Utraquism and Sixteenth-Century Anglicanism, an Imperfect Parallel: Bydžovský on Erastianism

Zdeněk V. David (Washington D.C.)

In my past writings, I have dealt with the similarities between Utraquism and sixteenth-century Anglicanism as they evolved respectively from the Bohemian and the English Reformation.[1] In order to create a context for this article, it seems useful to recall the salient features of the past discussion. I have particularly called attention to the Bohemian theologians of the mid-sixteenth century, especially Bohuslav Bílejovský (ca. 1480–1555) and Pavel Bydžovský (1496–1559), and to the aspects, in which their standpoints may be considered early analogues of Elizabethan Anglicanism. This was, above all, evident from their consolidation of Utraquist theology in the second quarter of the sixteenth century, along the lines of a middle way between Rome and Luther.[2] Their via media foreshadowed the features that subsequently became evident in England thanks to the Elizabethan religious Settlement. In England, this transition involved the repeal of Queen Mary's pre-Henrician Catholic legislation (1553–58) and the restoration of Henry's Act of Supremacy in 1558, and the process was crowned by the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1563. The main theological architects of the Settlement were Bishop John Jewel (1522–1571), and Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504–1575, in office: 1559–1575), followed by Archbishop John Whitgift (ca. 1532–1604, in office: 1583–1604) and the theologian Richard Hooker (ca. 1554–1600).[3]

[1] Most recently in Zdeněk V. David, "Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology: Utraquists and Anglicans in the Latter Sixteenth Century," BRRP 9 (2010) 198–220; idem, "Bohemian and English Reformations Compared," in *Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America*, Selected Papers from the Conference of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, June 8–10, 2007, eds. Zdeněk V. David and Petro Nungovitch (New York, 2008) 7–16.

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

[3] Hooker offered a near authoritative justification of the Anglican establishment in his multivolume *Ecclesiastical Polity,* see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation: A History* (New York, 2004), 289, 382–389. On Parker as the founder the Anglican *via media*, see DNB 15: 257. On Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, see DNB 21: 134.

At the most basic level, the Utraquists shared with the *Ecclesia Anglicana* an opposition to the Protestant principles of *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*.[4] Secondly, Bílejovský shared with Hooker not only the grim view of what they considered to be the foibles of the Roman Church, but also the implied hope of its salvageability. Like Bílejovský (and the Utraquists in general), though in opposition to Rome, Hooker set out to justify the ancient principles of Christianity against the Reformed churches in his magisterial *Ecclesiastical Polity*.[5] Thirdly, on the issue of the authority of Church Fathers – challenging the *sola scriptura* principle – the Anglicans, like Hooker, surpassed even the Utraquists who seemed somewhat more cautious in endorsing the attainments of medieval scholastics. For instance, they took a dim view of Thomas Aquinas for his endorsement of lay communion in one kind.[6] Otherwise, unless a particular writer contradicted clear statements of the Scripture, Bílejovský did support the Christian authenticity of the recognised corpus of not only patristic, but also scholastic literature.[7]

Fourthly, like the Utraquists, the sixteenth-century Anglicans recognised their own continuity with the medieval church. On the Utraquist side, Bílejovský dwelt strongly on the virtual persistence of lay communion in both kinds in the Church in Bohemia from the times of Sts. Wenceslaus and Ludmila. Thus, he sought to refute assertions that the Utraquists' Church dated only from the time of Jan Hus and Jan Žižka.[8] The Anglicans rejected similar charges accusing them that their Church was a new creation of the sixteenth century.[9] In the fifth place, another trait shared by Utraquism

[4] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (New York, 1990) 97, 99.

[5] This was his guiding position: "Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, others whome we much more affect leavinge it for newer and changinge it for worse; we had rather followe the perfections of them whome we like not, than in defects resemble them whome we love." Richard Hooker, *Folger Library Edition of the Works.* 7 vv. (Cambridge, Mass., 1977–98) 2: 121. See also John S. Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition* (Sewanee, Tenn., 1963) 38–39; Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis, 1989) 51–52.

[6] Marshall, *Hooker*, 38; and W. M. Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660–1700* (Athens, Georgia, 1993) 64–66; Václav Koranda the Younger, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* [Treatise about the Venerable and Divine Sacrament of the Altar] (Prague?, 1493) f. M7; Kamil Krofta, "Václav Koranda mladší z Nové Plzně a jeho názory náboženské," [Václav Koranda the Younger of Nová Plzeň and His Religious Views], *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* [Pages from Czech Religious History] (Prague, 1936) 275; Bílejovský, *Kronyka cýrkevní* [Ecclesiastical Chronicle], ed. Jozef Skalický (Josef Dittrich) (Prague 1816) 7–8.

[7] Bílejovský, *Kronyka,* 51–53.

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

[9] They had to reject statements such as: "… the Church of England was founded at the Reformation by separation from the Catholic Church; …its faith was then invented or changed by Henry VIII.; …the Church of England was responsible for all the views, motives, acts of Henry, Edward, Elizabeth and their courtiers…." Protest by William Palmer, cited by

and Anglicanism was an intellectual open-mindedness and moderation in theological discourse that can be attributed to their centrist positions, and to the irenic influence of Erasmus.[10] It is apropos to recall the mildness displayed by Bydžovský, the archetypal Utraquist, in treating Luther's doctrines in the 1540s, or in chiding the alleged errors of the Brethren.[11] One can cite, as a parallel with Bydžovský's treatment of Luther, Hooker's courteous treatment of Calvin, about whom he spoke with respect, while outlining or implying his profound disagreements with the great Genevan.[12] In the sixth place, the Utraquists, like contemporary Anglicans, did not embrace an ideal of moral perfectionism or rigourism. As a consequence, both experienced harsh criticism for moral laxity from the religious radicals among their compatriots, respectively the Brethren[13] and the Puritans.[14]

Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 179. See also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (New York, 1995) 146–157.

