

---

## Fynes Moryson's *Itinerary*: A Sixteenth Century English Traveller's Observations on Bohemia, its Reformation, and its Liturgy.

---

David R. Holeton

(Prague)

Zdeněk David has shown in his *Finding the Middle Way*<sup>1</sup> and elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that the accounts of foreigners sojourning in Bohemia can provide us with much valuable information about the Bohemian Reformation.<sup>3</sup> As observers from abroad, they bring a new perspective to religious questions in Bohemia as they comment on matters that were new or different for them but which were commonplace in Bohemia and, therefore, often go without mention in Bohemian sources. Fynes Moryson is one of those travellers whose writings bring us a plethora of insights into the religious life of Bohemia and Moravia during the first half of the last decade of the sixteenth century.

### I. Fynes Moryson's Personal Background

Fynes Moryson was born 1566, the third son of Thomas Moryson of Cadeby, Lincolnshire,<sup>4</sup> a member of the landed gentry who served as Clerk of the Pipe and

---

**A note on the manuscripts and their editions referred to in this article.** The Latin draft of Moryson's European journey is contained in London, British Library MS. Harley 5133 and the Irish part in London, British Library MS. add. 36,706. Moryson's English translation of these manuscripts was published in 1617 as *An Itinerary Written By Fynes Moryson Gent. First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English: Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell Through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London, 1617). This was reissued in a photographic reprint by the Da Capo Press (Amsterdam and New York, 1971) [The English Experience No. 387]. The most widely available version of the *Itinerary* is the edition in four volumes (Glasgow, 1907). The last part of the *Itinerary*, unpublished in Moryson's lifetime, is found in Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS. 94, portions of which were edited by Charles Hughes as *Shakespeare's Europe: Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary. Being a Survey of the Condition of Europe at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century* (London, 1903).

In this essay, the following abbreviations are used:

Latin draft of European Journey:	Harley
1617 published English translation:	<i>Itinerary</i>
1907-8 new edition:	1907
Last, unpublished volume:	CCC
<i>Shakespeare's Europe</i> :	SE

<sup>1</sup>"Skazaniia Inostrantsev" in: *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, 2003) 215-6 and *passim*.

<sup>2</sup>"The Integrity of the Bohemian Utraquist Church and the Problem of Neo-Utraquism," BRRP 5,2 (2005) 338 – 340.

<sup>3</sup>In the works cited, Zdeněk David uses the travel journals of Fynes Moryson, Pierre Bergeron, and Henrich Kilian, in which authors coming from the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Lutheran traditions respectively all remark on the "catholic" i.e. "un-reformed" nature of liturgical life in the Utraquist parishes they visited. *Loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup>The Visitations for Lincolnshire in 1592 (MS. London, British Museum Harley 1550 f. 50b) show Thomas Moryson (here spelled Morrison) to have five sons (Edward, Thomas, Fynes, Henry, and

Member of Parliament for Great Grimsby<sup>5</sup> and Elisabeth (Moigne) of Willingham, Lincolnshire. Fynes matriculated at Peterhouse, Cambridge on 18 May 1580, later obtaining a fellowship c. 1584. At age eighteen he graduated with a B.A. and was duly granted his M.A. in 1587. Moryson then won a place to study civil law but postponed his studies “out of [his] innated desire to gain experience by travelling into forraigne parts.”<sup>6</sup> From his father’s will (+1591), however, it seems that Fynes had been intended for an ecclesiastical career as his father had secured the prebend of Louth in Lincolnshire, a parish which would have provided a comfortable living.

## II. Moryson’s Travels

In 1589, now aged twenty-three, Moryson obtained the license which was then necessary to travel abroad. He then spent two years in London or on visits to friends preparing himself for his journey as well as coping with some objections raised by his father and friends to his proposed travels. On 22 March 1590-1<sup>7</sup> Moryson was incorporated as M.A. at Oxford, thus giving him academic status in both Universities which would have been advantageous for his travels as Oxford was better known abroad at this time than was Cambridge.

On 1 May 1591 Moryson took ship at Leigh, near Southend, and sailed north-east past Heligoland making his continental landfall at Stade, near the mouth of the Elbe. Thus began twelve years of travels including two continental voyages during which Moryson saw much of Europe and the Levant, a journey to Scotland and a long sojourn in Ireland.<sup>8</sup> Moryson’s return from Ireland in 1603 brought to an end

---

Richard) and two daughters (Jane and Faith). *The Visitation of the County of Lincoln, 1592* ed. Walter C. Metcalfe (London, 1882) 52 lists the family as Morison and (mis-)transcribes the family name in the manuscript as Morysone.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Moryson sat in the House of Commons during the sessions of 1572, 1584, 1586, and 1588-9.

<sup>6</sup> *Itinerary* I.i:1 = 1907 I:2.

<sup>7</sup> Great Britain and its colonies did not officially adopt the Gregorian calendar until 1752, although its use had become common before that. Moryson’s dates follow the Julian calendar and its English use in which the New Year began on Lady Day – 25 March.

<sup>8</sup> From there Moryson continued by land to Hamburg, Lübeck, and Luneburg and on to Wittenberg where he spent the rest of the summer. From Wittenberg Moryson visited Magdeburg, Leipzig, Freiburg, Meissen and Dresden before returning to Leipzig where he wintered. Moryson moved to Prague in the spring of 1591-2 where he stayed for two months before travelling on to Nürnberg. From there Moryson journeyed on, tracing a great circle through Germany (1592) to the Netherlands and, from there, on to Denmark in July 1593, then on to Danzig in August and to Cracow in early September. Moryson then travelled by horse through Moravia to Vienna and on to Italy where he arrived at the end of October. All of 1594 was spent in Italy. On 3 March 1594-5 Moryson began his return to England travelling from Italy, though Switzerland and France, then sailing from Dieppe to Dover and, by coach, on to London where he arrived on 13 May 1595.

Moryson undertook a second journey and, on 29 November 1595, left London with his younger brother, Henry, and sailed to the Netherlands and from there travelled on through Germany and Austria to Bozen, Trent, and Venice. From there they sailed Cyprus, continuing on to Joppa, Jerusalem, Tripoli, Aleppo (near where Henry died of dysentery), Crete, Naxos, Gallipoli (24 December 1556), Constantinople and Venice (30 April 1597). From there Moryson travelled by horse to Stade, where he had first set foot on the Continent, and then by ship to Gravesend arriving in London at 10 July 1597 at four in the morning.

Not quite a year later, Moryson travelled to Scotland (April 1598) and in November 1600 set out for Dublin where he worked as chief secretary to Sir Charles Blount, the lord-deputy of Ireland. He appears to have returned to England with Blount in 1603 and was granted a *per diem* pension of

his years of travel. The death of his employer, the Earl of Devonshire, in 1606 provided Moryson with the opportunity for which he had longed: the possibility of devoting himself to the writing project that appears to have lain idle for almost a decade, the transformation of his travel notes and diaries into publishable format – *An Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland & Ireland*.

### III. The Making of Moryson's *Itinerary*

In his chapter "Of Precepts for Travellers, which may instruct the unexperienced," Moryson advises travellers to make notes twice daily and to transfer them "at leasure into a paper book, that many years after he may looke over them at his pleasure."<sup>9</sup> Great care need be taken in keeping these notes and journals, says Moryson, as they could easily arouse suspicion and should, therefore, be forwarded semi-annually either home or to another safe place where they can be collected later. To be particularly cautious, the traveller "shall doe well to write such things in Ciphers and unknowne characters, being also ready to give a fained interpretation of them to any Magistrate, if need be."<sup>10</sup> Given the detail with which Moryson records events, it is fair to assume that he is writing from experience and that he kept extensive notes and journals throughout his journeys.<sup>11</sup> Whether he wrote these in Cipher or some other language (perhaps Latin) is unclear as the only literary remains of these original documents are copies of two bi-folio letters written in Latin which are inserted in the Latin draft of the *Itinerary*.<sup>12</sup> While Moryson comments several times on the usefulness of Latin (particularly spoken) while travelling<sup>13</sup> and the importance of learning local languages,<sup>14</sup> I have found no

---

6 shillings on 19 June 1604. He continued in the services of Blount – who was created the Earl of Devonshire in 1604 – until the earl's death in 1606. Much more detailed resumé of Moryson's travels can be found in Charles Hughes' introduction in *Shakespeare's Europe* (i-xix) and "Fynes Moryson," in Boies Prenrose, *Urbane Travelers 1591-1635* (Philadelphia, 1942) 6-34.

<sup>9</sup> *Itinerary* III.1:13 = 1907 375.

<sup>10</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> Boies Penrose, who wrote extensively on Tudor and early Stuart travel, judges Moryson to be "the most conscientious" in his journal keeping of the many "wandering litterateurs" of this age. *Travel and Discovery in the Renaissance 1420-1620* (Cambridge MA, 1952) 322.

<sup>12</sup> Two texts are copies of letters Moryson wrote during his travels and then inserted into his text. Harley ff.31<sup>a</sup>-32<sup>a</sup> is a letter written from Dresden to a friend on 7 March 1591 to which Moryson refers in the first paragraph of his chapter on Prague and then includes in his text; another text (Harley ff.56<sup>a</sup>-57<sup>a</sup> on which Moryson has noted "insert f 65" inserted after f. 64<sup>b</sup> in the text according to Moryson's original pagination) is a letter written from Basel on 24 May 1592 to "Ornatiss<sup>mo</sup> Viro Do<sup>o</sup> Sotori Joh: Vl." which is incorporated into the *Itinerary* (I.i:25=1907 51-51) as a letter "To the Right Worshipful Master Doctor John Ulmer." Here, the use of Latin would allow any censor (into whose hands the letters might fall) easily to assess their innocence and exonerate Moryson from any accusation of spying. But as they were written to others and not for Moryson's notes or journals alone, they are of no help in determining what language Moryson chose for his own travel diaries. Two letters written by Moryson in Italian and signed in his own hand (ff. 295<sup>a</sup>-300<sup>b</sup>) inserted between *olim* 549<sup>b</sup> and 550<sup>a</sup> which also appear in both the original and translated into English in the *Itinerary* (I.ii:156-I.ii.162=1907 I:335-348) tend to confirm this opinion.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example his section on language (SE 320ff.) in which he notes that Latin is readily understood in Germany. Several times (*Itinerary* III.1.15=1907 III:379; SE 391, 393) he notes that in Poland even young ragamuffins, artisans and smiths could speak Latin. Italians, on the other hand, know the language badly (SE 436).

explicit mention by Moryson of which language he used for his own travel journal. I am inclined to believe that he did as he advised others to do and wrote them in Cipher.

Whatever language Moryson used in his notes and journal, he chose to use Latin when he began his long labour of turning his travel notes and diaries into a manuscript for publication. There could have been several reasons for this choice: perhaps academic vanity, perhaps the hope of access to a wider commercial market than he thought might have been afforded by writing in English. It is possible that Moryson thought that, as a member of both Cambridge and Oxford, Latin<sup>15</sup> was the fitting language of communication for one of his social class and education.<sup>16</sup> On the other hand, in preparing his manuscript in Latin, Moryson may have been hoping to find a readership on the Continent where travel diaries as a literary genre were also much in vogue.

Work on the *Itinerary* seems to have gone on in several stages. After his return from Scotland in the spring of 1598, Moryson spent two years living with his married sisters Jane (wife of George Alington of Swinhope) and Faith (wife of Francis Mussenden of Healing) both of whom lived close to the family seat at Cadeby. During this time, Fynes devoted much time to “arranging his papers” which, one may reasonably assume, included time devoted to the material he had amassed during his travels.<sup>17</sup> But it was not until his return from Ireland in 1606 that Moryson found time to begin work in earnest. Three solid years he devoted to abstracting his diaries and to preparing a manuscript which, from his reference to it, appears to have collated his travels along with histories of the lands he had visited. According to Moryson’s own account, this grew to such proportions that he abandoned it and set out on a more modest project.<sup>18</sup> Given the length of the

---

<sup>14</sup> Moryson’s advice to travellers is that they learn the local languages (“Of Precepts for Travellers, 8” *Itinerary* III.1:14=1907 III:376ff.; see also SE 321) by first dwelling in the city where the language is spoken in its purest form, learning the basic rules of grammar and then important phrases. He makes no pretence that the traveller will become fluent (*Itinerary* III.1:15-16=1907 III:380f.) in the local language, but preferred it to relying on Latin or one’s own tongue as a means of communication. For example, after six months in Italy he still did not consider himself sufficiently fluent in Italian and so chose to spend the summer in the small town of San Casciano where he would only be in the company of Italians and not the English and Germans which were his companions at the University of Siena (*Itinerary* I.ii:155=1907 I:333). For reasons of safety, Moryson often had to disguise himself in a nationality other than his own (usually German). He appears to have German, Italian, Dutch and French well enough to be able to do this.

<sup>15</sup> Moryson remarks that in the English universities “wee write [Latin] much more elegantly [than do the Germans] and howsoever for want of practice, wee never using it in disputations, speake it not so readily, when we first goe into forayne parts, yet after small practice, we speake it also more readily and elegantly.” (SE 320.)

<sup>16</sup> Moryson could hardly have known that he was living at the time which is now generally hailed as the zenith of the evolution of the English language. Of the three “monuments” that are generally seen as defining the “standards” for the English tongue, the first, the *Book of Common Prayer* [BCP] was already in its third version (that of 1559), and during the time Moryson was travelling, Shakespeare was still active. The third “monument” the Authorised – or King James’ – Version of the Bible was not published until 1611.

