
How *Constantia* became *Kostnice* (and vice versa)

Pavel B. Kůrka

(Prague)

The assertion that “Master Jan Hus was burned in *Kostnice*” belongs in the Czech minds among the most fundamental facts of history; although we do not even recall, when or where we encountered it for the first time – yet it has a place in our subconscious. The seventeenth ecumenical council is understood from the Czech viewpoint distinctly otherwise than from the viewpoint of world history. What from one side is a matter of prime importance, from the other side figures as a mere episode. The Czech subconscious is without doubt powerfully affected by the fact that the name of the town Konstanz has been, for more than two centuries, translated into Czech as *Kostnice*, that is ossuary.

The very word *kostnice* has most likely been current in the Czech language ever since the construction of ossuaries started in the Bohemian lands – probably since the fourteenth century.¹ Another term for ossuary, however, also appears: *kostra* that is documented in the expression “*v kostře*”.² Despite many human vagaries, we can probably assert that nobody was ever incinerated in an ossuary. We might almost assume that the town of Constantine had become the target of a peculiar malice on the part of the offended Czechs, and to this day the name arouses unpleasant connotations in the Czech language. The importance of the subjective perception of a simple term or designation, which has no real significance by itself, was shown – exactly for the area of Czech-German relations – ninety years ago by the specialist in German studies, Arnošt Kraus, whose work we shall mention again.³

The current terminology is not being questioned: every Czech encyclopaedia refers to “*Konstanz*, see *Kostnice*,” and German encyclopaedias by and large are not concerned with another possible name for Konstanz. This is also true of the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, which does not list any older forms of the town’s name.⁴ It is surely remarkable that Czech historiography lacks any more substantial treatment of the history of Konstanz; the slim volume by František M. Bartoš traces mainly the history of Hus’s memorabilia in the town.⁵

Several, mutually contradictory pieces of information, however, can be found also at present. The web version of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* states: “Constance (Latin *Constantia*, German *Konstanz* or *Constance*, Czechic [sic!] name *Kostnitz*).”⁶

¹ The assertion of Philippe Ariès in *Dějiny smrti I*, (orig. *L’homme devant la mort*, 1977), trans. Danuše Navrátilová (Prague 2000) 81–83, that ossuaries date only to the fifteenth century, evidently cannot be applied to Central Europe.

² F. Kulhánek, *Dějiny kr. m. Nymburka* [History of the royal town of Nymburk] (Nymburk, 1911) 134.

³ Arnošt Kraus, *Böhmisches nebo Tschechisch?*, reprint from *Naše doba* 26 [1916] no. 57.

⁴ LMA 5: col. 1400–1401.

⁵ František M. Bartoš, *Hus a město Kostnice 1415–1915* [Hus and the city of Constance 1415–1915] (Prague, 1934).

⁶ “Constance,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia* IV (1908)

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04286c.htm> (Last updated 15 September 2003)

The index of the streets of Berlin under the entry *Kostnitzer Strasse* states: “Since the thirteenth century Konstanz was intermittently called Chostinze, Costenze, Kostinz, Kostenz and since the fifteenth century Constanz, or Konstanz. The name of the town was never Kostnitz. That name came about because of an error in reading, but it was used fairly often in north- and east-German literature in the fifteenth century and later.”⁷ The *Meyers Konversationslexikon*, in a nineteenth-century edition, had a different interpretation, according to which the terms *Konstenze* and *Konstentz* were used; the form *Kostnitz* came into use under the influence of the Czech language.⁸ It surely comes as a surprise, when we hear that, in fact, the expression *Kostnitz* occurred earlier in German than in Czech. The only piece of scholarship that makes this claim in recent times is by Janusz Siatkowski. He states briefly that the medieval Czech designation stemmed from a Latin form, while the modern one derived from a German dialect.⁹ The almost century-old *Topographisches Wörterbuch des Grossherzogtums Baden* surveys most comprehensively the various instances of the German forms of the town’s name.¹⁰

Heterogeneity and inconstancy of pronunciation and orthography is nothing unusual in geographic names; from the German milieu, we can recall, for instance that Leipzig can be also found under the Saxon expressions as Lipsch or Lipitzk.