10 Zdeněk V. David, *Realism, Tolerance, Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation* (Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, 2010) 28.

11 David, "Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism's Encounter with Luther," 42–53.

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

13 The Brethren, despite their many virtues, were quite uncharitable toward their opponents and unsparing in their censure of alleged Utraquist amorality. For instance, even the sympathetic Krofta demurs at the Brethren's unsubstantiated characterisation of the Utraquist Administrator Martin of Mělník, as "a dishonorable man, a liar, a drunkard, an obvious whoremonger…" […člověk nevážný, lhář, ožralec, kurevník zjevný…], see Kamil Krofta, "Boj o konsistoř podobojí v. l. 1562–1575 a jeho historický základ" [Struggle for the Utraquist Consistory, 1562–1575, and Its Historical Basis], ČČH 17 (1911) 302 n. 2. The typical sources for the treatment of the Brethren have been *Akty Jednoty bratrské*, ed. Jaroslav Bidlo 2 vv. (Brno 1915–23); Anton Gindely, *Quellen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder* (Vienna 1859); or "Diarium… Bratří českých," *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* [Bohemian Diets from 1526 to the Present], vv. 1–11, 15 (Prague, 1877–1941) 4: 392–464. On the Brethrens' expressions of vengefulness, see Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách: Kulturně-historický obraz v XV. a XVI. století*.[Ecclesiastical Life in Bohemia: A Cultural and Historical Depiction from the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Century] (Prague, 1895) 1: 495–6.

14 In England, the Puritans similarly attempted to undermine the reputation of their Anglican opponents by assailing the leaders of the Church of England as Hooker, *The Folger Edition* 1: 18: "worldlings, timeservers, pleasers of man not of God."

The Question of Erastianism

While there were these remarkable similarities between mature Utraquism and the Anglicanism of the Elizabethan settlement in the latter part of the sixteenth century, there were, however, likewise comparable differences rooted in the concept of the Church's origins.[15] The point of departure for this divergence was the role of the monarch as the head of the Church at the expense of the role of the popes and the See of Rome (the problem of so-called Erastianism). The status of the episcopacy constituted a related issue.[16] The Utraquists saw themselves as deriving from the see of Rome and being in a sacerdotal communion with it, while the sixteenth-century Anglicans saw their origins in the indigenous British Church and in a sacerdotal separation from Rome.[17]

Within this paradigm, reflecting their concern with the sovereign's supremacy, the Utraquist theologians took an early stand on the question of royal headship in the church. This happened even before the two churches, Utraquism and sixteenth-century Anglicanism, in other respects embarked on parallel courses (after 1563). This can be seen when the issue of ecclesiastical supremacy was raised by Henry VIII's conflict with Rome, and the Utraquist position was presented by the prominent theologian, Pavel Bydžovský, in his treatise, *Histories of Several English Martyrs* (Prague, 1554).[18] This article seeks to analyse Bydžovský's arguments and to explore the sources of his inspiration for this treatise. On the issue of the papal origin of the English Church, which was discussed previously, his principal source in the same treatise was the Venerable Bede's *The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation.*[19] The key source for his treatment of the primary issues of this presentation – the church leadership in England and the martyrdom of John Fisher and Thomas More – appears to be rather unexpectedly the treatise of Reginald Pole, *Defense of the unity of the Church*, first published in Rome in the 1530s.[20]

[15] On the divergence concerning the papal role in the establishment of their respective churches, see Zdeněk V. David, "Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology: Utraquists and Anglicans in the Latter Sixteenth Century," BRRP 9 (2014) 198–220.

[16] Ultimately, the divergence could be subsumed under a distinction between universalism and nationalism in ecclesiology. Concerning the universalist ideology of Utraquism, see Zdeněk V. David, "Universalist Aspirations of the Utraquist Church," BRRP 7 (2009) 194–212.

[17] David, "Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology: Utraquists and Anglicans in the Latter Sixteenth Century," BRRP 9 (2014) 198–220.

[18] Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum* (Prague, 1554).

[19] Bede, The Venerable, 673-735, in: Baedae *Opera historica*, with an English translation by J. E. King, 2 vv. (London and New York, 1930). A manuscript copy was available in Prague, Strahov DF III 1. See David, "Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology: Utraquists and Anglicans in the Latter Sixteenth Century," BRRP 9 (2014) 198–220.

[20] Reginald Pole, [Reginaldi Poli Cardinalis Britanni], *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione, libri quatuor* (Rome, c.1536); English translation: Reginald Pole, *Pole's Defense of the unity of the Church* (Westminster, Md., 1965).