<sup>17</sup> *Itinerary* “To the Reader,” n.p. [2]=1907 xx.

<sup>18</sup> During the life of the worthy *Earle of Devonshire*, my deceased Lord, I had little or no time to bestow in this kind: after his deth, I lost fully three yeers labor (in which I abstracted the Histories of these 12 Dominions thorow which I passed, with purpose to joyne them to the Discourses of the severall Commonwealths for illustration and ornament: but when the worke was done, and I found

*Itinerary* as published, this original project must have been of truly gargantuan proportions.

After abandoning the original work, Moryson then set out to re-write the work as a whole – still in Latin. It is from this stage that we have our first literary relics of Moryson's work: two codices presently in the collections of the British Library in London.<sup>19</sup> Both these manuscripts are “copy ready” for typesetting and corrections are relatively few – particularly in the second volume – but constitute only part of Moryson's project as planned for, in the table of contents, he lists two more parts yet to be completed.<sup>20</sup>

Exactly when Moryson completed this Latin text is not clear but, at some stage, either on his own or under pressure from his publisher, Moryson changed his mind about the language in which his *Itinerary* was to be published. He abandoned Latin as the intended language of publication and set out on the work of translating his manuscript into English. This stage involved a number of drafts before Moryson settled on the final version.<sup>21</sup> The fair copy of this English translation was subsequently entered into the *Registers* of the Stationers' Company on 4 April 1617<sup>22</sup> and was published later that year in three folio volumes as *An Itinerary written by Fynes Moryson ... containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland and Ireland. Book I c. 2 (Of my journey from Leipzig to Prage (in Bohemia)...)*<sup>23</sup> contains the principal account of his journey to Bohemia – which he regularly calls “Boehmerland” – but other comments about Bohemia are to be found peppered throughout the volume.

In the table of contents heading the work, Moryson declares that the *Itinerary* is incomplete and announced that “The Rest of this Worke, not as yet fully finished, treateth of the following Heads...”<sup>24</sup> and then proceeds to present the contents of

---

the bulke thereof to swel, then I chose rather to supresse them, then to make my gate bigger than my Citie.) *Itinerary* n.p. [I:vii].

<sup>19</sup> MS. Harley 5133 which contains Moryson's travels in Europe and MS.add. 36706 being Moryson's account of his time in Ireland.

<sup>20</sup> In Harley ff. 6a-10a., Moryson lists a *Pars prima* which includes the material in BL MS. Harley 5133 and a *Pars secunda* which is his time in Ireland and found in BL MS. add. 36,706. These correspond to headings in his later English translation (*Itinerary* n.p. [I:viii-xi]). In addition to this there is a *Pars tertia* and a *Pars quarta* which, according to the chapter divisions listed, were to be of an encyclopaedic character in which Moryson would write of each of the countries and peoples he had visited under categories such as: the nature and mores of a people, their customs, clothing, arts, sciences &c. Religion was also to be dealt with under categories such as marriage, baptismal and funeral customs. No Latin version exists of these texts and may never have existed. The only witnesses to this material are the passages extracted from the Harley manuscript (see below) and the English version of the text in CCC.

<sup>21</sup> Moryson makes apology for the length of time taken in producing his *Itinerary* and notes: “If you ... remember that the work is first written in Latine, then translated into English, and that in divers Copies, no man being able to put so large a worke in good fashion. And ... to save expences, I wrote the greatest part with my owne hand, and almost all the rest with the slowe pen of my servant: then I hope the loss of time shall not be imputed unto me.” *Itinerary* “To the Reader,” n.p. [2]=1907 xxi.

<sup>22</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A.D.* ed Edward Arber, 3 vv. (London 1876) 3:606.

<sup>23</sup> These are largely a translation of his Latin text in Harley ff. 36b-42a – with the exception of the passages dealing with religion. *Itinerary* I.i:13-17=1907 I:25-33.

<sup>24</sup> *Itinerary* n.p. [I:xi].

the work as he intends to complete it.<sup>25</sup> There is no extant Latin witness to this volume, but an English manuscript – written partly in Moryson’s own hand – in which the heading divisions closely follow the outline presented in the table of contents in the Latin manuscript is found in Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 94. This volume, bearing the Imprimatur of Sir Thomas Wilson, head of the State Paper Office, and dated 14 June 1626, contains over 681 ff. which would have been the equivalent of 1,200 quarto printed pages. Despite its 1626 imprimatur, internal evidence would suggest that this final volume was complete by 1619 or 1620 and much of it may have been complete by the time the first three volumes went to press. But while this text, like the Latin codices, is “copy ready” it was never to see the light of day in print. Why, is not exactly clear. Possibly because the volumes already in print had not been a commercial success; possibly because Moryson (or his prospective publisher) realised that the manuscript was in need of radical revision were it not to appear as a mere curiosity. By the time Moryson received his imprimatur, the Thirty Years War had been raging for six years and many of the places Moryson had visited and whose people and customs he described in such detail had been ravaged by the war. This would have had disastrous consequences for this last volume – especially for the chapters devoted to descriptions of countries, their territories, military power, religion, and currencies (particularly those passages on Germany of which he was so fond). Much of this was now vastly changed. At the very least, for the focus of this essay, the religious plurality and liturgical practices he had described in Bohemia were a thing of the past; their non-Roman practitioners had either been exiled or were being forcibly incorporated into the Roman Church and the buildings which once housed Utraquist worship now saw the Tridentine Missal imposed upon them. In short, by 1626, the last part of the *Itinerary* was unpublishable.

In this final, manuscript, volume Moryson continued in the encyclopaedic style he had begun in the last of the published volumes and set out to treat each country he had visited under the headings that he had announced in his original (Latin) table of contents (later translated into English for his first printed volume): history, rulers, revenues, military affairs, legal system and laws of inheritance, and punishments. The third “book” is devoted to the subject of religion in each country. The fourth and fifth books cover the same countries under such headings as the nature and manner of the peoples, their strength of body and wit, manual arts, sciences, universities, pomp of ceremonies (“especially in marriages, childbearings, christenings and funeralls”) customs, and sports (especially hunting, ... birding and fishing). It is here, in the portions of the manuscript dealing with Bohemia, that we find the most extensive and valuable observations on liturgical life and practice.

---

<sup>25</sup> There is no indication that this means that Moryson was in the process of translating a complete Latin text or whether he was composing a new text. The latter seems more probable. Having made the decision to publish in English and extracted material from the first volume which was eventually to appear in the manuscript of what was announced to be the fourth volume, it is unlikely that Moryson would have composed a Latin volume which was then to be translated into English for publication! Moryson occupied the final years of his life on a work to be entitled “On the Commonwealth of England” which he had intended to publish as an addendum to the *Itinerary*. As there is no trace of this text we do not know if Moryson brought it to completion. Penrose, *Urbane Travelers* 38.

#### IV. Moryson as a Writer

Sidney Lee, the author of Moryson's entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* offers a succinct and fair observation of Moryson as a writer:

Moryson is a sober and truthful writer, without imagination or much literary skill. He delights in statistics respecting the mileage of his daily journeys and the varieties and the values of the coins he encountered. His descriptions of the inns in which he lodged, of the costume and the food of the countries visited, render his work invaluable for the social historian.<sup>26</sup>

There seems to have been very little that Moryson did not think worth recording and passing on to his readers. Thus, in the *Itinerary*, the price of beer, a meal, feed for his horse, or a bed in a small town are recorded alongside keen observations on social customs and daily life in the place he is visiting.<sup>27</sup> For the modern reader, it takes considerable sifting through what may seem like seas of trivia before finding gold.<sup>28</sup>

Moryson is a keen observer of detail and appears to report fairly and accurately. He demonstrates a sane charity towards all save Irish priests and the Turk.<sup>29</sup> As will be seen later, he has little sense of the aesthetic.<sup>30</sup> For matters that will most concern us here, it is important to note that Moryson's own religious background as a member of the Church of England is "high church" rather than "puritan".<sup>31</sup> Writing in an era in which there were growing tensions over ritualism in the Church of England, Moryson would certainly have been familiar with the

<sup>26</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography* ed. Sydney Lee 63 vv. (London, 1885-1900) 39:173b.

<sup>27</sup> Moryson stands in stark contrast with another English visitor to Prague, John Taylor, who spent three weeks there in September 1620 which he reported in *Taylor his Travels: From the City of London in England, to the City of Prague in Bohemia* (London, 1620). While Taylor's short (32 pp.) account of his journey does relate some information about the cities he saw along the way – brief and somewhat superficial because of the speed at which he travelled – much of it inclines in the direction of the sensational or the vulgar. Of the ten pages devoted to his time in Bohemia, a page and a half are devoted to a gruesome description of two executions (*ibid.* f. C3a-C4a) and two to his own doggeral. There are also a brief account of the Jews, the castle and court, foodstuffs, and the military situation in the city.

<sup>28</sup> In his advice to travellers, Moryson suggests that notes should be written each morning and evening so that nothing be forgotten and that, in time, "he shall distill Gold out of this dung of Ennius." (*Itinerary* III.i:12=1907 373.) Boies Penrose, who wrote several works on travels during the Tudor and Stuart periods, remarks that "while [these details] must have been of great use to Moryson's contemporaries and must still be of value to an economic historian, yet these are very tedious to the average reader of the present day." (*Urbane Travelers*, 35). Edward H. Thompson, *Elizabethan Economic Analysis: Fynes Moryson's Itinerary* [Dundee Discussion Papers in Economics No. 57] (Dundee, 1994) is witness to the ongoing value of these details to the economic historian. Thompson makes no mention of Bohemia in this essay.

<sup>29</sup> *SE* xlv.

<sup>30</sup> Penrose notes that "Regarding Venice itself, Moryson wrote a long description which, although accurate and full, aggregating eighteen of Moryson's interminable pages, is thoroughly uninspired ... With the exception of telling us of the Rialto, which 'deserves to be reputed the eighth miracle of the world,' Moryson seems to have been totally incapable of enthusiasms..." (*Urbane Travelers* 15-6).

<sup>31</sup> Moryson, on occasion, cites the Anglican theologian William Perkins (1558-1602) who was the most popular preacher at Cambridge in Moryson's time at the university and the most wide-read Anglican theologian in the early seventeenth century (much more so than was Richard Hooker at the time.) While Perkins was known for his puritan sympathies, Moryson invokes him only on the issue of eucharistic presence (*Itinerary* III.i:32f.=1907 III:416ff.) where his position does not vary from the Anglican theological position of the time.

ongoing use of those rites and ceremonies left untouched by the English reformers. But these he would have known in a more austere form than the manner in which he witnessed them performed in Bohemia. Thus Moryson does not assume the Puritan position which would have objected to all religious ceremony *per se*, but he does comment on religious practice which he considers superstitious or, sometimes, ridiculous.

#### V. Moryson in Bohemia

Moryson began his journey from Dresden to Prague by coach on 8 March 1591/2. The road first followed the left bank of the Elbe and, crossing the river, made its way through “Saxon Switzerland” and into Bohemia. Passing through towns Moryson names as Ausig [Ústí nad Labem], Weiden [Budyň nad Ohří], and Welber or Welberg [Velvary], the coach arrived in Prague three days later, in the afternoon – i.e. 11 March 1591/2. Moryson’s stayed in Prague for the space of two months which included Holy Week and Easter which fell on 29 March that year.

From what he writes, Moryson was very favourably disposed to the Czechs: “ffor I never founde greater humanity and curtesye in any people, then in the Bohemians, both youthe men and plebeans, espetially in gentile wordes with frequent putting off their hatts to honour those they did meete.”<sup>32</sup> Quite often he compares Czechs to other peoples whom he has already met, for example the Poles, where Czechs are presented in a favourable light:

And the Polonians also are of very curteous behaviour yet herein I thought them to differ, that the Bohemians seemed courteous of humble and ingenuous simplicity, the Polonians rather out of a pryde to be honoured, seldome shewing curtesy to any who doe not first give honour to them.<sup>33</sup>

But when compared to his experiences in Germany, Bohemians not infrequently come off second best:

[The Bohemians] contrary to the Germans, thinke it no immodisty for men to make water openly in the streetes.<sup>34</sup> And elsewhere: Agayne the women of Bohemia, contrary to the custome of the women in Germany drincke with as large intemperance as the men, and goe alone by themselves without the company of men to Taverns and *Shenckhausen* (or houses where beare is solde). And so come shorte of that modesty and chastitie for wich the women of Germany are renowned.<sup>35</sup>

In his published account of life in Bohemia, Moryson remains faithful to the model he uses for other countries.<sup>36</sup> There is copious information about the cost

---

<sup>32</sup> CCC 540

<sup>33</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 544.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 540. It is only in reading Moryson’s description of some of his experiences in Germany that one gets the full picture of what life in Bohemia was like. For example, Moryson’s report that “The men drinke (if it be possible) more than the Germans, and are much more subject to gluttony ...” (CCC 91) needs to be read in light of the report that “For with them [the Germans] it is no shame espetially in the lower partes of Germany from Nuremberg to the Northern Sea, if they drinke till they vomit, and make water under the table, and till they sleep.” (SE 342.)