The Latin name *Constantia* is not by itself problematic; it was current from the foundation of the town in the Late Roman times and was preserved in medieval Latin texts. Only in the eleventh century the origin of the name was temporarily forgotten and the Latinized German name *Constanze* cropped up once in the twelfth century.¹¹ As early as the start of the Middle Ages the Romance population of the town and its environs gradually changed into a Teutonic one. In consequence of shifts in consonants the name of the town sounded as *Chostenz* or *Chostez* in Aleman, and *Chostinza* in Old High German.¹² We have to take into account that only recordings in unstable orthography are available to us; the more important phonetic development is virtually impossible to reconstruct. The initial Ch is probably a transcript of the aspirated German Kh. The German forms *Konstenze*, *Konstenza* or *Costentz* occurred in the course of the High Middle Ages.¹³ Similar forms are also

⁷ “Kostnitzer Straße,” in: *Straßennamen-Lexikon*, <http://www.luise-berlin.de/strassen/Bez09h/K802.htm> (Accessed in May 2004) *Konstanz hieß seit dem 13. Jahrhundert wechselnd Chostinze, Costenze, Kostinz, Kostenz und seit dem 15. Jahrhundert Constanz bzw. Konstanz. Der Stadtname lautete nie Kostnitz. Er beruhte auf einem Lesefehler, war aber in der nord- und ostdeutschen Literatur des 15. Jahrhunderts und später weit verbreitet.*

⁸ *Meyers Konversationslexikon, Eine Enzyklopädie des allgemeinen Wissens* (Leipzig, 1888-1889⁴), entry “Konstanz:” “Konstanz (früher Costenze, Kostentz; die Form Kostnitz ist tschechischen Ursprungs und seit Huß’ Zeiten mißbräuchlicherweise üblich geworden).”

⁹ Janusz Siatkowski, “Obce nazwy geograficzne w języku czeskim i polskim,” in *Język a Kultura* 7 (Wrocław, 1992) 55, <http://www.lingwistyka.uni.wroc.pl/jk/JK-07/JK07-siatkowski.pdf> (Accessed May 2004).

¹⁰ Albert Krieger, *Topographisches Wörterbuch des Grossherzogtums Baden* (Heidelberg, 1904/1905), reprint (Heidelberg, 1972) 1219.

¹¹ Helmut Maurer, *Konstanz im Mittelalter*. Vol. 1: *Von den Anfängen bis zu Konzil* (Konstanz, 1989) (*Geschichte der Stadt Konstanz* I) 20-21.

¹² *Ibid.* 19, 23.

¹³ *Ibid.* for instance 21-22, 141, 151.

used in the German texts of Rudolf of Habsburg and Ludwig of Bavaria, who brought the language into written contact with the Imperial Chancery.¹⁴

Everything indicates that the German Chancery of Charles IV was the first to use the form *Kostnitz*. The King stayed in the town (with brief interruptions) from 15 August to 3 October 1353.¹⁵ The inhabitants of the town that participated in an anti-royal league of Swabian cities, were rather alarmed by the news that Charles was obtaining relics and sundry religious treasures in other places; although they feared the same and initially obstructed his entry into their town, in the end they prepared a festive welcome for him.¹⁶ The monarch, here “zu *Kostnitz*” issued German documents for the monasteries of Elchingen and Einsiedeln, and in the matter of Swabian treaties of pacification [*landfrýdy*].¹⁷ A direct consequence of his stay in the area was a document, issued in Zurich on 15 October, that granted the town of Konstanz (for three years) the collection of tolls from a bridge across the Rhine for the purpose of improving the bridge.¹⁸ In this document, the form *Kostnicz* or *Kostnitz* occurs altogether five times. This form might be understood as a faulty reading of the correct *Kostincz* or *Kostencz*, which would appear in the Gothic semi-cursive of the document very similar, if it were not for the dots over the “i”, which are quite distinct in the document.

It is a question, whether Charles’s German Chancery adopted this unusual form from an outside source, or whether it was created by mistake; the latter possibility could be substantiated by the difficulties of introducing a new official language.¹⁹ In this case, however, it would be puzzling, how such a form could have lasted for so long, even if we consider the ascendancy, which Charles’s Chancery enjoyed in the standardization of literary German. Let us recall that the overwhelming majority of Charles’s scribes hailed from the Bohemian lands, or from the areas of the bishopric of Bamberg, or from the archbishoprics of Trier and Magdeburg; on the contrary, few of the scribes came the region of southern Germany. The Chancery of Charles had no connection with the official practices of Ludwig of Bavaria, and much less so with those of the town of Konstanz.²⁰ It would be rather convoluted to maintain that the form of *Kostnicz* was invented quite intentionally by one of the Bohemians in the King’s entourage exactly on this occasion; nevertheless all possibilities remain open.