Henry VIII's Pride and Ecclesiastical Ambition

Bydžovský depicts the actions of Henry as a punishment, which was meted out to the English people due to their sins. In this process Henry turned his back on his ancestors, and chose to venerate worldly values, having shed all decency. He rejected the principles of the orthodox faith, Christianity and religion, as well as the obedience to the sacred Gospels and the rites of the Holy Church, all of which were more precious than pure gold. Instead, Henry took up the Gospel of this world and the devil. In imbibing from the golden chalice of the Apocalyptic Beast with a great merriment of his spirit, he became immune to all sobriety. The culmination of this orgiastic mood and constant inebriation was an ambition, exceeding the proverbial vanity of the poet Suffenus, to declare himself under Jesus Christ the supreme head of the English Church.[21]

Against Henry's perversity, Bydžovský extols the courage and sanctity of Fisher and More. He calls them the two best, most remarkable and greatest men of God who opposed the King's criminal acts. The first was a bishop of high erudition and great piety, devoted to heavenly contemplation; the other was most cultivated and distinguished by the purest manners, having been the Lord Chancellor of the English Kingdom, which was the highest dignity next to the King's. Entirely due to the fear of God, they agreed to protest, one speaking, the other in silence refusing to agree.[22]

They were prosecuted under a law passed by the English Parliament that stated that the King alone should be acknowledged by all – under the penalty of life and property – as the head in both spiritual and temporal matters in the kingdom, and annulled all ecclesiastical power outside the kingdom with what Bydžovský called "schismatic temerity." First of all Fisher, inspired by God himself and convinced of the truth, steadfastly opposed the law, and was thus seized by the agents of public power and detained for many days in the precincts of the Tower of London.[23]

In a separate section, "About the Cruel Slaying of Various Individuals, for the Testimony of Truth" (*De Crudeli mactacione diversorum, pro veritas testimonio*), Bydžovský expands the number of prisoners from More and Fisher alone to an unspecified number of Carthusian monks.[24] He quotes the prior of the London Charterhouse saying the following:

> … for the relief of his conscience, he wished to say three things. The first I see that Our Lord Jesus Christ gave his Vicars spiritual power

[21] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v-A3r; for reference to "Suffenus," see ibid, f. D2r.

[22] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A3v.

[23] Ibid., f. B2r.

[24] Three Carthusians were convicted with Fisher and More; five heads of religious houses, three of them Carthusians, were executed for treason three months earlier; see J. D. Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors, 1485–1558*, Oxford History of England, vol. 8 (Oxford, 1952) 362.

> by his words in the Gospel: And to you I give the keys of the Heavenly Kingdom, and it is not asserted that he said these words to any other doctors, except only to St. Peter, which however power is transferred to other Apostles, and consequently to the Pope and the bishops. Who then can understand these words about the King, a lay and secular man, that he was the supreme head and the Primate of the English Church?[25]

According to Bydžovský, these additional martyrs protested that they were never disobedient to the king, unless in matters that were repugnant to the sacred gospel and to the Catholic Church, and therefore they accepted death not only patiently, but willingly. Moreover, they added that they realised how great a gratitude of God one secures, if one succumbs to death for God's truth, and for the assertion of his evangelical and catholic doctrines, saying that the king is not in spiritual matters the primate and the head of the English Church.[26]

Henry's Sensuality and Remarriage

Among his weaknesses, according to Bydžovský, Henry embarked on illicit activities in repulsive carnality, which human beings compare not so much with themselves but with the behaviour of cattle, billy goats, and the most brutish of brute animals. As an imitator of St. John the Baptist, John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester, tried his best to divert Henry from such powerful evils and abominations. However, it would have been easier to produce a harvest by planting stones or to teach a crawfish to move forward instead of backwards. In his malice Henry shamelessly repudiated Lady Catherine, his first wife, and arranged to celebrate a second marriage with Ann Boleyn in 1534.[27] Both by speaking and through silence, Fisher and More continued to protest, entirely from a fear of God, because the king acted in violation of divine law and sacred canons.[28]

Bydžovský then proceeds to cite provisions of the canon law from the Decretum of Gratian (Quaestio 31 and 34, Causa 1). A marriage involves two people, not three or four or many. A woman, whose husband had to flee

[25] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D1r: "…pro relevatione conscientiae suae velle dicere tria. Primum viso quod Dominus noster Iesus Christus dedit suis Vicariis spiritualem potestatem per sua verba Euangelica: Et tibi dabo claves Regni Coelorum, et nullus unquam doctorum haec verba alteri dicta esse asseveravit, praeterquam sancto Petro soli, quae quidem potestas inde ad alios derivatur Apostolos, et consequenter ad Papam et Episcopos. Quo ergo modo possent illa verba intelligi de Rege homine laico et saeculari, quod ipse sit supremum caput, et primas Ecclesiae Anglicanae."

[26] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D1v-D2r.

[27] Ibid., f. A3r.

[28] Ibid., f. A3v.

to another duchy or province, always remains married to him, even if she cannot follow him. Finally, if a lonely wife is not permitted to take another husband, the same rule applies also to the man.[29]

Bydžovský describes Henry's reaction to the censures by Fisher and More in lurid colours, once they showed him the transgressions of his wanton adultery. He responded with extreme anger like a tiger deprived of all reason, or like a ship floundering violently at sea. He ordered the two detained in prison for long periods of time and then finally had them taken out and inflicted on them a shameful death. In doing so, he caused their spiritual rebirth.[30] Bydžovský stresses that, particularly in the case of Fisher, the king's vengeance was aroused by his opposition to Henry's marital behaviour. Urged by his conscience, Fisher opposed both in words and in writing Henry's second marriage, maintaining that having set aside Lady Catherine, his first wife, and deciding to enter another marriage with Ann Boleyn in 1534, he had become a bigamist.[31]

Cruelty of Henry's Punishments

In the mentioned separate section, "About the Cruel Slaying of Various Individuals, for the Testimony of Truth" (*De Crudeli mactacione diversorum, pro veritas testimonio*), Bydžovský dwells on the extraordinary cruelty of the executions, by which Henry revenged himself against his detractor, especially among the Carthusians. At the same time, he stresses the courageous demeanour of the victims and the significance of their passage from their earthly existence to heavenly sanctity.

