prelates demurred. During the heady days of the revolt against ecclesiastical authority and power the radicals stooped to kidnapping bishops and holding them hostage until they had ordained enough clerics for the fledgling reform church to perform adequately its administration of religious practice. Even the nobility sometimes joined in the nefarious activity and in 1417 Čeněk of Vartenberk took part in the capturing of Heřman, the suffragan bishop of the archdiocese of Prague.⁵⁴ Rokycana and his colleagues were not in a position to follow this guerilla approach. Instead, the Lower Consistory was tempted to look to Constantinople.

From a variety of sources the Czech reformers had learned that Eastern Orthodoxy retained many of the practices of the primitive church; practices such as utraquism which had fallen into disuse in the Latin church. In religious disputations Hussite theologians had on occasion appealed to the Greek church as the “daughter and disciple of the apostles” and the “teacher of the Church of Rome”.⁵⁵ In 1452 a delegate was dispatched to Constantinople where allegedly on behalf of the Utraquist church he made this declaration: “I do not believe in the pope ... [for he is] a wolf and the source of abomination in the church.”⁵⁶ The man was not Peter Payne⁵⁷ but his presence in Constantinople demonstrates the attitude of the Lower Consistory with respect to ecclesiastical reform.⁵⁸ This familiar account of the

53) On this see Thomas A. Fudge, “Myth, Heresy and Propaganda in the Radical Hussite Movement”, 212–221. It should be noted, however, that the Táborites upon realizing that they stood alone among the Hussites leaders on this issue only reluctantly agreed to participate in the negotiations with Basel. William R. Cook, “Negotiations Between the Hussites, the Holy Roman Emperor, and the Roman Church, 1427–36” *East Central Europe* 5 (1978) 96.

54) On these activities see the chronicler’s reports in Vavřinec of Březová, *Historia Hussitica*, 425, 447 and Palacký, ed., *Staří letopisové čeští*, 473.

55) See Kamil Krofta, “Bohemia in the Fifteenth Century”, in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, eds., C. W. Previté-Orton and Z. N. Brooke (Cambridge, 1936) 8:93.

56) Cited in Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Dějiny křesťanství v Československu* [History of Christianity in Czechoslovakia], (Prague, 1948), 3:87.

57) The long-held Payne thesis was finally put to rest in the important essay by František M. Bartoš, “A Delegate of the Hussite Church to Constantinople in 1451–1452”, *Byzantinoslavica* 24 (1963) 287–292 and 25 (1964) 69–74.

58) “[T]he decision to undertake the mission shows the trend of Rokycana’s thought: his unwillingness to tolerate Rome’s claim to universal supremacy (an unwillingness which, in the eyes of Rome, was in itself not merely schismatic but heretical) and his hope for a permanent status for the Bohemian Church as one of several coordinated bodies within the Christian world, rather than any thought of complete union or fusion with Constantinople. ...” Heymann, “John Rokycana – Church Reformer Between Hus and Luther”, 252. Rokycana

Czech proposal for alliance with the Byzantine church abruptly ended when Constantinople fell to the Turks on 29 May, 1453. For the Lower Consistory and the Utraquist Church the light in the east was gone, now it was either continued negotiation with Rome or total separation. Faced with these two options the Lower Consistory elected to remain more Catholic than fully schismatic. Utraquist records mention bishops in Erfurt, Paris, Meissen, Passau and Münden who provided services to Utraquism. Italy, however, seemed to be the place where most Utraquist priests were ordained during this period.⁵⁹ By 1482 the Utraquists secured the resident services of Augustino Luciano, titular bishop of Sanctorino, whom Václav Koranda the Younger invited to come to Bohemia from Italy. Bishop Augustino ordained many Utraquist priests and fulfilled other episcopal functions.⁶⁰ After his death in 1493, the Italian episcopal presence continued with the titular bishop of Sidon, Filippo de Villa Nuova of Modena, who resided in Prague until his own death in 1507.⁶¹ Despite the efforts of the Lower Consistory for continued reform and unity with Rome, the Utraquist Church worked unwittingly throughout the course of the fifteenth century to shatter the unity of western Christendom even further. In this, it continued the stance assumed during the revolutionary period. The single church in the Christian west in 1415 had become long before the end of the fifteenth century what Jarold Zeman has termed a *de facto* “ecclesiastical dualism”.⁶² By 1485 that dualism was *de iure*.

and the Lower Consistory were in fact profoundly naïve. The Byzantine Church would no more allow this than the Roman Church, a fact set forth very clearly by Milada Paulová, “L’empire byzantin et les Tchèques avant la chute de Constantinople (L’Union Florentine et les Tchèques)” *Byzantinoslavica* 14 (1953) 158–225.

59) Rudolf Urbánek has noted that Hussites were ordained even in Rome. *České dějiny* [Bohemian History] (Prague, 1930), 3/3:834 n.3. The records of the Lower Consistory demonstrate a significant number of ordinations occurring in Italy. Klement Borový, ed., *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické i utrakvistické* [Proceedings and Correspondence of the Catholic and Utraquist Consistories] I *Akta konsistoře utrakvistické (1525–1562)* [Acts of the Utraquist Consistory, 1525–1562] [Monumenta Historiae Bohemica, V] (Prague, 1868) *passim*.

60) *Staří letopisové čeští* 224–245. See also Hrejsa, *Dějiny křesťanství v Československu* 4:48 and 97.

61) See the anonymous chronicle in Palacký, *ibid.* 268 and Hrejsa, *ibid.* 172.

62) Jarold K. Zeman, “The Rise of Religious Liberty in the Czech Reformation”, *Central European History* 6 (1973) 131–138.