For the change to prevail, it would have to correspond to the logic of the spoken language, which was then the main medium of communication; a mere

¹⁴ RI VII:1 no. 222. (21 August 1334, “ze *Kostentz*”). Online available in RI at <http://www.regesta-imperii.de>, resp. http://regesta-imperii.uni-giessen.de/index_ri.htm (Accessed June 2004).

¹⁵ RI VIII: No 1603, 1615, 1616.

¹⁶ Maurer, *Konstanz* 1:211.

¹⁷ RI VIII: No 1617

¹⁸ Maurer, *Konstanz*, 1:211; the document is reproduced on p. 212. RI VIII:130, no. 1629 dates the document incorrectly in Uznach; actually, the King was that day in Zurich, as other sources in the same publication indicate.

¹⁹ See also, for instance, Gottfried F. Merkel, *Das Aufkommen der deutschen Sprache in den städtischen Kanzleien des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1930), reprint (Hildesheim, 1973) 17-18.

²⁰ Ludwig E. Schmidt, *Die deutsche Urkundensprache in der Kanzlei Kaiser Karls IV. (1346–1378)*, [*Mitteldeutsche Studien* 11] (Halle an der Saale, 1936), reprint (Tübingen, 1972) 73.

change of the written form would not have had a chance of lengthy survival. I personally think that the change from *Kostenz* to *Kostinz* occurred in the context of consonantal shifts; in this process the pronunciation of consonant *n* became problematical. That is attested by the frequent occurrence of the variants that omit this consonant, and therefore its transfer in front of the *i* could have also occurred. At the same time, it is necessary to point out that only the form *Costentz* persists in the documents in the municipal administration of Konstanz during the second half of the fourteenth century.²¹

Prior to the ecumenical council, there had apparently not been any contact between the bishop's town and the Czech-language milieu so that it is difficult to assume the possibility of a transfer of its name into Czech. The town was the scene of events important for the entire Empire only twice during the twelfth century in the reign of Frederick Barbarossa: an Imperial Diet was held there in 1153 and a peace treaty concluded thirty years later between the Emperor and the Lombard cities.²² Needless to say, neither of these events is recorded in any Czech-language sources during the Middle Ages. As for any later treatment, it is interesting that those events are not recorded in the entry for Kostnice of any modern Czech encyclopaedia, while being noted in German ones.

A genuine contact of the Czech-language milieu with the ominous town could have occurred when the Emperor-to-be Charles IV visited Konstanz in mid-September 1353. He was accompanied by his German Chancery that was staffed largely by members hailing from the Bohemian lands.²³ Charles's almost three-week stay in Konstanz, however, did not seem worth noting by any contemporary Bohemian chronicler; it has not even found a place in the modern monographs concerning the Emperor.

An undocumented – improbable, nevertheless theoretically possible – visit by Charles in the city might have occurred again in the fall a year later, when he was once more in the vicinity of Zurich, playing the role of a mediator in the conflict between Albrecht of Habsburg and the Swiss Confederation. Otherwise, however, Konstanz lay far away from Charles's habitual travel route to the Rhine that most often followed the line Nuremberg – Frankfurt – Strasbourg (– Basel).²⁴

Czech texts from the time of the Council and during the following centuries, in which, unsurprisingly, the name of the town occurs quite often, drew on the Latin form *Constantia/Constancia* that could be Bohemicised as *Constancí*. As an example for the fifteenth century, we can name the song “*O svolánie Konstantské*”²⁵ or the *Passion of Master Jan Hus* by Petr of Maladoňovice;²⁶ the chronicle of Václav Hájek of Libočany had a great impact in the following centuries,²⁷ and afterwards

²¹ Vom Richterbuch zum Roten Buch. Die ältere Konstanzer Ratsgesetzgebung, Otto Feger ed. [Konstanzer Geschichts- und Rechtsquellen 7] (Konstanz, 1955) 24ff.

²² LThK 6 col. 317.

²³ Schmidt, *Die deutsche Urkundensprache* 73–83.