Bydžovský goes on describing the punishment of a group of four religious and one secular priest who refused to acknowledge Henry's special position within the English Church. The death sentence was pronounced by a jury of twelve men and the execution was scheduled for 4 May1535. On that day, the

[29] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A3v: "Nam 31 q I. C. Quo virginibus etc. Una costa a principio in una uxore versa est. Et erunt, inquit, duo in carne una nondixit tres vel quatuor, alioquin non duo sed plures. Item 34. Q. I C. Si quis necessitate inevitabili cogente in alium ducatum seu provinciam fugerit, et eius uxor cum valet et potest amore parentum et rerum suarum eum sequi noluerit. Ipsa omnitempore quam diu vir eius, quem insecure non fuerit, vivit, semper in nupta permanet. Item ibidem C. Ego dixi etc. Non debet dimissa uxore aliam ducere, hic actus similis est in muliere et viro."

[30] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A3v.

[31] Bydžovský adds a special eulogy for Fisher in Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. B2r: "The reverend Father D. John, Bishop of Rochester, while residing in pastoral care of the sheep entrusted to him, observed nightly vigils over his sheep, here in sanctity of life and austerity, there administering the sacraments, here assiduously teaching by voice and also in writing. In brief, he acted as a true bishop for many years, remarkably munificent to the poor, and kind in studies. Thus then, like a morning star in the middle of a mist, and like the full moon in our days, and like the shining sun, so he shined in God's temple, and dispelled errors and darkness by the splendor of his sanctity and erudition."

sentenced were taken from the great Tower of London and driven through the town all the way to the place of execution, distant one milestone from the city. The procedure then followed in three stages. At first – without any respect of order, or sacred attire, or religious without unfrocking, and in their own vestments – they were suspended from gallows, by some gross rope, but not strangled. At the second stage, they were taken down from the gallows, still alive. Their sexual organs were severed and thrown into a fire; then a spearman extracted their hearts, which he pierced through and also cremated in the fire. Finally, at the third stage, with the heads cut off, the bodies of the condemned were quartered. Eventually, the various body parts were placed on the top of gates and other public places of the city of London.[32]

Bydžovský then discusses the heroic behaviour of the Carthusian victims, while they still remained conscious during these grisly proceedings. He commends them, "Although not yet souls changed in the way of the truth, they do not show the fear of death, either by pallour of face, or by trembling words, or some gestures. Because strengthened by the spirit of truth, for which they journeyed toward the agony of death, they remained serene just as earlier when they were whole and sane."[33] Asked by the nobles and spearmen, they replied that they would be willing to live in an orderly way, and to obey the king serving him faithfully in everything, except for what was contrary to God and to the Church.[34]

Bydžovský concludes with the following grand eulogy, including this time More and Fisher with the Carthusians, and other religious martyrs in England for their inspiring examples:

> Otherwise as we see, or read, or hear, we give thanks to God, who clothed with the spirit of fortitude and zeal of charity many of his friends, who shed blood in England in testimony for truth. In that way are the Bishop of Rochester, Thomas More, the many Carthusians, and many of other orders all steadfast, whose heads and members affixed on stakes, teach us that we have to have faith and charity in Christ and the Church, which are to us demonstrated by their example. It ceded to them thus more glory to be attached to gallows and stakes, than to be buried with gold and precious stones. As for all those [who have] crossed over, their steadfastness, says, preaches to others, and broadcasts throughout the world, that people who have moved from here to the world above, which is not feared, and who can lose their body, but they are better off than those who have body and soul in hell.[35]

[32] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D1r-D1v.
[33] Ibid., f. D1v.
[34] Ibid., f. D1v-D2r.
[35] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D2r: "Caeterum, qui hęc vidimus, aut legimus, sive audimus, gratias agamus Deo, qui spiritu induit fortitudinis atque zelo charitatis multos sibi amicos, qui in Anglia pro veritatis testimonio sanguinem suum fuderunt.

Sources of Bydžovský's Critique of Henry's Policies

Although there had been important, even crucial, points of contact between religious thought in England and the Bohemian Reformation at the turn of the fourteenth century,[36] it might seem surprising that, even in the mid-sixteenth century, English religious events should arouse such a lively response on the part of a prominent Utraquist theologian. It is likely, however, that exactly at this time England again attracted special attention in Bohemia due to the Habsburg dynastic involvement in English affairs. This was highlighted by the marriage of Queen Mary in 1554 to King Philip II of Spain, nephew of the Bohemian King Ferdinand I. In addition, Mary was a daughter of Henry's first wife Catherine of Aragon (1485–1536) who, in turn, was an aunt of Ferdinand I, as well as of Emperor Charles V. Thus, Mary in her turn was the first cousin of both Ferdinand I and Charles V, as well as Philip II's first cousin once removed.