The Utraquists and their King

The period of Czech history following the death of Albrecht I of Habsburg (†1439) can be regarded as among the most critical for Bohemia.⁶³ During these years Rokycana came to the forefront of the Lower Consistory and Bohemia gained its first and only Hussite king. After Hynek Ptáček of Pirkštejn, the powerful baron and leader of the Utraquists in the area of Hradec Králové, died (†1444) Jiří of Poděbrady began to emerge and exert a powerful influence within the ranks of the Utraquists. Ptáček had stood against Prokop Holý and the “warriors of God” at Lipany. It was he to whom Sigismund had entrusted the siege of Sión in 1437 when Jan Roháč raised the final challenge to the old emperor. Between Roháč and Jiří of Poděbrady, Ptáček’s influence had been considerable.⁶⁴ However, by the time he was elected king, by the Bohemian diet on 2 March, 1458, Jiří had already made his mark in Czech politics and had support from both Utraquist and Catholic sectors of the country. A few years before prior to his election as king, the young Czech governor had met the Italian humanist Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini at the Bohemian diet held in Benešov in June 1451. Aeneas attended that assembly representing the German king, Frederick of Austria. The humanist was singularly impressed with the-then regent of Bohemia considering Jiří the best solution to the Bohemian problem. Little did either man know in 1451 that in only a few years hence they would face each other on an international level; Jiří as the king of heretics and Aeneas as Pope Pius II. The Utraquist king, like Rokycana, strove to maintain a *via media* among his divided subjects. He did not attempt to force the Bohemian Reformation upon the largely German-speaking Duchy of Silesia or the Margraviates of Upper and Lower Lusatia. The king generally attempted to ease the German-Czech dichotomy by not pressuring unduly his German and Catholic subjects, who constituted significant populations even in Bohemia and Moravia. For example, four of the royal towns in Moravia were essentially German-Catholic: Olomouc, Brno, Jihlava and Znojmo.⁶⁵ In Bohemia, Plzeň in the west and České Budějovice in the south had retained their Catholic character and German patriciates even during the Hussite revolution.

While Jiří sought consistently the *via media* on religious matters, this policy differed significantly from that of his predecessor. Ladislav I Posthumous (1453–1457) was reputed once to have said, “if the Czechs want me as

63) Otakar Odložilík, “George of Poděbrady and Bohemia to the Pacification of Silesia–1459” *University of Colorado Studies* 1 series B (1941) 276.

64) On this see Rudolf Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský* [The Age of Poděbrady], (Prague, 1915) 1:241–2.

65) Frederick G. Heymann, “The Role of the Bohemian Cities During and After the Hussite Revolution” in *Tolerance and Movements of Religious Dissent in Eastern Europe*, ed., Béla K. Király (New York/London, 1975) 32.

their king, they must likewise accept my religion”.⁶⁶ The young king considered Rokycana the great heresiarch, refused to have anything to do with him and steadfastly declined ever to visit an Utraquist church or observe the practice of communion *sub utraque specie*.⁶⁷ The policies of the Utraquist king were in some ways anticipatory of the Erastian tendencies of the later English monarchs with respect to the Church of England.⁶⁸ The question legitimately has been raised about the king’s personal religiosity. Were his policies politically or religiously motivated? As early as 1454 Jiří was accosted in Wrocław and asked why he remained with Rokycana instead of aligning himself with religious practice of virtually all the rest of European statesmen. He replied:

All people practice religion according to what they believe. We celebrate church ritual and worship in the way we think pleasing to God. This is not an arbitrary choice, for the human mind is, apart from our wishes, subject to the influence of persuasive argument. But some people will be led one way and another elsewhere depending upon the influence. I am fully convinced of the religious truth taught to me by my own priests. If I were to follow your conviction, I might be able to convince others, but to the detriment of my own soul. For God sees into the inner heart and cannot be deceived.⁶⁹

To his enemies King Jiří was infected with the Hussite error and had become a “cunning fox filled with heresy”.⁷⁰

While the king of the Hussites may have sought assiduously to avoid proselytizing his Catholic subjects, the same cannot be said of the Pope’s attitude toward the King’s Utraquism. When Rome realized that the king was just as heretical as his obdurate subjects an offensive was launched against the Bohemian Utraquists. The most fanatical of visitors to the Kingdom of Bohemia in the 1450s was the popular preacher and Minorite friar, John Capistrano. The friar preached without ceasing against the depravity of the Hussites and joked about the “fat goose” which had been fried in

66) *Archiv český* 4:406–7.

67) Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský* 2:806–11.

68) I owe the suggestion to Jarold K. Zeman, “The Rise of Religious Liberty in the Czech Reformation”, 137.

69) So recorded by Aeneas Silvius, *Historia Bohemica* (Frankfurt, 1687) 157.

70) “... vulpes dolosissima omni heresi plena...” Hermann Markgraf, ed., “Politische Correspondenz Breslaus im Zeitalter Georgs von Podiebrad” in SRS 8:14. The Breslau chapter advised Pius II on 30 April, 1459 that the Hussite king was a menace not to be ignored. “Hic est leo terribilissimus, qui suis unguis plus Turcorum ferocitate Jesu inconsutilem tunicam lacerare nititur.” *Ibid.* 23.