²⁴ See *Itineráře českých panovníků* [Itineraries of Czech rulers] in the catalogue of the Department Library of PVH FF UK.

²⁵ Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Dějiny husitského zpěvu* [The History of Hussite Song] [*Sebrané spisy Zdeňka Nejedlého* 42] (Prague, 1955) 440–441, 3:355–358.

²⁶ FRB 7:121–149.

²⁷ Václav Hájek z Libočan, *Kronika česká* (Prague, 1541) f. 370r.

Komenský's *Historia o protivenstvích církve české* [The History of Adversities of the Bohemian Church].²⁸ In the Utraquist period, we encounter most often the form of the locative case as *Constanci/Constancii*, of the accusative case as *Constanci/Constancie*, and the form of the adjective as *Constantské*. Other minor deviations are matters of the unsettled orthography of the period so that we may encounter forms *Constanczie* or *Konstancý* and their combinations; in modern editions such variants are normally standardised – the ending –ý is usually replaced by –í, and instead of –cz- one writes –c–.

Interestingly, Jan Hus noted the existence of the form *Kostnitz*, but neither he, nor his readers, used it as a springboard for possible associations. In a letter of 6 June 1415, he writes: "...a great abomination, which I have heard in general from the Swabians, that *Constanczie* or *Costnicze*, their town will, for thirty years, not be rid of the sins, which that Council has committed in their city."²⁹ It is necessary to add that otherwise Hus in his letters uses exclusively the form of *Constanczie*. We can understand the cited deviation as a form used by the local inhabitants that he introduced to stress his contact with the German-speaking denizens, while otherwise the Latin of the theologians was of a greater importance to him. He did not comment on the similarity of the German expression with the word *kostnice*, although he knew both.³⁰ At the same time, it does not seem that, in this connection, he wished to tamper with the Latin meaning of the word *Constantia*, that is, "constancy," as one of the editors of his letters assumes.³¹

In German, it seems that during the period of the Council the expression *Costenz / Kostenz*, alternatively *Constenz / Konstenz*, still prevail. The latter is used, for instance, in the chronicle of the burgher of Kostnice, Ulrich Richenthal. Its individual versions employ several variants together with the now customary *Konstanz / Constanz*, and with the Latin *Constantia*.³² We find the forms *Costnitz / Costitz* also quite commonly in contemporary sources, for instance, in the creations of contemporary poets.³³

A similar situation prevailed in the sixteenth century. The forms *Costnitz* and *Coste(n)cz* alternate in the individual contemporary editions of Martin Luther's

²⁸ Contemporary trans.: Jan A. Komenský, *Historia o protivenstvích církve české* [The history of the adversities of the Czech church] ([Leszno], 1655) 26f.

²⁹ MS Prague, National Museum Library VIII F 38, p. 74; *Documenta* 138 (here the editor replaces the initial C- with K-).

³⁰ See also Jan Gebauer, *Slovník staročeský* (Prague 1970²) 2:112.

³¹ *Listy Husovy*, ed. Bohumil Mareš (Prague, 1901) note on 163.

³² Facsimile of one of the manuscripts: Ulrich Richenthal, *Das Konzil zu Konstanz MCSXIV–MCDXVIII. Faksimileausgabe* (Starnberg and Constance, 1964). Old prints: *Das Concilium Buch geschehen zu Costencz* (Augsburg, 1483); *das Concilium, so zu Constancz gehalten...* (Augsburg, 1536).

³³ For various examples (citations or titles of various poems and songs) see Arnošt Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře zejména německé* [The Hussite movement in literature – especially German], Vol. 1: *Husitství v literatuře prvních dvou století svých* [The Hussite movement in the literature of its first two centuries] (Prague, 1917) (*Rozpravy české akademie*, tř. III., č. 45) 13nn.

German texts.³⁴ It was exactly Hus's case that represented the turning point for Luther's movement, when it began to agree with Hus that a Council also could be fallible. While in his written polemics with Johann Eck, Luther still hesitates, in his proclamation, *An der christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, he fully agrees with Hus. At a later time, it was precisely Luther, who toyed with the name of the town on the Bodensee; he re-baptised it as *Obstantia*, as happened in his work, *Etliche Sprüche D. Martini Luther wider das Concilium Obstantiense (wolt sagen) Constantiense*. First, however, he declared that he had nothing against the town as such, only against the Council, which had met within its walls.³⁵ In his polemic, directed also against the forthcoming Counter Reformation Council, Luther declares that the Council was contrary to Christ and to the Church.