<sup>36</sup> While the bulk of material is found in Moryson’s chapter “Of my journey from Leipzig, to Prage, (in Bohemia) ...” (*Itinerary* I.i:13ff.=1907 I:25ff.), other pieces of information can be found scattered

and nature of meals, the clothing and (often, table) manners of the population. The reader is also given a good “tourist’s guide” to Prague which “consists of three Cities, all compassed with wals” none of which he considers strong enough to resist an enemy so that it would only be the “stinch of the streetes [that could] drive backe the Turkes”.<sup>37</sup> Moryson comments on features such as the bridge, the emperor’s castles (notably “*Stella*”, the Star Palace and its zoo where, among the exotic beasts, he was fascinated particularly by the leopards).<sup>38</sup> Among other “highlights” in Prague, he notes an inscription attributed to Alexander the Great kept at the Emmaus Monastery and another one at the university which (he claims) places its foundation in the year 767,<sup>39</sup> he describes the cathedral and some of the Kings of Bohemia buried in its crypt where he also tells of a “Monument of a Bishop, who being the Queenes Confessour, was cast into Molda because he would not reveale her confession to her husband Wenceslaus. They doe so reverence the Monument of this Bishop (since made a Saint by the Pope) as they thinke he shall die with shame, that passeth by it without reverence.”<sup>40</sup> Moryson, as a tourist guide, was not unlike those of our own age who often delight in relating insalubrious bits of information. In this vein, he tells us that “In Old Prage towards the South, and upon the East side of *Molda*, there is an old Pallace, where they show a trap-doore, by which the Queene was wont to slide downe into a Bath, where shee used to satisfie her unlawful lust.”<sup>41</sup> Outside Prague we are told of the royal castle and its crown jewels at Karlstein and of Žižka’s tomb at Cassel [Časlav] – along with the story of Žižka’s order that, after his death, he should be flailed and his skin be made into a drum.<sup>42</sup>

Missing from Moryson’s description in the published *Itinerary*, however, is material concerning the religious and liturgical life in Bohemia and almost nothing that can be gleaned about it from the printed text with the rare exception of the “tourist” information about the statues of Jan Nepomuk in the cathedral and on the Charles bridge. In the process of translating the Latin manuscript, Moryson carefully excised even the passing comments about the religious demography of the towns he passed through on his way from Poland to Vienna.<sup>43</sup> Information that is of interest to us concerning liturgical and devotional practice is all to be found in the manuscript that was unpublished manuscript now in the library of Corpus Christi

---

throughout the work e.g. money (*Itinerary* I.3:288=1907 II:148), mileage (*Itinerary* I.3:295=1907 II:163-4), crops (*Itinerary* III. li:91=1907 IV:45-6) his passage from Poland to Vienna (*Itinerary* I.i:65-6=1907 I:138-140).

<sup>37</sup> *Itinerary* I.i:14=1907 I:29.

<sup>38</sup> *Itinerary* I.i:15=1907 I:30.

<sup>39</sup> *Itinerary loc. cit.*=1907 I:31.

<sup>40</sup> *Itinerary* I.i:16=1907 I:32.

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

<sup>42</sup> *Itinerary* I.i:16-7=1907 I:33.

<sup>43</sup> Moryson regularly made observations on the religious character of the towns in which he stayed. These are all stricken out of the manuscript. For example, the following passage from the *Itinerary* (I.i:65=1907 I:139) is a faithful translation of the Latin passage in the Harley manuscript (f. 143b) except that the passages concerning religion (here cited from the Latin original) have been excised: “After dinner we rode a mile and a halfe in a paved way, with some corne fields on both hands, to the City *Speron*[Přerov]; [*Speronae ac Granizae* [Hranice] *supradictae, Cives Religionem ad normam Lutheri reformatam profitentur. Aliqui etiam Picardorum dogmata sequuntur et urbs suo Baroni paret.*] where I paid for my supper five grosh. (I meane now, and hereafter groshes of *Moravia*,) and for my horse-meat three grosh: and here I paid for an Orange two grosh.”

College, Oxford. Some, but not all of this text was edited and published by Charles Hughes as *Shakespeare's Europe. Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary* (London, 1903).<sup>44</sup>

#### VI. Moryson on Religion in Bohemia

In Book III Chapter ii “On Bohemia touching Religion”<sup>45</sup> and Chapter v “Of Bohemia, touching all the heads of the first Chapter”<sup>46</sup> [i.e. Of the <Bohemians’> Nature and Manners, strength of body and witt, manuell Artes Sciences Universities language pompe of Ceremonyes, espetially in Maryages, Childbearings, Christenings, and Funeralls: as also of their divers Customes, Sports Exercises, and perticularly of Hunting Hawking Fouling birding and Fishing]<sup>47</sup> Moryson deals at length with religious matters in Bohemia. He begins with a brief, and somewhat idiosyncratic, survey of Christianity in the Czech lands in which his opening sentence covers the period from Christianity’s arrival to its need for reform by arms:

The Bohemians were first Converted to Christian Religion about the yeare 816 or litle after, and when the Popes of Rome had by degrees corrupted the Doctryne of the Gospell, they were the first that by suffering and by Armes wrought some Reformation.<sup>48</sup>

Then, having related that the Albegensians “suffered like sheepe without resystance” and won no reforms and that “Wicklefe in England had taught the errors but reformed none”<sup>49</sup> he arrives at Hus of whom we are given a potted history containing as much myth as reality:

The Bohemian Hus borne in the Village Huskin of wich he had his name, being yet a Chylde, is sayd to have applied burning Coales to his body for tryall of his patience, as if his mynde presaged what he was to suffer. He and his Consort Jerome of Prage, (whereas one or both are sayd to have beene instructed by Wicklefe in England), did sharpely & constantly preach against the errors of the Roman Church, and being called to the Councell of Constantia (Vulgarly Costnetz) a City of Germany, in the yeare 1417, Upon the Emperors safe Conduct, the Councell as superior to the Emperor, did violate his word, Condemnig and burning them both.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> In his preface, Hughes claims that to have published the entirety of the Oxford manuscript would have required 1,200 pages – his volume falls just short of 500. His editorial criterion was to omit those passages he felt not to be of “permanent interest.” (SE xlv) Almost all passages concerning religious practice in Bohemia fell within that category so that, in the Appendix to this article, just over 200 of the almost 3,000 words cited were included in passages published by Hughes. In 1977, using the 1907-8 edition and Hughes’s *Shakespeare's Europe* as a source, Alois Bejblík published a Czech translation of portions of the text (*Fynes Moryson, John Taylor: Cesta do Čech* [Journey to Bohemia] [Prague, 1977]). Bejblík had no access to the manuscript so that his translation has not only Hughes’ lacunae but others in that he did not hunt for the passages buried elsewhere in the text and also chose to omit all passages that concern religion on the grounds that they were without interest. (*Ibid.* 200) I am presently engaged in preparing a bilingual edition with commentary of all the texts concerning Bohemia found in the *Itinerary* in its entirety.

<sup>45</sup> CCC 325-338.

<sup>46</sup> CCC 539-545.

<sup>47</sup> SE 290. This chapter heading, used first for the Germans, is the outline Moryson follows for each nation he treats.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.* 325.

<sup>49</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>50</sup> *Loc. cit.*

Moryson then relates that the Bohemians succeeded in securing a reformation in the church by force of arms but that this reformation amounted to little more than a curtailment on the pope's tyranny rather than a true reformation of religion which would "breake his power" ... "as shall appeare by the Hussites doctryne." The "true" reformation of religion, in Moryson's eyes had to await the advent of Luther when "many Bohemians Imbraced this more large Reformation, and the greatest part fell from all obedience of (!) the Pope."<sup>51</sup>

At first glance this would appear to be a reading of Bohemian history inspired more by John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of matters happening in the Church*<sup>52</sup> than by anything Moryson witnessed during his stay in Bohemia. Moryson had likely first read Foxe before his journey began for, next to the Bible, it was the second most widely read book in England at that time and, later, he may well have been using it as one of his sources in his preparation of the *Itinerary*. Foxe devotes an extended section in his monumental work to the Bohemian Reformation but, in doing so, writes as if what went on in Bohemia was breaking ground for Luther. Just as Moryson cites "Hussite doctrine" as proof that the pope was "restrained" but not "broken", Foxe says that Hus was condemned:

...not for any error of doctrine, which they could well prove in him, who neither denied their popish transubstantiation, neither spake against the authority of the Church of Rome, if it were well governed, nor yet the seven sacraments, and also said the mass himself, and almost in all their popish opinions was a papist with them; but only of evil will was accused of his malicious adversaries, because he spake against the pomp, pride and avarice of the wicked enormities of the pope, cardinals, and prelates of the church, and because he could not abide the high dignities and livings of the church, and thought the doings of the pope to be Antichrist-like.<sup>53</sup>

Like Foxe before him, Moryson seriously undervalues the importance of the Bohemian Reformation as a distinct religious movement. He understands it as a transitory movement which was to find its fulfilment in Luther. It is difficult to know, here, if Moryson is simply rehearsing information culled from Foxe or if his sources were Germanophones in Prague. The latter is a real possibility. Where else would he get the idea that after the arrival of Luther's teachings "the greatest part fell from all obedience of the Pope"?<sup>54</sup> Moryson in general cites Bohemian place names as transliterations into English from their German, rather than their Czech, forms. As someone otherwise quite careful about detail and "local colour", this would lead one to surmise that Moryson may have had more contact with Germanophones than

---

<sup>51</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>52</sup> Commonly known as "Foxe's Book of Martyrs", the *Acts and Monuments* were initially published in a Latin edition at Strasbourg in 1554 and later translated and expanded in an English edition first published in 1563. I have used the modern reprint (New York, 1965) of the 1843-49 edition in eight volumes.

<sup>53</sup> *Acts and Monuments* III:510.

<sup>54</sup> Zdeněk David, has demonstrated that this was not the case either at the time of Lutheranism's advent in Bohemia nor over the course of years until its extirpation after Bilá Hora. (*Finding the Middle Way* particularly chapters 2, 8 and 11.) See also: Joel Seltzer, "'Divided in the Faith': Utraquist Accounts of the First Lutherans in Prague," BRRP 6 [in press].

Bohemophones while in Bohemia and, consequently, carried away with him some of their views on the religious situation.<sup>55</sup>

While Moryson had an interest in religion and religious issues, he appears to have made no effort to discuss religious questions with an Utraquist.<sup>56</sup> Nor does he mention having conversed with a Lutheran while in Prague although he mentions having attended Lutheran worship.<sup>57</sup> Lutherans, where reports of them are to be found in the *Itinerary*, are mentioned only in some of the towns of Moravia through which Moryson passed on his way to Vienna.<sup>58</sup> The only individual with whom Moryson reports having an extended conversation on religious matters in Bohemia was an Englishman and former Jesuit whom he quotes extensively.<sup>59</sup>

What was most impressive to Moryson about religious life in Bohemia was its pluralism – something of which he is not entirely approving. He observed that, while embracing the “larger [sixteenth century] Reformation”, the Bohemians were “in those tymes more zelious and valiant then learned and wise”, and allowed such a degree of liberty of religious conscience that he believed there to be “no lesse confusion of Sects then the Kingdome of Poland.”<sup>60</sup> The result was a religious plurality that clearly astounded Moryson:<sup>61</sup>

Generally in all the kingdome there was great confusion of Religions, so as in the same Citty some were Calvinists, some Lutherans, some Hussites, some Anabaptists, some Picards, some Papists, not only in the Cheefe Citty Prage, and the other Cittyes of Bohemia, as Bodly [Bodenbach=Podmokly?] and

---

<sup>55</sup> Nowhere in his discourses on language does Moryson imply that he had any fluency in Czech. It would appear that he relied on German (or Latin) for communication during his sojourn in the lands of the crown of St. Wenceslaus. At one point he notes that “almost all the Bohemians inhabiting the old City of Prage, could speake the German tongg as naturally as their owne.” CCC 541.

<sup>56</sup> Whereas in Rome he met on a number of occasions with the Jesuit Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (*Itinerary* I.ii:142=1907 I:303f.) and with the Calvinist Theodore Beza in Geneva (*Itinerary* I.ii.181=1907 I:390) the only extended religious conversation in Prague which he reports was with a young Englishman and former Jesuit (CCC 331-338). Here, Moryson’s interest is clearly more in gaining and revealing knowledge of the “secret life” of the Jesuits who were much feared and hated in the England of his time.

<sup>57</sup> There were no churches actually belonging to the Lutherans in Prague during the time of Moryson’s visit but they did have regular use of the Church of the Holy Rood in the Old Town and the Church of St. John Baptist in Malá Strana as well as occasional use of the Church of St. Stephen in the New Town. (I am grateful to Kai Wenzel of the GWZO in Leipzig for this information.) It would also not have been difficult for Moryson to have found a chapel in one of the private palaces in Prague where Lutheran worship would have taken place regularly and been accessible to all. (For this information, I am grateful to Pavel Kůrka.) The Church of the Holy Trinity (Our Lady of Victory since its confiscation after the defeat at the White Mountain) built on the site of the Church of St. John Baptist in Malá Strana, which was the first Lutheran (and first baroque) church in Prague, was not built until 1611.

<sup>58</sup> Harley f.143<sup>b</sup> mentions Lutheran populations in several Moravian towns Moryson passed through on his way to Vienna. (All these passages were omitted from the printed text.)

<sup>59</sup> CCC 334ff.

<sup>60</sup> *Loc. cit.* While Poland may have offered a great variety of churches and sects, religious life there, as described by Moryson, was characterised by conflict and open violence. SE 282-3.

<sup>61</sup> This is not without its own significance as late sixteenth century England was experiencing a growing diversity of religious opinion both within the Church of England and in the small, but growing, radical reform groups that had clearly seceded from the established church.