Constance.⁷¹ The reference to Hus did not go unnoticed and Capistrano did not dare set foot in Prague. From afar he railed against Rokycana, accusing the archbishop of having assembled a harem which he enjoyed in his own castle. The belligerency of the crusading preacher knew no limits and he insisted that heretics should not be granted hearings, but rather destroyed.⁷² Reception of the chalice by the laity constituted a mortal sin and Capistrano was also quoted as saying that any layperson who had in fact received the forbidden chalice had irrevocably lost their soul.⁷³

Capistrano's radicalism would later find a faint echo in the posture assumed by Fantino de Valle. King Jiří took steps to expel the zealot from the kingdom but, even when his venue shifted elsewhere, Capistrano continued to fling invectives toward Bohemia. Meanwhile the Hussite king confirmed Rokycana as administrator of the Utraquist Church at an ecclesiastical synod in the spring of 1454 wherein both consistories were present. His enemies saw this step as further provocation and indication of his propensity toward heresy and rebellion.⁷⁴ For the Lower Consistory, the king's appointment was seen as confirmation not only of Rokycana but also of the Utraquist reforms. Jiří's disobedient inclination would be subsequently manifested in a particularly dramatic way (as in 1461) by his participation in the Utraquist processions in Prague on Corpus Christi Day with his wife and children, publicly marching behind the maligned Rokycana.

In hopes of gaining papal approbation for the recognition of both churches in the Czech lands, the king sent to Rome in early 1462 a delegation of Czechs from Prague: Prokop of Rabštejn representing Czech Catholics, Zdeněk Kostka of Postupice, a special delegate of the royal family, Václav Koranda the Younger and Václav Vrbenský, clerics and representatives of the Utraquist party. The chief issue was to obtain papal confirmation for the *Compactata* which by this time had been in effect without papal sanction for almost thirty years. If the Lower Consistory ever had a reasonable chance of securing papal approval for the agreements made at Basel, certainly Pius II would have been as amenable as any pontiff in the fifteenth century. Not only had Pius been a supporter of a modified conciliar theory, he had actively advocated papal acceptance of the *Compactata*

71) A reference to Jan Hus in the form of a pun. Capistrano's text, "Epistola responsiva ad praefatum epistolam Johannis Borotini" has been edited in František Walouch, *Životopis swatého Jana Kapistrána* [Biography of St. John Capistrano] (Brno, 1858) 840 for the reference.

72) Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský* 2:574–5.

73) See Johannes Hofer, *Johannes von Capestrano* (Innsbruck, 1936) 381–2. It should be noted that the friar did deny having said that the souls of those who had communicated at a Hussite eucharist were damned.

74) Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský* 3:25ff.

before Pope Calixtus III in the fall of 1455.⁷⁵ More than that he had an intimate knowledge of the Hussite situation having visited Bohemia personally in 1451 and just prior to his elevation to the papacy had completed his *Historia Bohemica*. The hopes of the Utraquist king and the Lower Consistory did not come to fruition but instead suffered a grievous setback.

The pope's response to the Czechs was long, but to the point.⁷⁶ He condemned the freedom extended to the heretical Rokycana, insofar as the latter continued to preach. Pius denounced the king for participating in Utraquist processions. Prokop of Rabštejn tried in vain to defend the king's practice by reminding Pius that there were two kinds of people dwelling in Bohemia and the king regularly attended events sponsored by both. The pope was unmoved and threatened the embassy with the use of force should the king of heretics not reverse his current policies. Kostka took advantage of comments made by Cardinal Nicholas Cusa to force the other to admit that there was no religious error involved in communicating in both kinds. According to Cusa, "anyone who says it is a religious error is a fool. But it is indeed erroneous to claim that there is more divine grace in taking both kinds, as people think in your country." Kostka then set forth the position held by the king, Rokycana, and the Hussites in general: "if it is not a religious error, I shall continue with the communion in both kinds."

Pius was in no mood to hear about conciliar decisions. Two years earlier, on 18 January 1460, the pope had published his bull *Execrabilis* in which he condemned all appeals from papal decisions to general councils. All challenges were strictly forbidden.⁷⁷ When reminded of his earlier support for conciliarism and negotiation with the Hussites, Pius' reply was a curt retort: "Aeneam rejicite, Pium recipite" [Reject Aeneas, accept Pius].⁷⁸ In his crucial address on Utraquism, lasting over two hours, Pius II denounced the "errors" of Hus and the "ignorance" of Jakoubek of Stržbro. He condemned the Hussite wars and the vicious "blind rogue" Jan Žižka. Finally, the pope announced an entirely new concept. Since the *Compactata* had been intended from the council's perspective to extend only to those Hussites living at the time, any consideration for further extension to all times carried with it a responsibility on the part of the Czechs to ask the council for extended jurisdiction. This the Hussites had failed to do. The pope then invoked the decree handed down by the Council of Basel on 23 December 1437 which ruled that the chalice could only be allowed under certain

75) Johannes D. Mansi, ed., *Pii II. olim Aeneae Sylvii Piccolominei ... orationes politicae et ecclesiasticae* (1755) 1:336–383.

76) A Czech version appears in *Archiv český* 8:336–342.

77) The text of this bull in English appears in "The Commentaries of Pius II", trans., Florence Alden Gragg in *Smith College Studies in History* 25 (1940), book 3:276–7.

78) This comment appeared in the "Bull of Retraction" of 26 April 1463. See the citation in Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972) 321.

circumstances. The Christmas decree mandated that communion under one kind was law.⁷⁹ Pius went on to denounce the Hussite teaching that utraquism was essential to salvation and condemned also the practice of communing infants and ended by unilaterally repealing the *Compactata* of Basel.⁸⁰ The lengthy discourse came to an end with a declaration of papal superiority: “We and the cardinals, our brothers, are the fathers, you are the sons.” Eleven days later, before a large crowd Pius II publicly annulled the *Compactata*, declaring them henceforth null and void, having neither authority nor validity.⁸¹ Any future celebration of the eucharist under both kinds was denounced by the pope.