A lively Bohemian interest in English affairs is also documented by the circulation of the encyclopaedist Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia*, as well as the histories of Johannes Carion and Johannes Sleidan.[37] References to events in England were likewise frequent in the chronicle of Johannes Cochlaeus (1549), who was a familiar figure on the Bohemian scene for his sharp critique of Hus and the Bohemian Reformation.[38] In addition, Carion's chronicle was published in a Czech translation in 1541, and Münster's *Cosmographia* in 1554.[39] Finally,

Cuiusmodi sunt Episcopus Rossensis, Thoma Morus, Carthusienses multi, aliorumque ordinum constants omnes, quorum capita membraque post mortem stipitibus affixa, prę decant nobis, quam fidem quam ve charitatem ad Christum & Ecclesiam, debeamus habere vsque in mortem hoc que a se factum suo nobis exemplo commonstrant. Cecidit enim illis in gloriam multo maiorem sic patibulis & stipitibus esse affixos, quam cum auro gemmis que sepultos. Ab omnibus enim transeuntibus eorum constantia discitur, praedicatur, atque in mundum traducitur: quo caeteri quoque discant, homines ad huc in mundo super esse, qui nontiment eos, qui corpus possunt occidere, sed eum potius, qui potestatem habet & corpus & animam mittere in gehennam."

36 David, *Finding*, 34–38.

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

38 Johannes Cochlaeus, *Commentaria Joannis Cochlaei de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri Saxonis chronographice, ex ordine ab anno Domini M.D. XVII. usque ad annum M.D. XLVI. inclusive, fideliter conscripta : adiunctis duobus indicibus, et Edicto wormaciensi …* (Mainz, 1549) [Reprint: Farnborough, Hants., 1968], with references to England on pp. 47, 64–65, 68–70, 155, 232–233, 284–285, 288, 292–293. On his concern with religious events in Bohemia, see Johannes Cochlaeus, *Historiae Hussitarum libri duodecim* (Mainz, 1549).

39 Johannes Carion, *Kniha Kronik o všelikých znamenitých věcech od počátku světa zběhlých* [A Book of Chronicles about Diverse Notable Matters Occurring Since the Beginning of the

the knowledge of English affairs in Bohemia was summed up later in the sixteenth century in Marek Bydžovský of Florentin's compendium, *Prima pars annalium seu eorum, quae sub Ferdinando rege contigerunt*.[40]

The problem with these sources, however, is their rather bland treatment of Henry VIII's part in the events of the 1530s, including his marital problems, his execution of Fisher, More and the Carthusian monks, and his break with Rome. These treatments lack the passion and the indignation of Bydžovský's narrative. As an illustrative example, it is possible to cite the dispassionate account in the Czech translation of Münster's *Cosmographia* (1554):

> …to whose [Henry VII's] place Henry VIII succeeded and still in our age has ruled. Having taken as his first wife Catherine, the daughter of the Spanish King Ferdinand, and having lived with her for several years, he put her into a cloister, and took two other daughters of English lords. One bore him a son Edward and died during the childbirth. He ordered the other one beheaded; I do not know the reason, unless that some had accused her of adultery. … This Henry collected and appropriated the annual payments, which his ancestors, for the sake of religion, were giving to the Apostolic See.[41]

The account in Carion's *Kniha Kronik o všelikých znamenitých věcech od počátku světa zběhlých* [A Book of Chronicles about Diverse Notable Matters Occurring Since the Beginning of the World] (1541) is similarly innocuous.[42] Even the treatment in the chronicle of Johannes Cochlaeus

World], trans. Jan Burian Sobek z Kornic (Litomyšl, 1541), 349, 359, 362, 367–68, 368–69, 397–98, 404 (on Henry VIII), 347, 407, 412 (on Edward VI), 412, 415, 421 (on Queen Mary), 368–69, 415, 421 (on Queen Elizabeth), 367–68 (on Thomas More); Sebastian Münster, *Kosmografia česká* [A Bohemian Cosmography], transl. Jan z Puchova (Prague, 1554), for instance, f. 153v. Subsequently, a second Czech edition of Carion's book, enlarged by Daniel Adam of Veleslavín, appeared as *Kronyka Světa* (Prague, 1584); this second version was a basis of the modern edition, as Johannes Carion, *Dějiny evropského světa, 1453–1576* [A History of the European World, 1453–1576], ed. Petr Vorel (Prague, 2008), in which references to English events are on pp. 87, 91, 92, 97, 131, 134, 141, 143, 150.

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

41 Sebastian Munster, *Kosmografia česká*, transl. Jan z Puchova (Prague, 1554) f. 152v: "…na jehožto místo nastoupil Jindřich Osmý a za tohoto našeho věku ještě panoval. Pojav sobě první manželku Kateřinu, dceru Ferdinanda krále Hyspánského a několik let s ní jsa, do kláštera ji dal a jiné dvě pánuv englických dcery sobě pojal. Jedna mu splodila syna Edvarda a při porodu umřela. Druhou stíti kázal; nevím z které příčiny, než že ji někteří cizoložstvem nařkli. Potom pojal sestru knížete julického, ale tu také nedlouho miloval. Tento Jindřich zase sobě přivedl a vzal roční plat, kterýž jsou předkové jeho z náboženství stolici apoštolské dávali."