From the writings of Luther's contemporaries, it suffices to name the translation of Mladoňovice's report *History und wahrhaftige geschicht, wie Johann Huss in Concilio zu Costnitz verbrannt ist*,³⁶ or *Geistlicher Bluthandel Johannis Huss zu Costentz* by Ulrich von Hutten.³⁷

Czech literature of the sixteenth century, as already mentioned, continues to use the form of the type *Konstancí*. It appears, as if no attention is paid to German literature that, of course, had to be known in Bohemia. There was, however, no compelling reason to replace the established usage with a new one, because in this case the domestic tradition was more powerful. This is attested, for instance, by the great respect of Czech Lutherans for Jan Hus, although in principle they opposed the veneration of saints. On the other hand, as noted by Jiří Pešek, the attitude of the Bohemian Utraquist and Lutherans was rather problematic, as far the sudden German interest in Hus was concerned. While the Utraquists did not need to be reminded of Hus's teaching, Bohemian Lutherans focused on the interpretation of Scripture.³⁸ As a result, Hus's writings, with minor exceptions, were printed primarily in German-speaking lands. These editions were also represented in the libraries of Prague, although significantly only one of those libraries belonged to a priest.³⁹

³⁴ For instance, *Luthers Werke* 2:454 (*An der christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*); *ibid.* 2:587 (*Von den neuen Etschen Bullen*); *ibid.* 7:431 (*Grund und Ursach*); see the notes concerning differences in spelling; in the final edition the form *Costnitz* mostly prevailed.

³⁵ *Luthers Werke* 39/1:11: "Die löbliche stad hat seinen Namen ‚Constantia‘ das Heist Bestand oder Fest, manlich gemüte, Daher sie es nennen Constantiense Concilium, Aber ich Doctor Martinus Teuffe sie nach irem rechtem namen, den sie inen selber hierinn gebenn, Obstantiense Concilium. Obstantia aber heisst widerstand, denn hie haben sie nicht allein mit der tat wider Christum und seine Kirche gehandelt...."

³⁶ Johann Agricola, *History und wahrhaftige geschicht, wie Johann Huss in Concilio zu Costnitz verbrannt ist* (Haganaw, 1529). Agricola's translation is discussed in FRB 8:XXVIII–XL; text at *ibid.* 150–221.

³⁷ Ulrich von Hutten, *Geistlicher Bluthandel Johannis Huss zu Costentz* (Np., 1520).

³⁸ Jiří Pešek, *Proměny utrakvistického kultu v předbělohorské době aneb Jan Hus v knihovnách pražských měšťanů na přelomu 16. a 17. století* [Changes of the Utraquist cult in the times before the White Mountain or Jan Hus in the libraries of Prague citizens at the turn of the seventeenth century], in *Ad vitam et honorem. Profesoru Jaroslavu Mezníkovi k pětasedmdesátým narozeninám*, ed. Tomáš Borkovský, Libor Jan, and Martin Wihoda (Brno, 2003) 743–751.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

The literature of the Bohemian Counter Reformation also retained the form *Konstancý*.⁴⁰ The Baroque period was the same time, when the use of the name *Constanz* was gaining ground in German. The final exchange of the initial C- for K- was a matter of the nineteenth century. While the town itself used the name *Konstanz* exclusively, in more remote areas the form *Kostnitz* still survived in German into the nineteenth century. This is attested, among others, by the translation of a book about Jan Hus by the French historian Émile Bonnechose in the last edition of 1870.⁴¹ The last piece of evidence is the earlier mentioned story of the *Kostnitzer Strasse* in Berlin-Wilmersdorf, named so in 1895. The name was changed to *Konstanzer Strasse* in 1908 on the grounds that the form *Kostnitz* was obsolescent.⁴² Since then, the form *Kostnitz* occurs in German only accidentally in publications of popularisation or in historical belles lettres, where an author wished to reproduce an historical model, or was ignorant about the connection between *Kostnitz* and *Konstanz*.⁴³

A contrary turn of usage, however, occurs in the Czech-language milieu toward the end of the eighteenth century. At the start, there stood undoubtedly the provocative work of Kaspar Royko, a professor of the Seminary in Graz, later of the University in Prague, *Geschichte des grossen Kirchenversammling zu Kostnitz*.⁴⁴ Highlighting the interest of the Catholic Enlightenment in the Bohemian Reformation, the author in his preface cites the writings of Johann Stumpf, a sixteenth-century Swiss historian,⁴⁵ and Jacques Lenfant, a Huguenot minister of the early eighteenth

⁴⁰ For instance, Jan Beckovský, *Poselkyně starých příběhův českých* [Messenger of old Czech stories] (Prague, 1700) 639.