What was the response to all of this by Jiří of Poděbrady? Clearly, the future of the Lower Consistory, the Bohemian Reformation and ecclesiastical reform in general in the Czech lands now hung precariously in the balance. The king’s response was unequivocal. Perhaps his action in the spring of 1462 is the best indication. Two and a half months after the pope’s pronouncement the king arrived in Prague in mid-June just in time to take part again in the Utraquist Corpus Christi procession. His presence with the queen in this event may have said more in response than a royal decree. Soon after this, in August 1462, the Diet of St. Lawrence convened in Prague wherein the papal diplomat Fantino de Valle and the king of heretics faced off.

Fantino had urged Jiří in letters and personal audiences to abandon communing *sub utraque specie*. The legate proposed an eleven step drastic plan of action whereby unification between the Utraquists and the Catholics could be achieved. Among his unrealistic programme were calls for the end of all Czech hymnody, defaming or deriding the Roman Church and its doctrines. Jan Rokycana was to be removed from office and public life. Finally, the king should rule against the practice of utraquist communion, and warn his subjects that its continuance was detrimental to salvation.⁸² On 13 August 1462 during a session of St. Lawrence Diet, Fantino argued provocatively against the validity of the *Compactata* and insisted that since Pius II had repealed them, no layman could receive the cup. He called upon the king, together with his family, to take communion only in the Cathedral of St. Vitus. Furthermore, all Utraquist priests should be relieved of their posts, and turned over to Hilarius of Litoměřice, the administrator of the Upper Consistory, for punishment and correction. Furthermore, the king was to ensure that utraquism was suppressed throughout his realm. Otherwise, he might not only be excommunicated personally but deprived of his crown by

79) MC. Basilense, Scr. II 1112.

80) See *Archiv český* 8:360–363. The proclamation declaring the compacts null and void is in FRA 20:269.

81) See FRA 20:268–271.

82) SRS 8:112–13.

the Holy See. The chronicler records that Jiří was hard pressed not to put Fantino to the sword on the spot.⁸³

Naturally, the king refused to yield to the suggestions of the curia. In fact, the king prescribed measures exactly opposite to those Fantino had urged. Addressing Bishop Tas of Olomouc and representatives of the Catholic Moravian clergy in 1463, Jiří announced that he would no longer tolerate any attacks on the Utraquists, particularly those relating their doctrine to heresy.⁸⁴ Again the reforms of the Lower Consistory were safeguarded.

The successor of Pius II, Paul II, went even further and declared King Jiří “the son of perdition” and a relapsed, grievous heretic. The pronouncements of 2 August, 4 August and 8 December 1465 also released the Czechs from obeying their king.⁸⁵ The threat advanced by Fantino in 1462 was finally implemented by the curia in 1466. Despite lacking a replacement for Jiří to wear the Crown of St. Wenceslas, Rome moved ahead with a formal deposition of the king. On 23 December 1466 the solemn act was carried out in Rome before a large gathering.⁸⁶

Jiří [of Poděbrady] ... is named, on the basis of certain knowledge, to be a wicked and stubborn heretic and protector of heretics, a supporter of this cursed heresy, a liar and despiser of the church. This he has been and continues to remain and therefore merits to be made subject to this judgment, ban and excommunication which the laws of the church have set forth against relapsed heretics, liars, and those who support and promote heretics. Because of this, he is deprived of the dignity, dominion and rights of kingly rule and of all other rank. Neither he nor his descendants may ever again possess such rank. On the authority of our papal power we absolve all nobles, cities and subjects, both in Bohemia and elsewhere, from obedience to all oaths and duties now and

83) FRA 20:272–77 and SRS 8:123–27. Earlier in the proceedings of the diet the king had addressed himself to the demands of the papacy and especially to his coronation oath in which the king swore to eradicate heresy from the land. “We are accused by the Pope of not fulfilling the oath we have sworn at our coronation. We shall read to you this very oath ... You hear that we have sworn to destroy and extinguish heresy in our realm. Truly I want you to know that we do not love heretics but that we despise them and are their enemy. But that the Pope could call a heresy or make appear as heresy the Communion in the two kinds, and our Compacts, this has never been our understanding. For these are grounded in the Holy Gospel, in the acts of Christ and of the primitive Church. ... we will also hold it and defend it and with it live and die. ...” The speech is translated in Heymann, *George of Bohemia: King of Heretics* 283–4.

84) Heymann, *George of Bohemia: King of Heretics* 344.

85) SRS 9:135–149.

86) *Ibid.* 210–15.

hereafter. Anyone violating this sentence shall be disgraced by God Almighty and the apostles Peter and Paul.

Again the religious prospects of the Lower Consistory were thrown into serious doubt. Could Jiří survive this ecclesiastical death sentence? The Bohemian Reformation appeared once more to have come close to annihilation.

The declaration from Rome sparked a series of religious wars which accomplished nothing for the benefit of either Utraquists or Roman Catholics. Violence erupted in parts of the country and the Hussites were forced to take up arms to repel foreign invaders once again. Jiří of Poděbrady was determined not to yield. Those who fought against the Hussites did not consider the bloodshed of the Czechs to be a spilling of Christian blood. Those who supported Rokycana and Jiří of Poděbrady were themselves heretical and the blood of heretics was not the blood of Christians.⁸⁷ Yet the Hussites were undeterred and even the administrator of the Upper Consistory, Hanuš Kolovrat was forced to admit the resilience of the Utraquists.⁸⁸ By 1469 it seemed as though the radical spirit of revolutionary Hussitism would emerge yet again. At the beginning of the year in the name of more than three thousand Bohemians and Moravians, a manifesto was issued as “a letter of old Czechs, sincere lovers and defenders of the truth of Christ and the Czech nation”. The document invoked the memory of those times when “a small number of faithful Czechs with little arms and practically naked, led by Brother Žižka of glorious memory, chased away large armies and destroyed them, strengthened only by their faith in Christ and the blood of Christ”.⁸⁹ It was but another example of the fervor of religious devotion in Bohemia. It showed that the Utraquist spirit of attachment to the cup did not wane during the tenure of Rokycana.