42 Johannes Carion, *Kniha Kronik o všelikých znamenitých věcech od počátku světa zběhlých*, trans. Jan Burian Sobek z Kornic (Litomyšl, 1541), 362 [Vorel, 87]: "1534: Henry VIII was

(1549), in which one might expect more passion from a noted Roman Catholic apologist, is rather anodyne.[43] In fact, Cochlaeus seeks to relativise or historicise Henry's actions by comparing his treatment of More to the sentencing of Socrates by the Athenian Senate, and in the case of Fisher bringing up Pope Paul III's provocation by appointing the prosecuted bishop a cardinal.[44]

Reginald Pole's Invectives

The most likely source of Bydžovský's invectives and harsh treatment of Henry's attitudes and actions was another book, almost certainly available in Bohemia and published in plenty of time for Bydžovský to use in the mid-1550s. It was Reginald Pole's *In Defense of the Unity of the Church* (*Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione, libri quatuor*), two editions of which were published in Rome in 1536 and 1539 respectively.[45] The Bohemian

anathemised by the pope for repudiating his wife Catherine, aunt of Emperor Charles V, and took another spouse. To retaliate, he issued a decree naming himself the first head of the English Church after Christ and – under the penalty of death – prohibited his subjects to ascribe the supreme authority to the pope, or to pay the annual tax to the pope, known as Peter's pence." Ibid., 367–68. [Vorel, 91]: "1535: Henry VIII ordered Thomas More beheaded in July because he did not want to approve the king's divorce. For many years he held the office of Chancellor, the second highest after the king. Retired from it with king's permission to devote himself to intellectual pursuits, as Erasmus (his excellent friend) had reminded him. Yet, he did not enjoy his free life for long, since ill-will and envy soon cut him down, as often happens to good and virtuous people at the courts."

43 Johannes Cochlaeus, *Commentaria Joannis Cochlaei de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri Saxonis, chronographice, ex ordine ab anno Domini M.D. XVII. usque ad annum M.D. XLVI. inclusive, fideliter conscripta : adiunctis duobus indicibus, et Edicto wormaciensi …* (Moguntiam 1549) [Reprint: Farnborough, Hants., 1968] 284: "Accidit hoc anno [1535] lamentabilis fidei ac religionis turbatio, studio et instigation malignorum, in florentissimo Regno Angliae, accepta per infaustum Regis diuortium occasione, dum Clemens Papa VII noluisset diuortium illud permittere. … Cum autem optimi et Doctissimi uiri, Ioannes Fischerus, Episcopus Rossensis, et Thomas Morus, supremus Cancellarius Regni, dissuasissent diuortium illud; aliquandiu catiui detenti sunt in carceribus, ac tandem hoc anno (cum neque diuortium neque defectionem Regis, qua ab obedientia Ro. Pontificis et Unitate Ecclesiae discessit, seque ipsum supremum Caput Ecclesiae Anglicanae constituit, approbarent) ambo capitate truncate, et ultimo supplicio publice affecti sunt."

44 Johannes Cochlaeus, *Commentaria Joannis Cochlaei de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri Saxonis*, 284: "Sexto Nonas Iulii , obtruncatus est in Britannia Thomas Morus, non minorem constantiam in iudicio et supplicio prae se ferens, quam iniquissimo Atheniensium Senatusconsulto condemnatus Socrates: Paucis diebus ante illum interfecto Episcopo Rossensi, in quem regis furor non alia causa uehementis exarsit, quam quod is in Cardinalium ordinem a Pontifice esset coaptatus."

45 Reginald Pole [Reginaldi Poli Cardinalis Britanni], *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione, libri quatuor.* Rome, c.1536. Christopher Highley, "'A Pestilent and Seditious Book': Nicholas Sander's *Schismatis Anglicani* and Catholic Histories of the Reformation," in *The uses of history in early modern England,* ed. Paulina Kewes (San Marino, Calif., 2006) 155. A modern

connection was strengthened by the support Pole (1500–1558) was given by the Habsburg dynasty, especially by Emperor Charles V, who wished to redress Henry's injury to his aunt Queen Catherine and her daughter Mary.[46] Pole was a distant relative of Henry who supported his early education. The book signalled his formal break with the king and he received the office of Cardinal Deacon from Pope Paul III in December 1536. At the time, when Bydžovský's treatise was published in 1554, Pole had returned to England as a papal legate after the accession of Queen Mary to the throne.[47]

Like Bydžovský in his treatise, Pole in *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione* sharply attacks Henry on his claim to the status of the Supreme Head of the Church. Pole addresses Henry, "With the ruin of your kingdom, with the slaughter and murder of the very best men…you had made a clear path for yourself to the title of supreme head of the Church in England. Nothing more ignominious could ever have been imagined than this pretentious title."[48] Those who supported the idea of the king's headship of the Church, according to Pole, acted against their better knowledge: "They knew that when Christ left this earth he left the position of head to Peter and that he appointed Peter as his successor. They saw, finally, that all the Roman pontiffs who succeeded to Peter, in the judgment of the Church, held the position of head and continually confirmed the greatest unity of the Church."[49] He taunts Henry by saying, "Should we now doubt which Church [Henry] headed since he commanded that [Fisher's and More's] heads be cut off … we wish to relate other deeds that were done whereby this renowned Head of the Church raised his shamelessness to heaven."[50]

Like Bydžovský, Pole attributes animal passions to Henry. Discussing what epitaph the king might deserve on his tomb, he suggests that of Sardanapalus: "I had those things that satiated my passionate desires" which, according to Aristotle, "might better have been inscribed on the tomb of a cow rather than upon the tomb of a king."[51] Likewise, Pole excoriates Henry's cruelty, comparing him to the Turks: "For what the king usurps for himself is in greatest agreement with Turkish dominion. By a nod, he may have greater influence than all laws …He has rescinded the privileges of all; he has transferred the rights of all to himself. By holding a sword in his hand, he decides all religious

English translation was published as Reginald Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church*, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. (Westminster, Md.) 1965.