⁴¹ Émile Bonnechose, *Johann Huss und das Concilium zu Costnitz*, (Leipzig, 1848¹); (Leipzig, 1870³); original: *Jean Hus et le concile du Constance* (Paris, 1845). About this book, see Bartoš, *Hus a město Kostnice* 21-22.

⁴² "Kostnitzer Straße," in: *Straßennamen-Lexikon* <http://www.luise-berlin.de/strassen/Bez09h/K802.htm> (Accessed May 2004).

⁴³ For instance, in the following text both forms occur: "Am Rande des Konzils von Konstanz (1414 – 1418) wurde sie [Die Installierung der Hohenzollern in der Mark] vollendet, als König Sigismund den Burggrafen von Nürnberg auf dem Marktplatz zu Kostnitz feierlich mit der Kurwürde ... belehnte." "18 April 1417," in: *Preußen-Kalender* <http://www.preussen.org/page/kalend04.html> (Accessed May 2004).

⁴⁴ Caspar Royko, 1. ed. [anonymous], *Geschichte der grossen allgemeinen Kirchenversammling zu Kostnitz*, 2 vv. (Vienna and Graz, 1780–1782); (Prague, 1796²). For more detailed bibliographic data, see Čeněk Zíbrt, *Bibliografie české historie*, (Prague 1902) 2: no. 14668. About Royko in fair detail, see *Otův slovník naučný* (Prague, 1903) 21:1061–1062; also Jan Herben, *Otázka náboženská v našem probuzení* [The religious question in our awakening] (Prague, 1927) 67–68; although Royko was not well known in Slovenia, because of his birth in Maribor, he was most likely of Slovene nationality, as Herben indicates. Apparently, he did not know Czech, according to Arnošt Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře*. Vol. 2: *Husitství v literatuře barokní a osvícenské* [The Hussite movement in baroque and enlightenment literature] (Prague, 1918) (*Rozpravy české akademie*, tř. III., no. 49) 160. About the effect of his publication, see Bartoš, *Hus a město Kostnice* 10.

⁴⁵ Johann Stumpf, *Des grossen gemeinen Concilium zu Costencz gehalten...*, (Zurich, 1541), see Zíbrt, *Bibliografie*, 2: no. 14659. Stumpf also wrote a Swiss and world chronicle, *Gemeiner loblicher Eydgenossenschaft Stetten, Landen und Völckern Chronick...*, where he used the forms *Costentz* and *Constantz* (for instance, 57, 281). About Stumpf, see Hans Müller, *Der Geschichtschreiber Johann Stumpf. Eine Untersuchung über sein Weltbild*, (Zurich in der Eydgenossenschaft, 1945).

century.⁴⁶ Neither of them, however, uses the form *Kostnitz*, which Royko had to adopt from another German author, whom he does not cite. As an oddity, it is relevant to note his use of the adjectival form *kostnizische*.

From Royko a direct line leads to his translators into Czech. In 1783, Matěj Markovič the Younger published a translation of Royko's edition of the decree on communion *sub una*;⁴⁷ almost immediately afterwards the decree was again published with a commentary.⁴⁸ Both of these pamphlets used the forms "*kostnický*" and "*w Kostnicy*." Two years later, Václav Stach (under the pseudonym of Václav Petryn) published a translation of Royko's history under the title of *Historie velkého sněmu kostnického*,⁴⁹ and in the same spirit of a symbiosis between Josephist Reform Catholicism and Utraquism as the original. The implantation of this form of the name into Czech did not proceed quite smoothly. Stach himself uses the plural form "*do Kostnic*" or "*v Kostnicích*,"⁵⁰ which suggests his uncertainty about the correct usage. Perhaps, he tried to avoid the term "*kostnice*," identical with "ossuary," and he lacked access to literature that might have helped him to choose a more suitable name for his translation. At last, however, the name sank its roots into Czech in the form that is familiar to us today. In his famous dictionary, Jungmann unabashedly uses the term *Kostnice* with the German equivalent *Constanz am Bodensee*.⁵¹