In the spring of 1469 the Hussite king was once again urged to give up his heretical faith. Jiří must have wearied of the continual round, but his policy, like that of Rokycana, was to explore the *via media* and the way of reconciliation. Among other matters, the king was offered to live out his years as King of Bohemia in peace if he would consent to the following:⁹⁰ (1) return, with his whole family, to the faith of Rome; (2) renounce all claims to the *Compactata*; (3) permit the King of Hungary to install in Prague an archbishop whose duty it would be to exterminate all traces of heresy; (4) support the King of Hungary in reconverting heretics to the true faith; (5) seize and deliver the archheretic Jan Rokycana into the hands of papal

87) This was the way Matthias of Hungary defended the shedding of Czech blood. See *Archiv český* 1:487–89.

88) This in a letter to Rudolf of Wrocław in FRA 20:608–9.

89) Molnár, ed., *Husitské manifesty* 229–240. The quotations appear on 229 and 236.

90) The list of demands appear in FRA 20:569–70.

officials. Jiří obviously could not accept these offending arrangements. He continued to rule for another six years after the papal sentence without yielding on the question of his Utraquist faith. The practice of Hussite religion as regulated by the administration of the Lower Consistory remained normative custom.

Frederick G. Heymann is certainly correct when he states that even though the king was a religious man he had never been deeply concerned with theological detail and there was probably much in the programme of the Bohemian Reformation that Jiří never understood. But his commitment to the chalice and to the religious practice of his forebears cannot be doubted.⁹¹ The cup was the single issue to which the king was committed to defend and, if possible, to finding a *modus vivendi* with the Roman Church. Failing that he could not, and would not, give up the central symbol and the substance of the Bohemian Reformation. Moreover, the king's commitment can be viewed as identical to that of the Lower Consistory, and his stance ensured the continuation of religious reform via Rokycana and the Utraquist church. Religious reform from 1440 to 1471 in Bohemia, despite the work of the Lower Consistory, must be seen as a Magisterial Reformation. Without the king, the Hussite ship may well have foundered and sunk on the high seas of dissent. In the end, King Jiří's unswerving commitment to a practice deplored by the Roman Church earned him a posthumous papal reference as "Jiří, of damnable memory".⁹²

Jiří of Poděbrady died in 1471, one month after Rokycana's death. He was buried in St. Vitus' Cathedral, the traditional burial site for monarchs, but it was not without significance that his intestines and heart were interred in the Týn Church by the side of Rokycana's tomb.⁹³ In death, as in life, the heart of the Hussite king remained with his spiritual mentor. The king was hailed by the Utraquists and vilified by the Roman Catholics. The abbot of the Monastery of the Virgin in Wrocław had a new chapel erected shortly after the death of the king with a mural therein depicting the last judgment. Among those cast out from the divine presence and delivered to the fires of hell was Jiří of Poděbrady shown carried downward by two demons.⁹⁴

91) Heymann, *George of Bohemia: King of Heretics* 581.

92) The reference is in a letter of July, 1471 from Pope Paul II to the papal legate in Hungary, Lorenzo Rovella. Augustin Theiner, ed., *Vetera monumenta historica hungariam* (Rome, 1860) 2:424–25.

93) The anonymous Czech chronicler reported that Rokycana defended the chalice through preaching while the king defended it by the sword. The details of the burial are included in this account. The chronicler also points out that King Jiří received the cup up until the time of his death. *Starší letopisové čeští* 203.

94) J. G. Kunisch, ed., *Peter Eschenloer's Geschichten der Stadt Breslau, 1440–1479* (Breslau, 1828) 2:274. Peter Eschenloer was the Wrocław town secretary.

Splitting the Heretical Rock

During the 1450s, after the suppression of Tábor, religious radicalism reemerged in various groups. Estranged Taborites, such as Petr Chelčický and Priest Vojtěch of Chelčice, were early leaders. By mid-century, Jan Rokycana perhaps unwittingly contributed to the establishment of the Jednota bratrská. The leading Utraquist churchman mediated disputes among the radical communities at Chelčice and Vilémov. Later he would direct some of the young enthusiasts to the separatist, Petr Chelčický, and thus help to lay “the first brick in the edifice of a rival church”.⁹⁵ Rokycana’s early radical preaching about the purity of priesthood found root in the hearts of some of his hearers. Unable to find clerics fitting their agenda, the Unity of Brethren took the step rejected by the Utraquists and established their own priesthood.⁹⁶ This innovation was condemned by both the Roman and the Utraquist churches. Rokycana naturally refused to condone this act, which was also condemned by the Utraquist king. The state of course viewed the boldness of the Utraquist dissidents, not as heresy, but as a criminal act. All residual protection afforded by the *Compactata* was thereby forfeited by them.

Both the king and the Lower Consistory came to regard the Jednota as Tábor *redivivus*, a form of religious practice which irreparably severed the links with traditional Christianity. The eucharistic theology of the Brethren was all too familiar and far too similar to ideas once proclaimed so defiantly by the Taborites from the hilltops of Bohemia. The Jednota did not emphasize the presence of Christ in the sacrament, and rejected the adoration of the host. More than that, the zealous radicals called for a strict admission policy to the communion rail. The Lower Consistory was scandalized by reports that the Jednota required rebaptism for acceptance to its community, inasmuch as the Utraquist church, like the Roman Church, considered rebaptism a sacrilege.