Spill [Spillendorf ?],<sup>62</sup> but in Sperona [Přerov] and Graniza [Hranice] Citties of Moravia. And as the Jewes have a peculyar Citty in Prage, so they had freedome throughout all the kingdome. Yea the same confusion was in all villages, and even in most of the private Families, among those who lived at one table, and rested in one bed together. For I have often seene servants wayte upon their masters to the Church dore, and then leave them to goe to another Church.<sup>63</sup>

Such a degree of religious liberty, however, did not always bring with it religious tolerance for Moryson relates that:

I have seene some of the Emperours Guarde stand before his face laughing to see him creepe on his knees to kisse the Crucifix and other Reliques. For the Emperours Trabantoes (or Guarde of Foote) were for the most part of his German Subiectes, whereof I formerly sayd the greatest part to be Lutherans....<sup>64</sup>

Simply existing in this pluralistic environment Moryson thinks demanded a particularly irenic character:

so I founde his subjectes in Bohemia more differing in opinions of Religion, yet to converse in strong amity and peace together, without which patience a turbulent spiritt could not live in those partes.<sup>65</sup>

This is a high compliment paid Bohemia, for of Germany Moryson says:

...it is incredible, with what bitter frowardnes yea malicious hatred the Lutherans prosecute the Calvinists, often professing that they would rather torne Papists yea Turkes, then admitt the doctrine of Calvin, whereof no sufficient reason can be yeilded.<sup>66</sup>

Moryson's generalised observations on religious life in Bohemia need to be read with some care. There is a clear dissonance between what he says in his "history" of the Bohemian reformation (out of which Lutheranism is said to have captured the loyalty of the "greatest Part" of the population and where what he says appears to be drawn from Foxe) and what he reports of his actual experience of religious life in Prague. It is these latter accounts that contribute something of unique value to our knowledge of religious life in Prague during the last decade of the sixteenth century.

## VII. Moryson's Liturgical Observations

Arriving in Prague in March 1591/2 Morrison was in the city at the time of year when the liturgy is most varied and the Church celebrates some of its most solemn rites. Moryson saw the various Lenten practices observed by local Christians as well as the most sacred days of the Christian liturgical year – the Paschal Triduum. It was the religious pluralism and the general tolerance among Christians that allowed

<sup>62</sup> Cities and towns Moryson visited in the Czech lands are not always easy to identify. Sometimes he uses the German place name, sometimes a transliteration of the Czech place name as "heard" by his English ear. I am indebted to my colleague Jan B. Lášek in identifying several of these.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.* 326

<sup>64</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>65</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>66</sup> SE 271. Moryson makes a similar remark on *ibid.* 264.

Moryson to attend a variety of liturgies during his stay in Prague.<sup>67</sup> He comments that in Prague “where free liberty of all Religions being permitted, I had oportunity (without Communicating with them so much as in the least outward reverence of standing bareheaded) not only to beholde the divers Ceremonyes, of the Hussites, the Lutherans,<sup>68</sup> the Papists, and the singular Jesuites, but also to have free speech with the Jewes, and to enter their Synagogues at the time of divine service.”<sup>69</sup> Moryson also devotes a respectful paragraph to the Brethren, who would have been unlike any religious community known in England at that time, but, while mentioning something of their liturgical calendar, he says nothing about their worship.<sup>70</sup>

Moryson mentions having attended the liturgy at a number of churches and chapels in Prague. Of these, some can be identified – particularly those which he visited during the Paschal Triduum (Maundy Thursday to Easter). As the most atypical liturgies in the course of the liturgical year, these liturgies attracted

---

<sup>67</sup> Moryson did not always feel such freedom during his travels. In his “Precepts for Travellers” he relates that “My selfe lived in Italy, and for the space of one yeere never heard a Masse, but daily I went out of my chamber in the morning, as if I had gone to Masse” (*Itinerary* III.i:31=1907 III:412-13) and went through a great ruse by travelling from Rome to Siena to Florence to Pisa and back to Siena between Tuesday in Holy Week and the end of Easter Week so that it would not be detected that he had not made his obligatory Easter communion. (*Itinerary loc. cit.*=1907 III:413.) Later, he says that “I doe not commend the curiositie to be present at seeing the rites of a contrary Religion,” for fear of danger (stoning by Muslims, “fier and sword” by Roman Catholics). It is preferable, according to Moryson to make a semblance of religious practice in Roman Catholic countries by going out early each morning as if to mass. (*Itinerary loc. cit.*=1907 III:414.) The religious liberty he experienced in Prague must have been quite exceptional.

This atmosphere of religious liberty also seems to have affected John Taylor who wrote: “The City of Prague is almost circular or round, being divided in the middle by the river Moldoue ... there is said to be in it of Churches and Chappels, 150 for there are great numbers of Catholiques, who have many Chappels dedicated to sundry Saints, and I was there at foure several sorts of divine exercises; viz. at good sermons with the Protestants, at Masse with the Papists, at a Lutheran preaching, and at the Jewes Synagog; three of which I saw and heard for curiosity, and the other for edification.” (John Taylor, *Taylor his Travels*, f. C4a.) Taylor does not say who these “Protestants” were but, from what we know of Utraquist worship at the time, he may never have been present as its visual aspects would not have seemed very “protestant” to him. It is remarkable that on the eve of the outbreak of war, when Prague was already highly militarised - he reports that the city’s population had trebled in size because of the wars (*ibid.* f. D1a) - that it was still so easy to pass at liberty between churches.

<sup>68</sup> If this is the case, Lutheran worship must have been so unexceptionable that it merited no comment of any sort (unlike his experience of Lutheran worship in Germany which elicited positive comment). Other than this claim to have attended Lutheran worship, Moryson does not mention that, at the time, it was still illegal to build a Lutheran (or Brethren) Church in Prague but that worship for both those groups took place openly – the type of information that appealed to Moryson’s note keeping.

<sup>69</sup> CCC 666.

<sup>70</sup> CCC 328 =SE 277-78. “Touching the Picards and Anabaptists frequent in those partes. Their profession is not so austere as humble, abiect, and industrious. They lived like bretheren in Colledges with their wyves and Children, having one common purse, to which all that entred gave their goods. Each Family had lodgings aparte, and each morning earely all went to their superiors & tooke their meate and taske of worke for that day. For they exercised all manuary Artes, excepting the making of swordes and Instruments to hurte other men. And I have seeme some of these men in their Jorneyes apparreled with a long Coate of Course home spunne Cloth, (which all use without difference) having a staffe in their handes without any other Armes. If any be expelled [from] the Colledge for unchastity or blasphemy (as swearing and ungodly speeches) or for like offences, they loose the goods they brought, and they used severe disciplyne without any respect of persons. They kept the Feasts of the Annuntiation and of Easter, but they did not observe the Feast of the Nativity of our lord.”

Moryson's interest<sup>71</sup> and were given a more detailed description than were the usual course of Sunday liturgies which Moryson appears to have attended. Moryson also describes three funerals he attended all of which seem to have taken place in the Týn Church. Identifiable days and places of worship are the following:

Day in Liturgical Year	Utraquist	Roman Catholic	Lutheran	Brethren
Maundy Thursday		Chapel Royal		
Good Friday	Týn Church	Chapel Royal		
Holy Saturday		Chapel Royal		
Easter Vigil	Týn Church	Chapel Royal St. Clement's		
Easter Day	Týn Church	St. Clement's		
<b>Occasional Services</b>				
Baptism	Týn Church (?) (several?)	St. Clement's		
Wedding	-	-		
Funeral	Týn Church (3)	-		

In reading what Moryson reports of the liturgies he attended, it is important to remember that Moryson's own religious background as a member of the Church of England is "high church" rather than "puritan". Thus Moryson was accustomed to an ecclesial tradition which placed high value on daily liturgical worship and during his time at university would have been legally required to be a frequent participant in the sung liturgies of his college. While during the time he was writing there were growing tensions over ritualism in the Church of England, Moryson's own lifetime antedated many of these controversies and he would certainly have been familiar with the ongoing use of many of the liturgical rites and ceremonies he encountered in Bohemia whose basic shape had been left untouched by the English reformers in the *Book of Common Prayer*. But, while familiar, he would have known them in a more austere form than the manner in which he witnessed them performed in Bohemia. Nowhere in the *Itinerary* does Moryson assume a Puritan position which would have objected to all religious ceremony *per se*; he does, however, comment disparagingly on religious practice which he considers superstitious or, sometimes, ridiculous.

Since the earliest days of the English Reformation the question of just how "reformed" the Church of England should be had been a major point of controversy.<sup>72</sup> Accusations that the English church was only "half-reformed"

<sup>71</sup> This was Moryson's first Holy Week abroad and the liturgies would have afforded him something he had never experienced before in his life. As an Anglican, he would have been familiar with the cycle of the liturgical year but the *Book of Common Prayer* had abolished virtually all the ceremonies of Holy Week upon which Moryson comments in some detail. These traditional rites and ceremonies did not reappear in Anglicanism until the nineteenth century and were not officially restored in Anglican prayer books until the last quarter of the twentieth century.

<sup>72</sup> Until long after Moryson's death the English church tried to be all things for all people so that the entire nation could find a place within its fold. This was a tension that was eventually to prove to be

became the premise for Puritan demands for further protestantising reforms. Likewise, Moryson, who was certainly not a Puritan, finds Utraquism less than “half-reformed”. “Touching the Hussites,” he says, “the Reformation was not generall, for to this day they consent with the Papist in many thinges...”<sup>73</sup> Communion *sub utraque*, particularly the communion of infants, was the most striking difference that Moryson saw between Utraquism and Roman Catholicism (“Papism” to Moryson).

For whereas the Papists give not the Cupp to the layety, but only the bread, which they say contaynes the blood in the body, the Hussites give both kyndes, not only to lay men, but to very Infants, because Christ sayth, suffer litle ones to come unto mee. But still they beleeve with the Papists the Corporall eating of the body and blood of our lord with the mouth by transubstantiation.<sup>74</sup>

And he is quite aware that this was a reform gained only at the cost of blood shed:

Upon the outside of the dore of the Cathedrall [i.e. the Týn] Church in the cheefe City of Prague (for it hath a newe, and an olde City, besydes a third of the Jewes) they ingraven a sworde and a Challice, in memory that by the sworde they extorted from the Pope liberty to Communicate as well the Cupp or blood as the body of our lord in the holy Eucharist.<sup>75</sup>

Moryson also notes other similarities and differences between Utraquists and Roman Catholics. “[Utraquists] agreed with the Papists for the number of Sacraments, and the doctryne of Predestination.” Likewise, the Utraquist clergy did not marry. But unlike Roman Catholics, he reports that Utraquists: “deny that prayers may be made to the saints or before images”; and “that they yield no authority to the pope to remit sins [i.e. do not accept the sale of indulgences], that they deny the fires of Purgatory” “they had no holy water” and that they “sing no masses for the dead”.<sup>76</sup> During Lent, Moryson “observed that the Papists and Hussites did fast and eate fish, but the Lutherans and Calvinists did eate flesh without keeping any fasts.”<sup>77</sup> As far as Moryson’s account is an accurate reporting of what he heard and saw during the liturgy, he is an important witness to the breadth of Utraquist belief and practice. However, while he is accurate on matters like the number of sacraments, the doctrine of predestination and the rejection of indulgences, there are Utraquist liturgical texts which witness the invocation of the saints,<sup>78</sup> provide celebrations of the Eucharist for the dead,<sup>79</sup> and use holy water.<sup>80</sup>

---

unbearable – Roman Catholic recusants on the right and Presbyterian Puritans on the left could not live with the compromises such a comprehensive church required.

<sup>73</sup> CCC 327=SE 276.

<sup>74</sup> *Loc. cit.*=SE 277.

<sup>75</sup> *Loc. cit.*=SE 276-77.

<sup>76</sup> *Loc. cit.*=SE 277.

<sup>77</sup> CCC 328=SE 278. Devout Anglicans during Moryson’s time would have kept the Lenten fast as a matter of course so that he would have found the practice quite usual. (BCP 1552 and its successors contained a rubric ordering the priest to announce the fasting days occurring during the week. Only in the BCP 1662 proclaimed after the long Commonwealth, when the Calvinists tried to suppress such customs, was the rubric changed to make specific mention of Lent.) F.E. Brightman, *The English Rite 2vv.* (London, 1921) II:649.

<sup>78</sup> Hus and the other Bohemian martyrs were understood to intercede for the Bohemian nation. See, for example, a manuscript supplement to a Prague breviary (Prague, National Library *adlig.* 42.G.28 f. 3v<sup>2</sup>): Omnipotens sempiternus deus, fortitudo amancium et martyrum palma, solemnitatem huius

## The Celebration of the Liturgy

Not knowing the liturgical texts themselves, Moryson is naturally attracted to the visual and musical aspects of the liturgy and shows no interest in the liturgical texts themselves. As an observer of a basically unknown world, there is often a great disparity between what Moryson saw because it was visually or aurally prominent and what the rites and ceremonies intended to say had he read the liturgical texts themselves. Even for regular worshipers, this can create a gulf between “popular” and “liturgical” piety. Moryson’s observations are an important commentary on the general state of the liturgy at this time. This is particularly the case where liturgical minimalism had so diminished the fundamental liturgical sign-acts that they no longer were able to speak for themselves and had to be allegorised in order to be understood.<sup>81</sup>

Moryson’s impression of the visual character of the Utraquist liturgy was that: “[i]n generall the Papists and Hussites little differ in Ceremonyall rites...”<sup>82</sup> and that “for Ceremonyes, if the Papist be superstitious, surely the Hussites (according to their ignorant zeale) are ridiculous.”<sup>83</sup> The Utraquist eucharistic celebrations attended by Moryson were always sung and included a sermon as well as the communion of all the baptised. He notes with approval that there was generally provision made for an early liturgy for “Cooke and such servants as for householde Dutyes could not goe to Church at the ordinary time of Divine service.”<sup>84</sup> Normative Roman Catholic eucharistic worship, on the other hand, appears to have been the “low mass” celebrated by a single priest and (perhaps) assisted by a server (*ministrant*). At St. Clement’s (at the Clementinum), following the practice of the time which required every priest to celebrate mass each day, these low masses took place concurrently and saw the faithful wandering about so that they could gaze on

diei propicius respice et ecclesiam tuam continua fac celebritate letari, ut intercessione beatorum martirum Iohannis Hus, Jeronymi sociorumque eorum omnium in te credencium vota perficias. Per dominum &c. Examples of the belief in the intercessory role of the saints can be found throughout the Utraquist period. See: Joel Seltzer, “Re-envisioning the Saint’s Life in Utraquist Historical Writing,” *BRRP* 5,1 (2004) 147-166, particularly 162 and 165.