A plethora of diverse writings on the Bohemian Reformation appeared in the period around the revolutionary year 1848. Their radically oriented authors, such as Karel Havlíček, Jakub Malý, or Emanuel Arnold,⁵² undoubtedly knew the term *Kostnice* from Stach's translation of Royko's history, as well as from recent German literature. The biography of Hus by Royko's contemporary, the liberal Catholic priest,

⁴⁶ Jacques Lenfant, *Histoire du concile de Constance, tirée principalement d'Auters qui ont assisté au Concile*, 2 vv. (Amsterdam, 1714), see Zíbrt, *Bibliografie* 2: no. 14664).

⁴⁷ M. M. K. G. B. A. W. [Matěj Markovič the Younger], *Dekrét sněmu kostnického o přijímání pod jedním způsobem s poznamenáním od wysoce učeného pana K. R...* [The decree to the Council of Constance on communion *sub una* with notes from the well-educated Mr. K.R.] (Prague, 1793). About Markovič (Markovic) *Ottův slovník naučný* 16:868.

⁴⁸ J. C. K. K., *Dekrét sněmu kostnického o přijímání pod jedním způsobem s novým poznamenáním proti oněmu, které nedávno od M. M. K. G. B. A. W. w Praze vydané bylo* [The decree to the Council of Constance on communion *sub una* with notes from the M.M.K.G.B.A.W. published in Prague] (Prague, n.d.)

⁴⁹ *Historie velkého sněmu kostnického*, [A history of the great Council of Constance] 2 vv. (Prague, 1785–1786). The translator used the pseudonym Václav Petryn in the first edition; see Zíbrt, *Bibliografie* 2: no. 14669. About Václav Stach, see Antonín Rybička, "Dodatky a opravy k biografii starších spisovatelův českých a k starší české bibliografii [Additions and corrections to the biographies of older Czech writers and to older Czech bibliography]," *ČČM* 46 (1872) 214–216.

⁵⁰ Royko, *Historie velkého sněmu kostnického* 1st ed. 1:31, 51.

⁵¹ Josef Jungmann, *Slovník česko-německý* (Prague 1836); new ed. Jan Petr, (Prague 1990) 2:140.

⁵² H. B. [Karel Havlíček] "Mistr Jan Hus," *Slovan* 2 (1850) 1069–1075, 1098–1102; Jakub Malý, *Časové od Wáclawa IV. až do Ferdinanda I.* [The time from Wenceslaus IV to Ferdinand I] (*Sprawedliwá kronika Česká / Prostonárodnj dějepis české země* 5) (Prague, 1845) 45; Emanuel Arnold, *Děje Husitů s zvláštním zřehledem na Jana Žižku* [The history of Hussites especially concerning Jan Žižka] I/1 (Prague, 1848) 1. Further, for instance, the anonymous *Ján Hus z Husince* (Leipzig, 1845). The same was evidently true of Tomek's standpoint at that time, as expressed in his *Děje university pražské*, see below.

Augustine Zitte, *Magister Johannes Huss von Hussinecz*, was particularly well known, and was soon after 1848 translated into Czech.⁵³

The official historiographer of Bohemia, František Palacký, who operated in another milieu, opened the relevant chapter of his famous *History of the Bohemian Nation* with the following sentence: “The ecumenical *concilium*, or council, in the town of *Konstancie* (*Kostnice*) was among all the medieval councils the largest and the most glorious...;”⁵⁴ from then on Palacký uses the first of the two forms. For the sake of completeness, let us add that, in the German version of his work, the site of the council is called *Constanza*, which he provided with the attribute *am Bodensee* in the introductory sentence.⁵⁵ In this respect, however, Palacký did not leave a lasting legacy in Czech historiography. Even the *Česko-Moravská kronika* of Karel V. Zap leans toward the form *Kostnice*, although it repeats many formulations of Palacký’s *History* almost verbatim, including the introductory sentence cited above.⁵⁶ Under the influence of the earlier mentioned Jakub Malý the form *Kostnice* found its way into the authoritative *Riegrův slovník naučný*, in which this entry (erroneously) introduces the town as the seat of a bishopric, although such a status was lost during the Napoleonic Wars; afterwards the town could serve, at most, as an occasional residence of the bishop of Freiburg in Breisgau.⁵⁷