The Brethren implied in theological language loud and clear, that the Jednota were setting themselves up as the one true body of Christ in the world. This represented a direct contradiction of the doctrinal and ecclesial orientation of the Lower Consistory. While the Utraquists cherished the apostolic and sacramental principles of medieval Christendom, the Jednota revived the unforgotten ethos of Tábor and separated themselves entirely from the unity of Christian tradition. Had not the “little bishop” Mikuláš of Pelhřimov died in the dungeons of Poděbrady Castle? The Hussite king and

95) Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of the Czech Brethren* 73–74.

96) The process has been recounted elsewhere many times. Recently, however, David Holeton has shown that links to the tradition episcopal succession are now very much to be doubted. See his “Church or Sect?: The Jednota Bratrská and the Growth of Dissent from Mainline Utraquism”, 28–34.

the Utraquists must have felt certain they had at last eradicated a heinous error. But in less than a decade these radical sectarians saw no need for their priests to have any connection whatsoever to the historic succession of the episcopate. For the Jednota, the world of the traditional church, both Utraquist and Roman, belonged to the realm of antichrist. The Brethren were quite content to remain outside its walls and beyond its reach. But this was impossible. As early as 1461 King Jiří renewed sanctions against religious groups not protected by the *Compactata*. But even persecution could not deter the spiritual descendents of the Tábórites from the path they had charted out.

The character of Jednota's separation from the Utraquist church can be traced through its early dealings with Rokycana. In vain, Rokycana had attempted to keep the Jednota within the fold of Utraquism. In a disputation in 1463 Rokycana told Martin of Krčín that if the Brethren were to be reconciled to the Utraquists they could be spared from all persecution and protected by the civil authorities. Certainly Rokycana had in mind here the legal umbrella afforded by the *Compactata* which King Jiří had sworn to uphold. The Jednota, however, were not to be drawn. Martin's public response to Rokycana was to the point. "... the way of Christ would no longer be the narrow one and his cross would have been in vain."⁹⁷

The Jednota wrote to Rokycana in 1468 and made quite clear their position that conversion must precede sacramental communing.⁹⁸ To continue to administer the sacrament of the altar to those in obvious sin was to establish those people in false hope. Furthermore, the Brethren condemned the ministering priest for not warning his adherents of the grave danger of their actions. For the Jednota, Rokycana was inconsistent. His preaching and sacramental ministry seemed at odds. While he condemned sinful practice and called for reform in his preaching, he then turned to a celebration of the blessed sacrament and communed everyone present. As far as the radicals were concerned, such priests were to be excommunicated and punished in the spirit of the fourth component of the Four Articles of Prague.⁹⁹ An anonymous letter, "Whether the Sacrament of the Body of God Should be Given to Wicked People", set forth the view of the Lower Consistory that while no one should commune unworthily, there was little to

97) On this see Akty 1:462–471.

98) The document in question is the so-called fourth letter to Jan Rokycana. The reference is in Akty 1:41.

99) Akty 1:159–160. On these matters see the work of Marianka S. Fousek, "The Perfectionism of the Early *Unitas Fratrum*", *Church History* 30 (1962) 396–413, "The Ethos of the *Unitas Fratrum*", in *Czechoslovakia Past and Present*, ed., Miloslav Rechcigl (The Hague-London-Paris, 1964) 2:1221–1231, "The Pastoral Office in the Early *Unitas Fratrum*", and her more extensive "Church Discipline in the Early *Unitas Fratrum*", unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1960.

be gained from assuming a posture of ecclesiastical rigidity.¹⁰⁰ As time went on, and Rokycana did not separate from the traditional Utraquist Church, the Jednota began increasingly to see him in a negative light, still regretting that such a great and godly man should be so reluctant to separate himself from “antichrist” and share “with God’s people vilification, ignominy and danger”.¹⁰¹ Rokycana’s response was to issue a pastoral letter to the Utraquist clergy in August, 1468 warning them against the errors of the Jednota bratrská.¹⁰² Rokycana could no more yield to the Jednota than he could to the papacy. Faced with those alternatives he strove to act Christianly toward both while following the middle way.¹⁰³

As it turned out, the Jednota would perceive their origins in the circle of Utraquism rather than with Chelčický. That circle was sometimes identified as “Hus, Rokycana and Martin Lupáč”.¹⁰⁴ Strangely enough, Lukáš of Prague would deny in 1496 that the Jednota broke from the Utraquist church over the issue of clerical morality.¹⁰⁵ The reforms of the Lower Consistory and its posture throughout the fifteenth century served the Jednota, especially after the schism, as a background against which to conduct their lengthy internal polemical exchanges. In other words, it might be fair to state that in the early years the Jednota found it both helpful and convenient to describe and define its own position with reference to the Utraquist Church. Yet one thing is certain, the Jednota bratrská wanted no part of the teachings proposed and implemented by Rokycana and the Lower Consistory. The rock of heresy was shattered.

The Extent of the Hussite Century

The Lower Consistory did not change dramatically after the death of Rokycana. Even though he had not assumed the official mantle of administrator, the unconsecrated archbishop provided the spiritual direction for the

100) The letter was likely composed by the suffragan bishop of the Utraquist church, Martin Lupáč. It appears in Akty 2:269–273.

101) Cited in Odložilík, *The Hussite King* 126.

102) Akty 2:11–17.

103) Šimek, ed., *Postilla Jana Rokycany* 2:934.

104) See Jaroslav Goll, ed., *Quellen und zur Geschichte der Böhmisches Brüder* (Prague, 1878) 1:49, 53–56 and 114–128 and Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách. Kulturně-historický obraz z XV. a XVI. století* [Ecclesiastical Life in Bohemia. A Portrait of Cultural-History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries], (Prague, 1895) 1:36.