<sup>79</sup> Musical settings of the texts for the requiem mass can be found in both Latin and Czech Utraquist graduals throughout the Utraquist period. See: Barry F. Graham, *The Litoměřice Gradual of 1517* [Monumenta Liturgica Bohemica I] (Prague, 1999) 208-210 for lists of the Latin graduals and *ibid.* *Bohemian and Moravian Graduals 1420-1620* [in press]. In the *Communio Tuam deus deposcimus* (*Litoměřice Gradual* No. 1551 p.210) is found a particularly Utraquist intercession: “Pro quorum memoria sanguis christi sumitur dona eis domine requiem sempiternum.”

<sup>80</sup> The blessing of holy water is provided for in a fifteenth century Utraquist Agenda (Brno, University Library MS.Mk 85 ff. 1<sup>a</sup>-5<sup>b</sup>). Most Bohemian graduals provide the antiphon *Vidi aquam* during which the congregation was sprinkled with baptismal (i.e. holy) water on Easter Day. See: Graham, (*Litoměřice Gradual* No. 336 p. 55). The Altar Book of Adam of Tábor [*Oltářní knihy Adama Thaborského*] transcribed by Václav Čáslavský of Písek in 1588 (Prague, National Museum Library MS. III F 17 ff. 174<sup>b</sup>-188<sup>a</sup>) makes provision for this Easter procession.

<sup>81</sup> This was a general liturgical problem during the middle ages and baroque era. See David R. Holeyton, “Insights into Utraquist Eucharistic Thought: A Fifteenth Century Expositio missae” in Jiří K. Kroupa ed., *Septuaginta Paulo Spunar Oblata (70+2)* (Prague, 2000) 349-366.

<sup>82</sup> CCC 542.

<sup>83</sup> CCC 327=SE 276.

<sup>84</sup> CCC 327-8=SE 277. Such a liturgy is provided for in the Altar Book of Adam of Tabor (ff. 1<sup>b</sup>-11<sup>a</sup>). It is an abbreviated liturgy but retains its basic musical and ceremonial character involving a number of liturgical ministers – i.e. it is not a “low mass” without preaching, music, or numerous liturgical ministers.

the elevated host to the end that they often did not attend the entirety of any particular liturgy.<sup>85</sup> Preaching and communion (except on Easter day) were also of little importance. These two very different forms of eucharistic piety would have provided a very striking contrast for any visitor. Moryson, for whom there would not have been any Anglican equivalent of the “low mass”<sup>86</sup> and who would have been accustomed to communicate whenever there was a eucharistic celebration at home, not surprisingly seems to have found the Roman Catholic practice more noteworthy for his readers than the Utraquist practice which, despite some of its “foreignness”, was more akin to his own tradition.

The aspects of the Sunday Utraquist liturgy which Moryson seems to have found most striking were the use of Latin for the liturgy as a whole but Czech for the lections and communion *sub utraque* for all the baptised. Here, Moryson, again reveals his Anglican background in which the worship he knew would have been in strict accordance with the 1559 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* [BCP].<sup>87</sup> While the Prayer Book liturgy during Moryson’s lifetime was characterised by a certain solemn dignity of both text and ritual act, it had been shorn of most of the late mediaeval liturgical sign-acts described in the preface (reprinted from the first [1549] edition of the BCP) as “dark and dumb ceremonies”. Moryson would not have been a stranger to the use of Latin in the Anglican liturgy as a Latin translation of the Elizabethan BCP had been published specifically for use at the Universities,<sup>88</sup> but this was an exception to parochial use where English had become the normative language for the entire liturgy from the time of the proclamation of the first BCP on Pentecost 1549.<sup>89</sup> Communion *sub utraque* was also the Anglican norm<sup>90</sup> but the question of infant communion had been raised only as a polemical device by paedobaptists who attacked the Anglican practice of infant baptism without taking infant communion as the theological consequence.<sup>91</sup> Otherwise, most of

---

<sup>85</sup> CCC 330. “They thinke it necessary to Salvation, to heare (or rather to see) a mumbled masse every morning, if they be in a place where they may have that oportunity. But after they have heard the masse, or only worshipped the Elevated hostie (walking up and downe in the Church till that be Elevated to that ende with sounde of a little Bell) the litle regard to heare the Sermons or the rest of Divine service on the very Sabbath Day, thinking themselves safe that day from all evill by that one bending of the knee and beating of the breast.”

<sup>86</sup> The “said communion” found in many Anglican churches today is a nineteenth century invention, introduced during the “catholic revival” to make sure that weekly communion was possible while making it possible for communicants to attend fasting. See: “The Question of Fasting Communion,” in: Donald Gray, *Earth and Altar* [Alcuin Club Collections 68] (Norwich, 1986) 16-23.

<sup>87</sup> By the time he Moryson was writing the revision of the BCP proclaimed in 1604 under James I would have been the official Prayer Book. Variations from the Elizabethan BCP of 1559 would have been minimal.

<sup>88</sup> *Liber precum publicarum, seu ministerii Ecclesiastice administrationis Sacramentorum, aliorum rituum et ceremoniarum in Ecclesia Anglicana* (London, 1560) was a translation of the Elizabethan BCP published particularly for use at the Universities.

<sup>89</sup> Moryson had also encountered the extensive use of Latin in the liturgy (for both prayers and hymns) in German Lutheran churches. *SE* 273-4.

<sup>90</sup> Moryson objects to the Roman Catholic practice of communion *sub una* saying “... in the Lords Supper they want the true forme required ... to make a true Sacrament, ... namely, that they mangle it and make it lame, by giving it only in one kind of bread, without the other kind of wine, contrary to the institution.” (*Itinerary* III.i:34=1907 III:419.)

<sup>91</sup> In a polemic against the Church of England, the radical dissenter Thomas Cartwright (rightly) attacked the inconsistency of Anglican sacramental practice in which infants were baptised but not communicated. See: David R. Holeton, *Infant Communion - Then and Now*, [Grove Liturgical Studies 27] (1981) 16.

what Moryson saw at the Utraquist liturgies would have seemed very [Roman] “Katholick” to him.

### Liturgical Space

Early in the chapter, Moryson comments that the churches in Bohemia are not as impressive as those in Germany and that, with the exception of the Chapel Royal, there is little statuary to be seen or much of beauty in general. He also observes that the churches are generally unkempt and dirty.<sup>92</sup> Apparently, the general Utraquist suspicion of statues was striking to the eye of a traveller who, at home, was not accustomed to seeing images in churches but had come to accept their presence through his visit to various German churches.<sup>93</sup> In the England of Moryson’s day, stained glass would have been one of the few remaining media of representational art to be found in most churches.<sup>94</sup> Thus, for Moryson, the “bareness” of Bohemian churches would have been more like home. But churches must have been very unkempt if this drew Moryson’s attention as it appears also to have been a problem in England.<sup>95</sup>

### The Easter Triduum

Moryson spent a lot of time during the Easter Triduum attending various liturgies and was present at least nine liturgies between Maundy Thursday and Easter Day. Roman Catholic worship seems to have held the greatest fascination for him attending, as he did, the Chapel Royal four times (once each on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday, and on Holy Saturday both during the day and at night for the Paschal Vigil). He also attended the liturgy at the Jesuit church of St. Clement’s (on Karlova) twice. The only Utraquist liturgies he attended during this time appear to have been at the church of St. Mary’s before Týn. It would appear that Moryson sought out places where the liturgy was likely to be both solemn and splendid –

<sup>92</sup> CCC 326 =SE 276. “As the buyldings of Germany generally, so the Churches and Mounasteryes particularly are much fayrer and more sumptously built then those of Bohemia, wherein I observed litle Carved worke, excepting that of the Emperours Courte, and the insydes to have litle beauty, and for the most parte to be uncleanly kept.”

<sup>93</sup> In Germany, Moryson comments on the presence of images and altars in Lutheran churches which were left undamaged at the reformation but which, unlike in Bohemia, were said to play no role in worship. “And among the Lutherans their Churches on the inside were curiously painted with Images (not defaced at the Reformation) and fayre Alters standing as they were of old; yet to no use of religion.” SE 269. On religious art in Bohemia see: “Milena Bartlová,” “The Utraquist Church and the Visual Arts Before Luther,” BRRP 4 (2002) 215-223 and *idem*. “Conflict, Tolarence, Representation, and Competition: A Confessional Profile of Bohemian Late Gothic Art,” BRRP 5,2 (2005) 255 ff.

<sup>94</sup> In England, iconoclasm began in the 1520s and there had been sporadic outbreaks during the 1530s. The Injunctions of 1538 outlawed almost all external signs of the cult of the saints. These had been observed in some – but not all – parts of England, so that another order for the removal of images had to be issued in February 1548. See Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars. Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (New Haven and London, 1992) 379-81, 407, 458 and *passim*.

<sup>95</sup> This was such a problem in the English Church that the Second Book of Homilies of 1563 appointed “An Homily for Repairing and Keeping Clean and Comely Adorning of Churches” in which the faithful were exhorted to “do ye your parts, good people, to keep your churches comely and clean: suffer them not to be defiled with rain and weather, with dung of doves and owls, stares and cloughs, and other filthiness, as it is foul and lamentable to behold in many places in this country.” *Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory*. I have used the edition printed by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (London, 1914) 289-90.

either because of the resources available in the particular parish or because of the “splendour” of the persons attending. It is unlikely that any of Moryson’s readers would have been in Bohemia – which would have allowed them to attend the Utraquist liturgy – and most of them presumably had never seen Roman Catholic worship either as, except in places like the private chapel of Queen Henrietta Maria, Roman Catholic celebrations of the liturgy were illegal in England while Moryson was writing his *Itinerary*.

Moryson’s observations on the liturgies of the Triduum (alas, Moryson says nothing about the Palm [Passion] Sunday ceremonies at the head of Holy Week) are an interesting study in the disparity between the textual and visual aspects of the liturgy which were discussed above. Basing his observations on what he saw and heard, rather than on reading the liturgical texts themselves or being given an “official” explanation of what was taking place, the cumulative result for Moryson was his general observation that from Maundy Thursday until Easter morning Roman Catholics “did night and day worship and pray unto the Crucifix, as unto Christ,”<sup>96</sup> and that the general liturgical activity of the laity was concentrated on making their confessions<sup>97</sup> and wandering about from one “mumbled mass” to another seeking out an elevation of the host.<sup>98</sup> Neither of these aspects played a significant role in the liturgical texts themselves and would probably have been described as either “popular piety” or “acts of private devotion” should he have actually asked an educated cleric about what he had seen and heard.<sup>99</sup> The music

---

<sup>96</sup> CCC 328.

<sup>97</sup> In order to maintain one’s status as a Catholic in good standing, since Lateran IV western Christians needed to receive communion at least annually (in Paschaltide) and, if in a state of serious sin, to make an auricular confession. In the Prague of Moryson’s time this appears to have been largely fulfilled during the Triduum. It is significant that no similar activity is observed as taking place in Utraquist churches. Milíč had begun the struggle to replace the annual, paschal, communion with regular, weekly, communion. Jiří Kejř, “Teaching on Repentance and Confession in the Bohemian Reformation,” BRRP 5 (2004) 89-116 provides us with a valuable study on penance and the early years on Utraquism. A study on the actual practice of penance throughout the Utraquist period is still badly wanting. While Roman Catholics during Moryson’s time saw confession as usual (if not absolutely normative) before communion, the absence of any comment on Utraquist practice would indicate that this link had been broken as well as the sense that confession during Paschaltide was an obligation on all the faithful.

<sup>98</sup> Moryson found this practice seriously problematic saying, “That I hold the hearing of a Masse, being always joined with kneeling to the Hostia, to be questionless a sinne...” as they “have further exhibited the reverence of kneeling to the Hostia, which howsoever is due to God at the receiving of the Sacrament, yet to beholders onely of the elevation, where the Priest onely receives it, no pretence is left for such outward reverence or worship.” (*Itinerary* III.i:33=1907 III:418-9.) In other words, kneeling to the host rather than as an act of reverence at the moment of communion (as required by the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer*) was, for Moryson, a sinful act of material adoration. Here, Moryson seems to take a more rigorous position on kneeling before the host than he attributes to William Perkins *Itinerary* III.i:33=1907 III:417.