The one exception is due to the linguistically and ideologically conservative Václav V. Tomek. Although, in his *Děje university pražské* [History of the University of Prague] from 1849, he consistently wrote *Kostnice*,⁵⁸ in the later *Dějepis města Prahy*, he used also (and more frequently) the form *Konstancie*, and even *Konstancí*;⁵⁹ evidently his usage reflected that of his sources in any given instance. His case can serve as an indicator of the correlation between linguistic and ideological conservatism. The passing of this old-fashioned scholar simultaneously signalled the vanishing of the obsolete *Konstancie*. By the 1870s, the form *Kostnice* had become firmly established; by that time, it had also come into use by the Roman Catholic apologists for the council.⁶⁰ Afterwards, nobody seemed to be concerned with the etymology of the name anymore.

A poem from 1868, which develops the motif of bones – hence ossuary/*Kostnice* – according to the vision of Ezekiel, indicates that the term *Kostnice* was considered self-evident rather than an odd ad hoc creation. The poem proclaimed: “Arise, move, you accumulation of dry bones / so that a new Israel can stand here, a Sun rise! – Now is the summer of the Lord / the days now fit for

⁵³ Augustin Zitte, *Magister Johannes Huss von Hussinecz* (Prague, 1789), trans. J. V. Sommer, *Obširný životopis mistra Jana z Husince* [A lengthy biography of M. Jan Hus] (Prague, 1850).

⁵⁴ František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* (Prague, 1850) 3:149ff. New edition (Prague: L. Mazáč, 1937) 3:94ff, gives preference to the form *Kostnice*.

⁵⁵ František Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen* (Prague 1845) 3/1:307.

⁵⁶ Karel V. Zap, *Česko-Moravská kronika* (Prague, 1906) 2:306n; (Prague, 1872¹).

⁵⁷ *Slovník naučný*, eds. František L. Rieger and J. Malý (Prague 1865) 4:859.

⁵⁸ Václav V. Tomek, *Děje university Pražské* (Prague, 1849) 1:230.

⁵⁹ Idem, *Dějepis města Prahy* (Prague 1875), for instance, 3:550 (“*Konstancie ve Švábích*”) 556 (“*Konstancí*”), or 561 (“*Kostnice*”).

⁶⁰ For instance, Antonín Lenz, *Učení Mistra Jana Husi* (Prague, 1875).

salvation: / Jesus Christ shall the Czech ossuary / once more transform into Bethlehem's Chapel!"⁶¹

Thus, the name *Koštice*, introduced into Czech by Markovič and Stach in 1783-1785, became established thanks to popular literature, despite the subsequent scholarly writings of Palacký and Tomek, who were familiar with the older Bohemian literature. The terminology of Palacký and Tomek did not persist despite their otherwise profound impact on Czech historiography. The terminological problem likewise reflects the discontinuity, in the Czech consciousness, of the Bohemian Reformation, the image of which had to be reconstructed on a new foundation during the period of the Enlightenment.

Numerous Czech names for German localities, originating from the nineteenth century, had never come into common usage, and some traditional Czech names for foreign towns are now gradually yielding to their alien originals (such as Řezno to Regensburg, and Solnohrad to Salzburg). Nevertheless, it does not seem likely – because of its symbolic value – that the current name *Koštice* would ever be replaced by its German equivalent. It is, however, still useful to be aware that the forms *Konstanz* and *Koštice* are not semantically identical.

(Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David)

⁶¹ “...Povstaň, hni se, houfe kostí suchých / Aby stál tu nový Izrael, Slunce vzešlo! - Nyní léto Páně / Příhodní teď dnové spasení: / Kristus Ježíš koštnici tu Českou / V Betlémskou zas kapli promění!” in *Hlasy ze Siona*, (6 July 1868) 133. I am grateful to Petr Pabián who called this poem to my attention. See: Petr Pabian, *Christianity in conflict over modernity: Czech and Dutch Christians in the nineteenth century*. (Th.D. diss. Protestant Theological Faculty of the Charles University, Prague, 2005)