105) Lukáš’ tract, “O příčinách oddělení sepsání bratrské” [Concerning the Cause of the Brethren’s Separation] is referred to in Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* 165 n.31. I have not been able to consult this source.

administration of the Utraquist Church. On 27 May 1471 Václav Koranda the Younger was elected to fill the vacant post.¹⁰⁶ His thought and policies did not differ significantly from that of his predecessor. Koranda remained faithful to the Utraquist cause and the Lower Consistory under his guidance rejected submission either to the Cathedral chapter in Prague (the Upper Consistory) or to Rome. Like his predecessors he continued the polemic against monasticism, laid firm emphasis on the authority of Scripture, at times inclined to rigorous moralism, and held even more strongly than Rokycana to the principle of apostolic succession. The continued adherence to the last-mentioned precept made it impossible in the judgment of the Utraquist church to seek an absolute ecclesial separation from Rome in the fifteenth century, and prepared the Utraquists to counter the appeals of the Protestant Reformation in the century that followed.¹⁰⁷ Koranda consistently administered the Lower Consistory with the intent of remaining in harmony with the Law of God [*boží zákon*], convinced that “everything had to be assessed by [this] unfailling standard”.¹⁰⁸ The Law of God, at least as a principle, remained at the center of the reformational stance of the Lower Consistory throughout the fifteenth century.

While the gulf separating Utraquist Prague and Papal Rome persisted and even widened somewhat as the fifteenth century drew to a close, the tensions with the Jednota bratrská tended to increase during the administration of Koranda. The Brethren had dismissed the Utraquist church as a partner with antichrist. Koranda’s position was uncompromising. He railed against the separatists as the “sectarians and mischief-makers” who are themselves “antichrists” on the basis that they had forsaken the “true faith” and given themselves up to “fantasies”.¹⁰⁹ More than that Koranda presented the practical argument that the secession weakened the church in her struggle against her opponents. While there may have been similarities between the Utraquists and the Jednota, for instance, in the insistence on an integral relation between faith and piety, it seems highly questionable to assert, as Kamil Krofta does, that under Koranda’s administration the

106) The most comprehensive source on Koranda is Kamil Krofta, “Václav Koranda mladší z Nové Plzně” [Václav Koranda the Younger of new Plzeň] *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* [Studies on Bohemian Religious History] (Prague, 1936) 240–287. Emma Urbánková reiterated Krofta’s thesis that Koranda was not ordained in “Zbytky knihovny M. Václava Korandy ml. v universitní knihovně pražské” [Remains of the Books of Master Václav Koranda in the University Library of Prague] *Ročenka universitní knihovny v Praze* 1 (1958) 135–161. See especially 137 and 160 n.7.

107) Josef Truhlář, ed., *Manuál M. Václava Korandy* [The Manual of Master Václav Koranda] (Prague, 1888) 185–186.

108) “The Manual of Václav Koranda”, MS Prague, KNM XIV E 7 fols. 77^r–80^r.

109) Truhlář, ed., *Manuál M. Václava Korandy* 176.

Utraquist Church was closer to the Brethren than to Rome.¹¹⁰ It is true that during the 1470s Koranda presided over hearings which allowed the dissenters opportunity to state their beliefs and hear questioning. Yet, Koranda was unimpressed, thought of the Brethren as heretics, and went so far as to issue warnings to the Czech nobility about their teachings.¹¹¹ In sum, Koranda and his colleagues in the Lower Consistory were no friends of the Jednota. The occasional peace overtures were insubstantial, and the prevailing tenor of mutual relations remained hostile and confrontational. The administrator of the Lower Consistory continued to take issue with certain practices of the Jednota. For instance, in a letter to Bohuš Kostka, the lord of Litomyšl and member of the Unity in 1492, Koranda condemned the Jednota's policy prohibiting members from assuming public office.¹¹² Koranda felt their position was inconsistent with the spirit of the Bohemian Reformation and with the Law of God. As the last link to the days of glory, Koranda stepped down from his post as administrator in 1497 at the ripe old age of close to ninety. Ahead lay the transformation of the religious landscape of Europe.

Perhaps the most significant event in interconfessional relations during the administration of Koranda was the Peace of Kutná Hora. Throughout the period 1440–1485 conflict along religious lines had become commonplace in Bohemian society. Agreements made at high level meetings of religious bodies or by the Bohemian Estates could not always be enforced at the local level. Serious riots erupted in Prague over the chalice in 1483, resulting in an attempt to enforce Utraquism generally. A league was formed to permit only communion in both kinds by adults and children alike. Celebration of *communio sub una specie* anywhere in Prague was forbidden, and those refusing to comply were banished from the precincts of the city. While King Vladislav II Jagiello was powerless, the crisis was resolved by an historic gathering at the central Bohemian mining town of Kutná Hora in 1485. On 13 March of that year an agreement was drawn up which legally recognized

110) "Václav Koranda mladší z Nově Plzně" *Sborník městského historického musea v Plzni* 3 (1913) 98. This essay has been reprinted in the aforementioned book by Krofta.

111) On this see Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren* 46.

112) "There have been and there still are ... certain people who refuse to accept office as aldermen or in any other capacity, seemingly because they do not want to administer justice, having regard to the scriptural passage: 'Judge not, that ye be not judged' ... which they interpret in their own fashion. But ... since these Brethren consider themselves more perfect than the rest of us, then, being lovers of justice and truth, they should be able ... in positions of authority to deal out justice ... fairly and faithfully in order that righteousness and truth may be established and unrighteousness and wrongdoing be put down ... It is a perverseness worthy of reprobation in these Brethren that they should ... regard [their fellow Christians] as pagans, for in this way they insult their neighbors by cutting themselves off from other Christians devoted to God's truth, trusting in themselves alone." Koranda's tract, "Že pigharti odpierají býti konšele" is cited in part in Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* 142.