<sup>99</sup> The veneration of the cross, the third part of the Good Friday liturgy could certainly be perceived as “praying to the crucifix”. As Roman Catholics received communion infrequently, unlike the Utraquists, seeking out an elevation and gazing on the host was seen as equivalent to receiving communion orally. (Elsewhere, Moryson remarks that “the Italians generally thinke they are not safe till in the morning they have worshipped the Hostia at the elevation thereof, which their devotion is done in a moment.” *Itinerary* III.i:31=1907 III:414.) The sixteenth century Eucharistic controversies with Luther and the other reformers had the effect of concentrating Roman Catholic devotion entirely on the Real Presence and marginalising the act of communion altogether. See: Josef A. Jungmann, “The Mass in the Baroque Period, the Enlightenment and the Restoration,” in *The Mass of the Roman*

sung (according to Moryson, “unceasingly”) from Maundy Thursday until the solemn mass of Easter he characterises as “mournfull tunes”.<sup>100</sup>

Moryson’s account of the Utraquist liturgies he attended during the Triduum is very brief. On Good Friday he does not appear to have attended the liturgy and saw only the clerk present at the sepulchre set up for the day and on Easter he saw the play *Quem queritis* and the Easter Eucharist.

#### Maundy Thursday

Moryson attended two liturgies at the Chapel Royal – the Royal Maundy and the Washing of Feet. Both would have been familiar to him – at least second hand.<sup>101</sup> At the Maundy the emperor gave money, clothing and more money (in lieu of food) to twelve paupers. After dinner, the “cheefe of the Clergy”<sup>102</sup> washed the feet of the clergy. Moryson makes no mention of attending the Utraquist liturgy this day.

#### Good Friday

During the day Moryson attended the Good Friday rite at the Chapel Royal and Tenebrae in the evening. Both of these would have been completely new to Moryson. The two processions – the first at the veneration of the Cross and the second at the return of the sacrament for the liturgy of the pre-sanctified – were what struck Moryson most (along with “the mournfull tunes which were heard”). At Tenebrae, where one might have thought Moryson would have been impressed by the lengthy psalmody and sung readings, it was the extinguishing of the candles on the catafalque after each set of psalms and reading that drew his comments. Here he was dependent on someone who gave him a fanciful allegorical interpretation of the rite of which the most remarkable is the anti-Semitic interpretation of the “great noise”.<sup>103</sup>

Moryson reports having been in an Utraquist church this day but, apparently, did not attend the liturgy. It would appear that on this day that Utraquist religious activity was confined to the liturgy itself (for which Moryson reports the decorated

*Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia) 2vv.* (New York, 1950) 141-159; especially 142.

<sup>100</sup> CCC 328. As a student at Cambridge, Moryson would surely have been familiar with the regular use of choral “art” settings of the liturgical texts as well as the “sombre” style of music composed for Lent and Holy Week which were widely sung in the various college chapels. It is difficult to know quite what Moryson means by “mournfull tunes” unless it was, perhaps, his first encounter with Gregorian chant which he would not have known in England.

<sup>101</sup> The Royal Maundy was a feature of English ecclesiastical life in Moryson’s day as it is today. During his time the monarch still washed feet as well as distributing alms – the number being the same as the monarch’s years.

<sup>102</sup> CCC 328. Moryson rarely mentions names. At the time of Moryson’s visit to Prague the see was vacant. Martin Medek had died in 1590 and his successor Zbyněk Berka of Dubá was not appointed archbishop until 14 December 1592. Vladimír Slámečka, “Zbyněk Berka z Dubé,” in: *Pražské archibiskupství 1344-1994* edd. Zdeňka Hledíková and Jaroslav V. Polc (Prague, 1994) 313-14.

<sup>103</sup> In the liturgy, when the last candle which was removed while still burning is brought back, a great noise is made. In its origins, this represents Christ bursting the bonds of death – Moryson has been told that it is made “to shoue their indignation against the Jewes”. CCC 329. From what Moryson goes on to say about the Jews not daring to set foot outside the ghetto during Holy Week (*loc. cit.*), there is little reason to doubt that his explanation of the act was how it was popularly understood in Prague at the time.

sepulchre) and that the church was not used for extra-liturgical devotions as was the Chapel Royal. Here we may find a significant difference between the corporate, liturgical piety of Utraquism and the more individualistic piety of the Roman Catholics in Prague at the time.

### Holy Saturday

Moryson seems to have attended three liturgies during the course of Holy Saturday night and the early hours of Easter morning. These appear to have been two Easter vigils – the first in the Chapel Royal which took place at an unusually early hour for this liturgy (before ten in the evening) because “the Emperor ... would have Christ rise early in the Church, that he might goe to bed”<sup>104</sup> and, because of this early hour, Moryson was able to attend a second vigil at St. Clement’s.

At St. Clement’s, Moryson is once again taken by activities which are of tertiary importance in the liturgy, but clearly visually impressive – he notes the changing of hangings (mid-point in the rite) and the procession of a vested statue of the risen Christ (at the conclusion of the liturgy).<sup>105</sup> It is difficult to believe that Moryson was present at the beginning of either liturgy as he makes no comment upon the interplay of darkness and light or the length and number of the lections that make this liturgy different from all others in the course of the liturgical year.

### Easter Day

Some time during the night “some hour before morning” Moryson left St. Clement’s and stopped at the Týn Church. There he saw a version of the Easter play *Quem queritis* acted by boys who represented Mary the Virgin and Mary Magdalene mourning at the tomb before an angel is let down on pulleys to announce the resurrection. This was followed by the Eucharist at which all communicated.<sup>106</sup>

After this, Moryson returned to the Chapel Royal for a procession, German sermon and solemn mass.<sup>107</sup> Of particular interest in Moryson’s account of the liturgy at the Chapel Royal is what he has to say of the reception of communion itself. Following the custom of the day, there is no relationship between the time when communion is distributed and the moment anticipated by the liturgy. Here, it appears to have been distributed after the liturgy was over. Of much greater interest is Moryson’s observation that “They gave also wyne to the lay man but not Consecrated”.<sup>108</sup> This is the only known account of this practice.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> CCC 329.

<sup>105</sup> CCC 330.

<sup>106</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>107</sup> There is some confusion here as Moryson reports that “mumbled masses” had been celebrated continually between the end of the vigil and the beginning of the solemn liturgy of Easter morning both at the Chapel Royal (CCC 330) and at St. Clement’s (CCC 331).

<sup>108</sup> CCC 330.

<sup>109</sup> Giving the cup to some of the unordained (usually monarchs or heads of state) was an ongoing practice despite the disuse and, later, inhibition of the lay chalice. This continued down to Vatican II after which the lay chalice once again became common practice in many parts of the Roman Catholic Church. In the middle ages, it was not uncommon to give unconsecrated wine to newly baptized infants (see: David R. Holeton, “La communion des tout-petits et la mémoire collective,” in : *La communion des tout-petits enfants: Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Âge*. [Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia, No. 50] [Rome, 1988] 226-229) but this is the first witness I have found that sees this abuse extended to adults.

## The Occasional Services

Moryson made a practice of attending the “occasional services” (churchings,<sup>110</sup> baptisms, weddings, funerals and other pastoral services at which the whole community would not be expected to be present) whenever he could during the course of his travels. He reports being present at a baptism on Easter Sunday afternoon at the Chapel Royal and at least one Utraquist baptism – where is not clear. Moryson also attended three Utraquist funerals – all of which seem to have taken place at the Týn Church. He comments that he has nothing particular to report on churchings or weddings as he attended neither while in Bohemia<sup>111</sup> but speculates that Bohemian practice is probably much like that in “Polonia the lesser” as they have common ancestors or possibly Germany because the King of Bohemia is also an Elector.<sup>112</sup>

## Baptism

Moryson’s report of the baptism in the Chapel Royal is partial in that he simply describes the reception of the child at the church door and initial exorcism.<sup>113</sup> He is more fulsome on the subject of Utraquist practice on which he comments twice. In his general comparison between Roman Catholic and Utraquist practice he observes that Utraquists “signe the Baptised Infants with the crosse, and anoynte them on the forehead and on the neck with oyle, and use exorcisme at the dore of the Church before they admitt the Infant into the Church to be Baptised.” He next notes that “They had no holy water, wherewith the Papists use to sprinkle men in the Church,” which while not necessarily immediately related to baptism, contrasts with the Roman Catholic rite he observed at the Chapel Royal.<sup>114</sup> Later on, in his section on ceremonies, Moryson reports that: “the Bohemians children are not Baptised naked with the whole body washed in the water, according to the custome of Germany, but are cloathed, and have only the face sprinkled with water and the forehead and neck anoynted with oyle.”<sup>115</sup>

Here, Moryson is an interesting witness to the diversity of baptismal practice that must have existed in late sixteenth century Bohemia. The font made in 1521 for the (Utraquist) parish of St. Adalbert (Vojtěch) in Litoměřice<sup>116</sup> was clearly intended

---

<sup>110</sup> Moryson would have been familiar with this rite of passage known in the 1559 BCP as “The Thankesgeving of Women after Childebirth, Commonly Called the Churchynge of Women” which in the first BCP (1549) was called “The Order of the Purification of Women.” Based on the Old Testament principle that child-birth imputes ritual impurity, at this service a woman gave thanks for safe delivery, was “purified” and then was re-admitted to church. The Utraquist Agenda in the Brno University Library (MS. Mk 85) follows the mediaeval use and provides two rites, the “Benedictio mulieris post partum” (ff. 24<sup>b</sup>-27<sup>b</sup>) and the “Introductio mulieris [in ecclesiam] post partum” (ff. 27<sup>d</sup>-31<sup>a</sup>). See: Adolf Franz, *Die kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter* 2v. (Freiburg im Bresgau, 1909) 2:208-240.

<sup>111</sup> CCC 542.

<sup>112</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>113</sup> CCC 330-1.

<sup>114</sup> The practice of sprinkling the candidate with holy water as part of the exorcism is not called for in the rite itself anticipating, as it does, the baptismal waters themselves of which holy water is, itself, an anamnesis.

<sup>115</sup> CCC 542.

<sup>116</sup> *Z pokladů litoměřické diecéze III.* [From the Treasury of Litoměřice Diocese] (Prague, 1997) 112 fig. 145.

for baptism by immersion as was the font made in 1542 for the (Utraquist) parish in Jílové u Prahy.<sup>117</sup> The Utraquist Agenda in the Brno University Library provides for the three-fold immersion of the infant<sup>118</sup> but only for a single post-baptismal anointing – on the crown of the head.<sup>119</sup>

### Funerals

Of all the liturgies Moryson attended while in Prague, it is funerals that elicit his most detailed descriptions. His was an age in which the pomp surrounding death and burial – particularly for the upper classes – held an important place in public social ritual.<sup>120</sup> Moryson carefully noted the “pomp” surrounding the funerals he attended (the cortège, the manner in which the body was dressed, the public demonstration of grief) in much greater detail than anything that was said or sung within the liturgical rite of burial itself. Once again, the visual impression was dominant for Moryson. What struck him as being of most interest in the funeral rite itself was the custom of raising the coffin and lifting it to the four corners of the church immediately before the body was taken to the place of burial. Whether this was a local custom of the parish or one that was in general use is not clear as there is no rubric directing it in the known Utraquist liturgical texts. But, again, it would have been a very striking act and something entirely outside his previous experience at the burial of the dead. Moryson also makes no mention of a celebration of the Eucharist in conjunction with the funeral – something for which provision was made in the liturgical texts – but which may have led him to make his earlier remark that “they sunge no masses for the dead”.<sup>121</sup> While in his introduction to religion in Bohemia, Moryson remarks that the Utraquists “used rediculous Ceremonyes in buyriall, as shalbe shewed in the next booke”<sup>122</sup> he does not comment on which ceremonies he considered ridiculous. This may well have been the raising of the body to the four corners of the church but it may equally well have been the public demonstration of grief that seems to have troubled Moryson’s personal (perhaps, English cultural) sensibilities on the (in)appropriateness of public expression of emotion.

### Evaluation

Fynes Moryson reports more extensively on religious practice in Bohemia than does any other foreign traveller whose writings have come down to us. As such, his *Itinerary* is of great value to the student of the Bohemian Reformation. It is difficult, however, to know exactly how to evaluate some of his observations for amongst them there are pieces of information that seem quite extraordinary and for which we have no other witness (e.g. the unconsecrated lay chalice at the Chapel Royal on Easter Day). Similarly, there are other accounts of his which appear to be

---

<sup>117</sup> Whether immersion was the invariable practice in parish churches is not clear. Baptism by immersion in an unheated church in March or April (when Moryson was in Prague) could have been dangerous to the infant’s health.

<sup>118</sup> Brno, University Library MS. Mk 85 f. 22<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.* f.22<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>120</sup> An account exists of the funeral on 26 February 1611/2 of Moryson’s sister, Jane Alington, from the parish of St. Botolph’s, London. In the procession, thirty-six poor women walked two-by-two and the male mourners all wore black cloaks. *SE* xxxix.

<sup>121</sup> CCC 327.

<sup>122</sup> *Loc. cit.*

simple errors of fact (e.g. his assertions that Utraquists did not invoke the saints, that they used Latin as the normative liturgical language save for the readings and occasional services, and that they baptised infants by effusion alone).

These observations, which are unique to Moryson, present a very different picture of liturgical practice in late sixteenth-century Bohemia than the one that has been commonly held and certainly demand further research to see if they can be corroborated by other texts. What appear to be errors of fact, may well be testimonies to the reality that there was a much wider diversity of Utraquist liturgical practice and as well as a plurality of Utraquist theological opinion towards the end of the sixteenth century than is generally acknowledged.<sup>123</sup> Interestingly, Moryson's account of Utraquist liturgical practices otherwise not enjoined in the known liturgical texts helps make sense of other, somewhat puzzling, contemporary correspondence between parishes, clergy and the Prague Utraquist Consistory as well as the Archbishop.<sup>124</sup> Moryson's remarks that Utraquists do not invoke the saints appear to reflect the use in several parishes whose graduals have a number of emendations in a later hands changing invocations of Mary and the saints "to invocations of either the first or second Persons of the Trinity."<sup>125</sup> Here, Moryson's *Itinerary* provides us with a few more pieces which help to reconstruct the very complicated puzzle that is Utraquist liturgical practice during this late period.