46 "Pole Reginald," DNB, 16: 36.

47 He would be consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 1556, and die in London on November 17, 1558. After the appearance of *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione,* Henry had avenged himself by having Pole's mother and brother executed. "Pole Reginald," DNB, 16: 35–46.

48 Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 288, see also 39, 209.

49 Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 207–08.

50 Ibid., 205.

51 Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 288 and *Encyclopedia Americana*, 30 vv. (Danbury, Conn., 1994) 24: 260: "Sardanapalus… was the legendary last king of Assyria, who according to the ancient account was the 30th and most dissolute of a line of effete sovereigns."

controversies. But this is manifestly something for Turks and barbarians."[52] Having had More and Fisher put to death, Henry proved himself to be worse than Nero and Domitian, who "were enemies … of Christians. But certainly if they knew these men as I well know you knew them, they would never have been so harsh or severe."[53]

The martyrdom of More and Fisher is the central theme for Pole as it is for Bydžovský, These martyrs are the principal figures of the book.[54] Pole stresses their characteristics as saints, asking, "Were these not the very men from whose virtues and literary talents England derived such a great enjoyment? By their lives they provided England with a singular saintly example… These are the same men, however, who defended ecclesiastical affairs with their learning, religious devotion, and written works…"[55] Directly addressing Henry, he asks rhetorically, "Could you have killed Fisher? Could you have killed More? Could you have conceived such a great crime?"[56] In addition Pole, like Bydžovský, conspicuously features the Carthusians as the most prominent victims of Henry's next to More and Fisher.[57]

Even more tellingly, however, Pole highlights the martyrdom of *Reginaldus monachus*, Richard Reynolds (c. 1487–1535), a Bridgettine monk,[58] to whom Bydžovský devotes an entire section of his treatise *De D. Reginaldi theologi martyrio, responsis, et sentencia Mortis propter fidem Ecclesiae*.[59] Both extoll Reynolds's remarkable erudition. Pole praises him for his knowledge of the liberal arts, which he could study in their original form, as he knew the relevant tongues. As Pole points out, "For he had an excellent command of the three particular languages in which all the liberal arts are contained. He was the only one of all the English monks who knew these languages. He seemed to lack nothing that would confirm the praise of his sanctity and learning for all times."[60] Bydžovský calls attention to Reynolds's remarkable knowledge of theology covering fifteen centuries, which included the decrees of the General Councils and the works of Church doctors and patristic writers, especially St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory.[61]

[52] Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 247.
[53] Ibid., 260.
[54] For instance, Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 38, 259–263.
[55] Ibid., 204–205
[56] Ibid., 259.
[57] Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 204, and Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D2r.
[58] Ibid., 253 "Behold the Bridgettine Order!… I cannot do this without calling by name upon one whom I knew intimately. His name was Reynolds." See also 292 no. 9 and "Reynolds, Richard," DNB, 16: 953–954; "Reynolds, Richard, Bl.," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 12: 455–456.
[59] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. C3v.
[60] Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 253.
[61] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. C4r-C4v.

Finally, perhaps the most revealing parallel is the virtually identical description of the standard triple stage executions, inflicted on Henry's victims. Pole writes about the "triple death" that snatched away the victims' lives:

> First, their breath was stopped short with a noose, … They were seen to be in the embrace of death, to be struggling with death itself rather than to be dying. And in this struggle, as soon as the hangman perceived that they had become weak…lowered them from the cross to the ground. They were then carried on to another kind of death even more harsh… For, seizing a sword, the hangman exposed their hearts and breasts to view. …with their entrails now exposed [they] saw them torn out and hurled into the fire… They could behold themselves as they were dying and they could see their own bodily members being consumed in flames. …. Indeed this second death would have consumed them had not the marvellous agility of the hangman prevented. … He now prepared to tear them into pieces that he quartered these breathing and living men before the eyes of all.[62]

There is also a negative feature – a missing piece of narrative – which connects Bydžovský with Pole. Neither of them develops the parallel of Henry and Anne Boleyn with Herod and Herodias/Salome, featuring Fisher in the role of John the Baptist. This parallel was relished particularly by sixteenth--century English recusant writers. Thus, this biblical simile between Herod Antipas and Henry was employed by Nicholas Harpsfield (1519-1575). Anne Boleyn is compared to Herod's half-niece and half-brother's wife Herodias, whom Herod marries after repudiating his own first wife. John the Baptist condemns Herod's divorce and remarriage, so Herodias's daughter Salome pursues revenge against the prophet demanding John the Baptist's head. Harpsfield is particularly anxious to point out that both Salome and Anne ended up decapitated. Anne by Henry's executioner, Salome in an accident by two sheets of ice.[63] As their works stand, Bydžovský's contains one fleet-

[62] Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 206, and Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D1v. The one difference in the accounts is that Bydžovský speaks of severed "sexual organs" thrown in the fire, while Pole merely of "entrails." It is possible that the American Catholic translator of Pole in the 1960s shied away from the term.