both the Utraquist and the Roman parties. The declaration forbade suppression of either group and called for an end to the polemical exchange. There was further to be no oppression of subject peoples on account of their religious faith. The “Peace of Kutná Hora” charged both churches to be content with the parishes and churches under their current control and not attempt to take properties from the other. Efforts to widen spheres of influence were discouraged and effectively this historic accord affirmed the binding nature of the *Compactata*.¹¹³ The Jednota bratrská was not included in the provisions of Kutná Hora. When legislation, the St. James’s Day Mandate, was introduced in 1508 against religious dissent, the Jednota became the target and persecution intermittently stalked the dissenting Brethren. The Utraquist church under the Lower Consistory, of course, maintained its protected legal status granted under the *Compactata*, and reaffirmed by the “Peace of Kutná Hora”.¹¹⁴

By the time Koranda’s administration came to an end, the shape of Hussite history had also been transformed once again. The Jednota bratrská had experienced its own internal schism. In 1495 the dissenting purists among the Brethren split from the rest of Jednota and pursued their separate ideological directions. The Roman Church in Bohemia had for the most part preserved ecclesiastical unity in 1400 despite the rising Bohemian Reformation. Jan Hus and his immediate followers created a rival faction. By 1419 the position of the Utraquist church was being seriously contested by the Táborites. Following Lipany and the events of 1436–7 conservative Utraquism came to the fore. The wheel had made its first complete revolution. Jan Rokycana was able to regain control for the *via media* by 1448, only to find the unity of the Bohemian Reformation disrupted a decade later by the defection of the Jednota. In turn the Brethren had their own schism to contend with in the middle of the last decade of the fifteenth century. The wheel had, once again, come full circle. The schism of 1495 marks the end of an era and a clear point of transition in the history of later Hussitism. Koranda’s resignation also signalled a new chapter in the drama of religious reform within the Lower Consistory. The new chapter would involve rewriting the script of ecclesiastical history in Bohemia and across Europe.

113) See Thomas A. Fudge, “The Problem of Religious Liberty in Early Modern Bohemia”, CV 38,1 (1996) 64–87. The complete text of the agreement appears in *Archiv český* 5:418–427. See also Winfried Eberhard, *Konfessionsbildung und Stände in Böhmen, 1478–1530* 56–73 and Eberhard, “Entstehungsbedingungen für öffentliche Toleranz am Beispiel des Kuttenburger Religions Friedens von 1485”, CV 29,3 (1986) 129–154.

114) On the St. James’s Day Mandate see Fudge, “The Problem of Religious Liberty in Early Modern Bohemia”, 73–5.

Better to be an Old Maid Than Ill Wed: A Postscript

The notion of Christian pluralism has, throughout history, proven to be a difficult concept indeed. The dualism in the religious life of the Czech nation stood in sharp contrast to her neighbors throughout much of the fifteenth century. The rôle of the Lower Consistory in Bohemia, in both the popular and intellectual strata, demonstrates the continuing power of religion in the life of a nation in late medieval Europe. Throughout the Jagiellon period the struggle for power between kings and estates was filled with the fervor of religious conflict. The Lower Consistory took an active part in the course of these contests. Given the intensity of the religious conflict and the symbiosis of religion and politics, the notion of an apparent withering of Hussitism during the latter part of the fifteenth century is a dubious proposition. True, Utraquism lacked the raw energy of the revolutionary period but the history of the Lower Consistory in the subsequent era represents a different chapter altogether in the story of the Bohemian Reformation. On the other hand, the chalice continued to set the First Reformation apart from the European reformations which dawned after 1520. The basic thrust of the ideals of Jan Hus and the Hussites quite clearly do not coincide with the principles advanced by the sixteenth century reformers, namely *sola fide* and *sola scriptura*. To insist on ideological unanimity, or even stages in development, between say the Hussites and the Lutherans is to fundamentally emasculate the heritage of the Utraquist Church. Efforts in the sixteenth century to amalgamate the Hussite tradition into the burgeoning context of Lutheranism could not but in the end fail. Luther's Hussitism was but a figment of his own imagination and his confession nothing more than a burst of hyperbolic enthusiasm and affection for the courage and conviction of Svatý Mistr Jan Hus. The Lutherizing of the Utraquists prompted experiments which can only be described as "extraneous, artificial and incongruous". In the end, Luther and Hus were incompatible. During the administration of Havel Cahera the dynamics of western Christianity assume more divergent directions. The wisdom of the marriage of Hus and Luther begins to be doubted. The celebrated honeymoon fails and before the wedding breakfast has concluded there are already signs of estrangement. While the divorce decree is being arranged the Utraquists begin to realize, perhaps unconsciously, that to continue to share space in the house of Luther was to abandon Hus. The wedding party shed their festive garments and begin to quietly return to their first love. The ensuing divorce makes clear the irreconcilable differences separating the Bohemian and European reformations.¹¹⁵

115) On popular devotion to the Hussite tradition and especially Utraquism see Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce* 1:352. I have discussed the basic differences between the two eras of ecclesiastical reform in print and in conferences proceedings with David R. Holeton and Zdeněk V. David. We are in essential agreement. See Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist

Despite sincere efforts at reform and attempts to reconcile the Utraquist Church with the Roman Church, the Bohemian Reformation, on the whole, was just as estranged from Rome in 1497 as it had been in 1437. That reality remains despite the fact that the Hussite king, Rokycana, Koranda and the Lower Consistory did not attempt to introduce new and radical reforms. Instead the aim was to secure papal recognition for the existence of the Hussite church, promote its growth and cultivate its heritage, while continuing to strive for peace with her political and ecclesiastical rivals. Of these three goals, only the second may be said to have been realized. But in the growth and cultivation of the Hussite heritage, the Lower Consistory bequeathed to Czech history, and indeed to European ecclesiastical history, a tradition of singular note.