<sup>123</sup> Hana Vihová-Wörner makes a similar observation about local diverse uses and local experiments in her "Bohemian Utraquists' Repertory of Proper Tropes," BRRP 5,2 (2004) 317-18.

<sup>124</sup> The Utraquist Consistory followed a policy that opposed this diversity. For example, in 1564 it wrote to the Prague clergy insisting that changes not be made to the missal and that they respect the Consistory's liturgical directives as normative. (*Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobilou přijímajících ... 1562-1570* ed. Julius Pažout (Prague, 1906) 122 no. 207). That these directives were not obeyed is clear from another letter from 1565 in which the priest Jan Misenus (who had been rector of Kadaň, later in neighbouring Žaboklíky, and then sent to Litovel in Moravia for disregarding the Consistory's liturgical use) was instructed that he *not* celebrate in the manner he had used in Kadaň (*ibid.* 182-3 no. 283). Misenus's innovations were because he knew too little Latin to celebrate according to the Consistory's norms.

Antonin Brus, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Prague was also faced with the problem of liturgical diversity. In 1569 the parish of Volyně in Southern Bohemia wrote to its patron, the Grand Prior of the Knights of Malta in Strakonice, asking that he intercede with the archbishop to allow the parish to return to the use of Czech for the liturgical readings and prayers as they had done under a former (Roman Catholic priest) so that the liturgy would be more comprehensible. Failure to do so would mean that an increasing number of parishioners who claimed that they could not understand the liturgy would worship in neighbouring non-Roman parishes or else to continue to remain at home reading the in Czech liturgy alone (*ibid.* 400-401 nos. 560 and 561).

<sup>125</sup> The Kolín or Časlav Gradual (Prague, National Museum Library MS. XII A 25) provides a number of examples. On the Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul (ff.169b-170) the text "Tu es vas electionis sancte Paule apostole gencium doctor **pro omnibus nobis ora deum qui te elegit,**" has been changed to: "**ut praedices Christum salvatorem omnium.**" On the feast of the Assumption (f.246) the prose has been changed so that "Tibi suam manifestatem...implorans **Maria**" becomes "**Iesu Christe.**" On the feast of the Nativity of the BVM (f.251) the prose has again been changed:

"Et nos peccatores **tibi devotio**" becomes "**Christe**"; "Nos hac die tibi gregatos serva **virgo** in loci mundi que prodisti **paritura** celo" become "**Christe**" and "**ostensurus**" respectively. Again, on the feast of S. Michael and All Angels the invocation "Audi nos **michael angele summe**" becomes "**Iesu fili altissimi.**" Similarly, in the Stabat mater (f.285) there are a whole series of changes including: "**Eya Mater**" becomes "**Eya Christe**", "**Sancta Mater**" becomes "**Deus Pater**", "Fac me flere **tecum**" becomes "**illum**" as does "Iuxta crucis **tecum.**"

## Conclusion

Liturgy is an organic phenomenon. It grows, develops and occasionally mutates. Utraquist liturgical practice was often self-consciously conservative and resistant to change. From the time of its inception, the historic liturgical texts were among those appealed to in the debates that defined Utraquism's fundamental character.<sup>126</sup> Throughout its existence, Utraquists continued to point to their faithful use of the Prague Use of the Roman Rite as a demonstration of Utraquism's catholicity and historic continuity.<sup>127</sup> At times this involved a contrived or false historicism.<sup>128</sup>

Despite this fundamental liturgical conservatism, Utraquist liturgical practice, like that of all churches, also evolved in response to changed circumstances, new theological insights, and pressure to meet particular pastoral needs.<sup>129</sup> Sometimes these new developments were idiosyncratic and know of no parallel in the history of the liturgy.<sup>130</sup> Traditional practices were sometimes displaced by innovations that distorted the original intention of the rites themselves and, in time, these new practices came to be seen as constituting "the tradition". Without any official body responsible for the regulation of the liturgy, and with Utraquism's generally loose administrative structure, local uses (some of which were inconsistent with the

<sup>126</sup> During the progress of the debates over infant communion, for example, Jakoubek of Stříbro claimed that the patristic practice of communicating infants was also the historic practice of the Bohemian church. As proof of this, he repeatedly cites a text from an "old Agenda" which witnesses to the practice (*Epistula de quibusdam punctis* [1417] Prague, National Library VIII E 7 f.110<sup>b</sup> [Spunar I: No. 659]; *Tractatus de communione parvulorum: Videtur michi* [1417-18] Prague, Capitular Library D 118 f. 61<sup>a</sup> (Spunar I: No. 574); *Videtur quod, sicut baptismus* [1418?] Prague, National Library VIII D 15 ff. 133<sup>a-b</sup>; and *Ad honorem* [1419] Prague, National Museum Library XVIII C 73 f.22<sup>a</sup> [Spunar I: No. 611]). In the text, the newly baptised infant is communicated after being vested in the chrisom (and confirmed, should the bishop be present). A fourteenth century Agenda found in the National Library in Prague (VI G 7) follows the order: chrisom, baptismal candle, communion with no mention of confirmation as the book was made for presbyters (f. 31<sup>a</sup> – 32<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>127</sup> See, for example, Pavel Bydžovský, *Deťátka a neviňátka hned po přijetí křtu sv. Tělo a Krev Boží, že přijímají mají* (Prague, 1541) f. B1<sup>a-b</sup>. In 1609, Rudolf II enjoined the Prague Utraquist Consistory to observe the Use of the Archdiocese of Prague, by which he meant those contained in the historic liturgical books of the diocese and not the post-Tridentine books in current use by Roman Catholics. See: Zdeněk David, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609-1620," BRRP 3 (2000) 179.

<sup>128</sup> The Utraquist musical repertoire (both Latin and Czech), for example, contained pieces that had long since fallen from use elsewhere in the Western liturgy but which could be pointed to by Utraquists when asserting the antiquity of their practices. At times, however, the actual use of these ancient texts in Bohemia did not antedate the "reformed" liturgical books produced under the aegis of Arnošt of Pardubice and which were to serve as an "editio typica" for the newly erected metropolitan see. Hana Vlhová-Wörner, *Tropi Proprii Missae* 1 (Prague, 2004).

<sup>129</sup> Among these could be included the introduction of the vernacular as a part of the linguistic "evolution" which began in the fourteenth century in which Czech became a "sacred" language. See my "The Jistebnice Kancionál and the Emergence of Vernacular Liturgy in Bohemia," (forthcoming). Similarly, the rubrical provision for lay involvement in the visitation of the sick (see, for example, MS. Brno, University Library Mk 85) could be seen as a response to a renewed ecclesiology in which the those who were not ordained also had an integral role in the ministrations of the church.

<sup>130</sup> A good example of this is the evolution of the preparation of the bread and wine at the Eucharist. See David R. Holeton "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: Baumstark Confirmed," in Robert F. Taft and Gabriele Winkler edd., *Acts of the International Congress Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872 -1948)* [Orientalia Christiana Analecta 265] (Rome, 2001) 777-785 which elaborates what I first developed in: "'All Manner of Wonder Under the Sun': A Curious Development in the Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy," BRRP 3 (2000) 161-172.

historic Use of Prague and Western liturgical tradition as a whole) developed and became custom.

When the time comes to write a monograph on Utraquist worship, this late period may well be one in which liturgical diversity and local initiative will be key factors in distinguishing between Utraquist and Roman Catholic liturgical practice. Both traditions had the same roots – both were different uses of the Roman Rite – and many of the differences would generally have been imperceptible to the ordinary observer. Hence Moryson was quite accurate in his observation that “[i]n generall the Papists and Hussites little differ in Ceremonyall rites....” But a more fundamental factor underlay these different uses: one of attitude. Utraquism was engaged in an ongoing process of liturgical inculturation which had begun long before Utraquism itself existed. Like every diocese in pre-print Europe, Prague had changed and adapted the original imported liturgical books (themselves adaptations of the Roman Rite) to meet the liturgical needs of the local church in which they were being used.<sup>131</sup> Post-Tridentine Roman Catholicism, on the other hand, was engaged in a contrary process – one that demanded absolute liturgical conformity leading, eventually, to the extirpation of all local uses. This was made possible by the printing press,<sup>132</sup> the decrees of the newly created (1588) Congregation of Sacred Rites,<sup>133</sup> the gradual disappearance of all diocesan uses,<sup>134</sup> and the eventual universal adoption of the post-Tridentine liturgical books throughout Latin Christendom.

This struggle of mentalities was one which began with the new understanding of liturgical conformity created by the invention of the printing press and the subsequent “*editio typica*” for each liturgical text. Fidelity to the tradition came to

---

<sup>131</sup> In the case of the books produced under Arnošt of Pardubice, some of the changes probably reflected the desire to make the new archbishopric’s liturgical use distinct from the uses of the surrounding dioceses thus imprinting a particular character on the local church.

<sup>132</sup> The printing press made possible the publication of the Roman rubrics at the beginning of the breviary and missal. Drawing on the 1502 *Ritus servandus in celebratione missae* of Johannes Burckhard, papal master of ceremonies, the Missal of Pius V (1570) demanded a uniformity of Use and practice heretofore unheard of in the Western Church.

<sup>133</sup> The Congregation itself was faced with bringing order to a chaotic liturgical situation within the Roman Church. See: H. Jedin, “Das Konzil von Trent und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches,” *Liturgisches Leben* 6 (1939) 30-66 here at 44. In a 1561 report to the Emperor Ferdinand I on the state of the Roman Catholic Church in Austria, Friedrich Staphylus noted such abuses as priests omitting the Introit, Gradual, Offertory and even the Canon Missæ, distributing communion *sub utraque*, baptising in the vernacular, and the giving of left-over Eucharistic bread to children. Friedrich Staphylus, “De defectibus circa cultum divinum, & his Parochis, qui adhuc speciem Catholici preserverunt,” and “De defectibus circa Parochos Catholicos,” in “De Instauranda in terris Austriacis Romano-Catholica ad Augustiss. Imp. Ferdinandum I. Consultatio,” in Johan Georg Schellhorn, *Amoenitates Historiæ ecclesiasticæ et litterariæ ...*, 2vv. (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1737) 1:632-34.

<sup>134</sup> Prague, like many other dioceses, could have retained its own liturgical Use as it had been established for more than two hundred years. In the end, most dioceses abandoned their traditional Uses and adopted the Roman books for economic reasons, because it was cheaper to buy the Roman texts which were being produced in quantity and, therefore, less expensively than the relatively small printings of their own diocesan Uses. There are nine known editions of the Prague Missal printed between 1479 and 1522 so that the restoration of the Roman Catholic Archbishop in Prague saw no attempt to restore the Prague Use clung to by Utraquists but, rather, the imposition of the *Missale Romanum* as an assertion of loyalty to Rome. For the editions of the Prague Missal see: W.H. Iacobus Weale and H. Bohatta, *Bibliographia Liturgica: Catalogus Missalium Ritus Latini* (London, 1927) 138-140.

demand an absolute conformity of text rather than the more general conformity to the shape and spirit of the Roman Rite which had characterised earlier liturgical practice. While Utraquists used printed editions of the Prague Missal and Breviary from the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth century,<sup>135</sup> they also persisted in their use of liturgical manuscripts long after Roman parishes in Bohemia had abandoned them in favour of printed texts. Thus, the Utraquist liturgical books themselves allowed for the ongoing local adaptation of the liturgy and the introduction of new texts which was possible as manuscripts could be easily changed and emended every time they were copied, while the printed post-Tridentine Roman books were intended to bring this process to an end. Here again, the gulf between Utraquism and Roman Catholicism continued to widen. Fynes Moryson's observations on liturgical life in Bohemia help illustrate this process and provide additional insights into some of the dynamics of what is one of the most fascinating periods in the history of the Western liturgy.

---

<sup>135</sup> There are a number of printed Prague Missals and Breviaries where manuscript annotations and supplements make clear that they were in Utraquist use. For example, Prague, Strahov DR V 12 has the feast of Hus written into the Calendar on 6 July as well as a supplement containing a Czech translation of the Propers for both the *temporale* and *sanctorale*. Similarly, a printed Prague Breviary (National Library *adlig.* 42 G 28) also has Hus entered by hand in the Calendar as well as a supplement containing propers for the feast of St. Jan Hus among others.

Appendix  
THE LITURGICAL PORTIONS OF FYNES MORYSON'S *ITINERARY*  
CONTAINED IN  
OXFORD, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE MS 94

Book III

Chapter ii: Of Bohemia touching Religion  
and

Chapter v: Of Bohemia, touching all the heades of the first Chapter

<i.e. nature, wit, manners, bodily gifts, Universities, Sciences, Arts, language, pompous Ceremonies, specially at Marriages, Christenings and Funerals: of their customes, sports, exercises, and particularly hunting.>

*Numbers in **[[bold]]** are the pagination in the manuscript; **SE** is the equivalent page in Charles Hughes Shakespeare's Europe (London, 1903) where he has transcribed a part of the text. The original punctuation, capitalisation and spelling have been retained with the exception of ff at the beginning of a sentence which has been changed to F and the letters u and v, and i and j which were used interchangeably in English orthography during Moryson's time but are here transcribed according to modern usage. The division headings in italics are mine.*

*General Observations **[[327; SE 277]]*** For whereas the Papists give not the Cupp to the layety, but only the bread, which they say contaynes the blood in the body, the Hussites give both kyndes, not only to lay men, but to very Infants, because Christ sayth, suffer litle ones to come unto mee. But still they beleeve with the Papists the Corporall eateing of the body and blood of our lord with the mouth by transubstantiation. But they deny that prayers may be made to Sayntes or before Images. They sing the Masse in lattin, but they reade the Epistle, the Gospell, the forme of Baptisme and buyriall, in the Bohemian Tounge. They signe the Baptised Infants with the crosse, and anoynte them on the forehead and on the neck with oyle, and use exorcisme at the dore of the Church before they admitt the Infant into the Church to be Baptised. They had no holy water, wherewith the Papists use to sprinckle men in the Church, and leave it in a kynde of Funt, at the dore, that they which enter may sprinckle themselves therewith.

*Lent **[[328; SE 278]]*** I was a Prage in lent, where I observed that the Papists and Hussites did fast and eate fish, but the Lutherans and Calvinists did eate flesh without keeping any fasts. **[[SE ends]]** There I continued till Easter was past. And because it is a place of great liberty to come into any church without any offence to the Conscience, I had opurtunity to satisfy my Curiosity in observing all Ceremonyes, whereof give mee leave to make some brief Relation.

The Papists in the Church of the Emperors Courts, from Thursday before, to Easter Day in the morning, did night and day worship and pray unto the Crucifix, as unto Christ, which Crucifix they buyried or rather intoombed with great ffunerall pompe, and many processions, and likewise they Celebrated his Resurrection with pompous Ceremonies on Easter Day.

*The Paschal Triduum **[[329]]*** During these three dayes no bell sounded in any Church, till Easter daye when all are rung without ceasing. From three dayes before Easter, was great concourse of the people to the churches, for making their Confessions, wich priests in Churches, and ffryers in Chappells of monnasteryes, heard continually. He that confesseth kneeleth in one seate, and the confessor sitteth in another so as they nether see nor touch one another, but the voyce is heard through litle holes boared in a boarde. And during those dayes to twelve of the clocke on satterday night, the people continually adored the Crucifix on the Sepulcher, and prayed at many Alters priviledged from the Pope with remission of sinnes.

*Mauudy Thursday (Roman Catholic – Chapel Royal) **[[328]]*** ... first on Thursday in the morning the Emperor gave to twelve poore men (after the number of the Apostles) three Ducates of golde, a Cloake, and Coate of Cloth, a payre of stockings and of shooes, a Hatt, a Shirte, and three dollars instead of meate to each man. After dynner the cheefe of the Clargy washed the ffeete of the priests.

*Good Friday (Roman Catholic) Solemn Liturgy at the Chapel Royal **[[328]]*** Upon good ffriday the Church was hung over with black Cloath, and all the priests wore mourning robes. Then they carryed the Crucifix with great pompe to the high Alter, whether the Emperor, his Courtyers, and all

the people, in order crept on their knees to kiss it. Then they Consecrated the Hostia, at a mumbled mass, and lifted it up as true Christ to be worshiped, and then Carried it under a black vail with poompe to the high Alter, and there layde it in a sillver vessell **[[329]]** covered with blacke ciprise, and after carryed the same with a ffunerall poompe into a Chappell of that church, whereafter continually the priests sung mornefull tunes without ceasing day and night, the silent tunes being continually heard though sometymes no priest was seene. In like manner they left another consecrated Hostia upon the high Alter, to which the people continually Crept upon their knees, some licking the very Dust of the pavement. And for those dayes the very beggyers gave mutuall Almes one to the other. The ffuneralls poompe was great, ffor at the high Alter was a Sepulcher in forme of a bed, with pillers of Silver covered on the outsyde with red velvitt, on the insyde with cloth of golde, having many stayres or degrees to asscend, upon each whereof were sett some candles of wax in silver candlestickes, and how (as in the foresayde chappel) mournfull tunes were continually heard, to the day of the Resurrection the singers being unseene, and all this tyme the people with silent concurse and devoute superstition approached to worship.

*Tenebrae at the Chapel Royal* **[[329]]** At the evening of good ffriday, they mumbled masses (wich otherwise are not celebrated but in the morning fasting) because they fasted all the day. And the Priest setting fyteene wax tapers before the high Alter, first putt one out to signify an Apostle falling from Christ, and so twelve in order for the twelve Apostles, then two for Martha and Mary, and at last he putt out the fifteenth signifying the death of Christ, at which tyme all the Church resounded with growlings and dispitfull spittings of the people, like noyse being made by the boyes with their ffeete, and with clappers of wood made for that purpose, all to showe their indignation against the Jewes.

*Good Friday (Utraquist)* **[[331]]** Touching the Hussites Ceremones at this tyme upon good ffriday they covered a Sepulcher with black cloth, but that day and the next I observed none of them to worship at the Sepulcher, only the Clarke attended to keepe it, whome I did see walke by it with his hatt on, and treade upon the Cloth with his fowle shoves, yea being unpatient at the driving of a nayle into the Cloth he was bold to sweare a great oath, as if he thought Christ was dead in deede, and could not heare him.

*Easter Vigil (Roman Catholic – Chapel Royal)* **[[329]]** About one of the clocke on Easter day morning, the papist priests beginne to celebrate Christs resurrection. But the Emperor being sleepy, Christ was made to rise in the Church of the Courte before ten of the clocke in the night, that the Emperor might goe to bed, at wich tyme with many ceremonies **[[330]]** the black hangings of the church were taken downe, and the Image of Christ was brought with great solemnity from the Sepulcher to the high Alter, and there adorned with a mantle of carnation satten, like a yong Phaeton, or litle Cuped. For the Papists use to adorne their Images with silver robbs and with cleane linnen changed on Sunday. And as the Image of Christ was in this sorte adorned on Easter day, so they use upon the Ascension day to sett it forth shadowed with clowdes, and upon Christmas day swadled with clouthes, and upon Palme sunday riding upon an asse, with many like representations.

*Easter Vigil (Roman Catholic – St. Clement's)* **[[331]]** The Emperor (as I formerly sayd) would have Christ rise early in the Church, that he might goe to bed, wich gave me oportunity to see the Jesuites Ceremonyes at the due hower of the Resurrection, who in all thinges assert some singularity, and so performed those Ceremonyes of the buyriall and Resurrection, with rich ornaments and an excelent Consort of still musicke. About the first hower of the morning on Easter day, while some tooke downe the blacke hangings of the Church, and hunge up rich hangings in their place, the Jesuites carryed the Image of Christ from the Sepulcher to the high Alter, and they placed it in glorious Attyere. It is uncreadible to relate what Concurse the Cittisens and strangers made to the Church all that night before Easter day, and with what superstitious devotion they worshiped, as well the Crucifix upon the Sepulcher till it was remoued from there, as the Statua of Christ risen from the dead which was sett upon the high Alter. After wich tyme masses were continually mumbled at divers Alters till eight of the clocke in the morning....

*Easter Day (Roman Catholic – Chapel Royal)* **[[330]]** On Easter Day morning, they mumbled masses at every Alter, and many at one tyme together. At eight of the clocke in the morning they gave to the people the fyfth chapter of St John's Gospell and a Crucifix to be kissed. This done, they began a soleme procession, with white banners (as before that day they had used red) wherein they carryed the Image of the Christ richly adorned from chappell to chappell, and continually sprinkled the people with holy water. The Court had but one Chaplyn who after this went into the Pulpett, and after

one reverence to the Emperor, made a sermon in the German tounge. The Emperor setting above in a Gallery belonging to his house. Then a solemne masse was sung aloude, with a full quire, at the high Alter in wich tyme also many masses were mumbled at other Alters, and in divers Chappells of the Church. After the masse, they distributed the Supper of our Lord, wich they gave only in one kynde of the bread to the layemen, lest they wiping their mouthes, or the women trembling, should spill any dropp of Christs blood, whereas they are so carefull, as the very Priests having druncke the Cupp off, doe reense it twice with water, wich they also drincke off, and then wipe the insyde with cleane linnen. And because they say the blood is the bread after the Consecration (as if our lord had instituted one of the signes in vayne) wich opinion being true (as it cannot be) yet not the blood in the vaynes but only that shedd out of the body profiteth us. They gave also wyne to the lay man but not Consecrated, and all of them did swallowe not eate the bread, lest they should seeme to grynde the body of Christ with their teeth. They thinke it necessary to Salvation, to heare (or rather to see) a mumbled masse every morning, if they be in a place where they may have that oportunity. But after they have heard the masse, or only worshipped the Elevated Hostie (walking up and downe in the Church till that be Elevated to that ende with sounde of a little Bell) the litle regard to heare the Sermons or the rest of Divine service on the very Sabbath Day, thinking themselves safe that day from all evill by that one bending of the knee and beating of the breast.

*Easter Day (Roman Catholic – St. Clement's) [[331]]* [Low masses were celebrated throughout the night at the side altars] till eight of the clocke in the morning, when a solemne mass was sung aloude with exquisite musicke, the Polonians (among the rest) in all those devotions casting themselves prostrate on their faces to pray, and when they did rise up, crossing all their bodies, not only before, but the very hinder partes.

*Easter Day (Utraquist) [[331]]* On Easter Day some hower before morning, the Hussites came to Church, where the Preacher, as a prologue to a play, tould them why they were assembled, then two litle boyes richly attyred in woomans apparrell, and so presenting Mary and Magdalen, went to the Sepulcher, and began to lament not fynding the body of Christ, till a thirde boye like an Angell with spread winges lett downe from above with pullyes, bad them not to seeke him among the dead, for he was risen. This play ended, they sung Psalmes, and received the supper of our lord in both kyndes, till the full congregation came, when they had Divine service in the forme above written.

*Baptism (Roman Catholic – Chapel Royal) [[330]]* On Easter Day in the afternoone a Chylde was Baptised when the Priest mett at the Church dore, not admitting the [[331]] childe into the Church till first by exorcisme (sprinkling of holy water he had conjured the Deville out of him.)

*Burial of the Dead (Utraquist) [[542]]* Touching the Ceremonyes of ffuneralls among the Bohemians, my selfe did see at Prage three persons of differing quality buyred, one a gentleman, who was thus carryed to the church. First at noone day threescore lighted torches were carryed, then all the severall Coate-Armes of his ffamily, then came the singing boyes and 14 Priests, having 4 great crosses carryed among them, and all of them singing, then followed the gentlemans herse all covered with black velvett, and ledd by two gentlemen in black mourning [[543]] habites, one holding the bridle on each syde, then followed 4 gentlemen mourners, one carrying spurrs, the second his sworde, the third his helmett and plumes, and the fourth his sheilde. Then some men carryed the Beare with the dead body, closed in a coffen of copper (but all the Cittisens and inferiour persons are buryed with their faces open). Twenty gentlemen mourning in blacke followed the hearse, and next then came the women mourners, clothed with white vayles and ornaments, but but (!) having their faces uncovered. The body being sett downe in the midle of the Church, the priests and boyes sung at the high Alter, and after a shorte Sermon, or vulgar oration (upon mortality, and of the dead person) the body was lifted up to the foure corners of the Church as giving farewell to all the people, and then brought to the grave within the Church where his nearest friendes attended to take their last leaves of him, wich they did with many childish lamentations, and complaynts that he would forsake them, which done, the body was putt into the grave, and many of the friendes did cast handfulls of earth after it. The second ffunerall was of a married Cittisen, wherein the priests and boyes went singing before the body wich had the face open, appareled in a poore blacke gowne, with a capp upon the head, a ruffe about the necke, black stockings, and shoes upon the ffeete, and laydd upon a bedd with two fayre pillowbeares under the head. The body was sett downe in the midst of the Church with twelve torches burning about it, and after the like singing and Sermon, it was in like sorte lifted up to the foure corners of the church as to bidd the people farewell, and so with singing carryed into the Churchyarde where the friendes attended at the grave, and first the

youngest, then the eldest children, then the wife, and other near friends, embraced and kissed the body with fouldish lamentation, that he wanting nothinge to a happy life, would thus forsake them, and the litle children could hardly be pulled from imbracing the dead father. Then the bedd and pillowes were carryed backe by servants, and the body so apparaled was putt into a Coffen of wood, and so into the grond, many men wich shamed to lament like children, and women castin handfulls of earth upon the Coffen. The third ffunerall was of a chiefe Cittisens oldest sonne, yet unmaryed, whose dead body was layd upon the Beare, covered with a ffether bead or boulsters, having the head raysed high with two fayre wrought pillowbeares. The body was layd with the face upward, the head being bare, save that it was adorned with krantz or garland of roses, the hayre of the head (for he had not is bearde growne) was curiously combed and curled, about his necke was a fayre thicke ruffe, upon his handes like cuffes and perfumed gloves, with silke stockings of carnation coller, white pumpes and black velvett pantoffles on his feete, and the whole body was covered with a thinne robe of sky collored satten. Thus the body was sett downe in the midst of the Church, and after the like Sermon or oration, was lifted up to the foure Corners of the Church to take his last leave **[[544]]** of the people, and then was carryed to his grave within the Church, and being sett downe there, his friends attending in the same place, tooke their farewell leaves of him, with many foolish lamentations, which ended, the bedd and pillowes being only carryed backe, the body with all the former ornaments was inclosed in a Coffin of wood, and so being putt into the grave, many friends cast handfulls of earth after it. For other Ceremonyes of ffuneralls, my shorte stay in that kingdome must pleade my excuse for omitting them as unknowne.