[63] Nicholas Harpsfield, *A treatise on the pretended divorce between Henry VIII and Catharine of Aragon*, ed. Nicholas Pocock [Westminster]: Printed for the Camden Society, 1878. Series: Works of the Camden Society, new ser., 21, 249–252. See also Highley, "'A Pestilent and Seditious Book': Nicholas Sander's *Schismatis Anglicani* and Catholic Histories of the Reformation," 157–158. Harpsfield treatise was completed at the death of Mary and not permitted to be printed under Elizabeth. The account of the Anne/Salome parallel appeared in Nicholas Sander's *Rise and growth of the Anglican schism* in 1588, as Nicholas Sanders, *De origine ac progressu schismatis anglicani*. Ingoldstadii: Ex officina typographica W. Ederi, 1588; transl., Nicholas Sander, *Rise and growth of the Anglican schism*. eds. Edward Rishton and David Lewis (London, 1877).

ing reference to Fisher as a John the Baptist, and Pole's one biblical reference to Anne concerns Jezabel; neither Herodias nor Salome figures in either Bydžovský's or Pole's account.[64]

There is yet another notable missing piece of the narrative that – by a testimony from silence – points to Pole's book as the source of Bydžovský's account. While Pole describes in gory details the process of the three-stage execution, applied particularly in the case of the Carthusian monks, he notably does not inform the reader that Fisher and More were spared such grisly proceedings, that were reserved for Henry's opponents (as traitors), and that the two were – by a special dispensation from the King – simply beheaded.[65] This qualifying information is also absent in Bydžovský's account.

The Epitaph and Canon Law

This leaves us to account for the source of the text of an epitaph for Thomas More, cited by Bydžovský, and for his use of the canon law in discussing Henry's marital complications. The epitaph, "Tabula affixa ad sepulchrum Thomae Mori," constitutes another separate section of Bydžovský's treatise.[66] It turns out to be a verbatim reproduction of the Inscription which More had included in a letter to Erasmus. The text is published in Nicholas Harpsfield's *The life and death of Sr Thomas Moore … describing the trial and death of More; More's indictment; and More's epitaph*.[67] The editor, Elsie V. Hitchcock, dates the letter to 14 June 1532, and cites *Des Erasmi Roterdami Epistolarum Opus* (Basel, 1538) as the source.[68] Bydžovský presumably had access to the text of the Epitaph in the Frobenius edition, especially since a Bohemian, Zikmund Hrubý of Jelení (Gelenius, 1497–1554) was assisting

[64] On Bydžovský's reference to "the imitator of the most blessed John the Baptist, John the Bishop of Rochester," see his *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, A3r. For the reference to Jezabel, see Pole, *Pole's Defense,* 258, 281.

[65] On More and Fisher being spared the type of execution designed for traitors, see Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors,* 362–363; Jasper Ridley, *Henry VIII* (New York, 1985), 247–249. A Statute of November 1534 declared that "the king was Supreme Head of the Church of England," and another Act defined as treason: "to deny any of the king's titles." Ridley, *Henry VIII*, 244.

[66] Pavel Bydžovský, "Tabula affixa ad sepulcrum Thomae Mori," in *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est* (Prague, 1554) C2v-C3v.

[67] The text of the epitaph is in Harpsfield, Nicholas, 1519-1575, *The life and death of Sr Thomas Moore, knight, sometymes lord high chancellor of England, written in the tyme of Queene Marie by Nicholas Harpsfield, L.D., and now edited from eight manuscripts, with collations, textual notes, etc., by Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock with an introduction on the continuity of English prose from Alfred to More and his school, a life of Harpsfield, and historical notes, by R.W. Chambers and with appendices, including the Rastell fragments, chiefly concerning Fisher; the news letter to Paris, describing the trial and death of More; More's indictment; and More's epitaph* (Oxford, 1932) 279–281, see also reference to epitaph, ibid., 60–61.

[68] See, Harpsfield, *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Moore*, 278.

Frobenius in publishing Erasmus's works.[69] As for a modern edition, the epitaph is published in Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, edited by Percy S. Allen, which, however, dates the letter to June 1533.[70]

As for his references to canon law in relation to marriage, mentioned above,[71] Bydžovský could safely rely on his earlier knowledge of this field. He had previously employed it in his arguments in 1541 to document that infant communion had enjoyed a traditional acceptance, specifically in the Western Church, into the second millennium of Christianity. After all, its classical justification in the *Decretum* of Gratian dated to the mid-eleventh century. From canon law he cited from Distinctio 4, Canon "*Si qui vel hi qui*," which provided that those who after baptism and confirmation were unable to walk, either because of young age or handicap, should be carried to receive communion. If the infant could not receive the wine directly from the chalice, it could be administered together with the bread on a spoon. Further, Distinctio 4, Canon "*Eccles*: " stated that their lack of understanding did not bar the infants from the Body and Blood of Christ, the reception of which enabled the attainment of eternal life.[72]

He had also displayed formidable knowledge of canon law on another occasion in 1543, adducing at least twelve Distinctiones and Causae from the *Decretum* of Gratian, particularly those defining the respective status of the bishops and the priests (Causa 1 and 24,[73] Distinctio 92 and 95[74]) and those bearing on the proper consecration of the eucharist (Distinctio 2[75]). Thus, unlike Luther – who had denounced this type of legislation as "*summa injuria tyrannis*" – Bydžovský had no qualms about resorting to arguments from canon law.[76] In this Bydžovský also followed in the tradition of the Bohemian

[69] Zikmund Hrubý of Jelení (Gelenius, 1497–1554) in 1523 left for Basel, where he worked as editor in the publishing house of Frobenius; see *Malá československá encyklopedie* [Small Czechoslovak Encyclopedia], 6 vv. (Prague, 1984–1987), 2: 859.

[70] Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, ed. Percy S. Allen, 12 vols. (Oxford; New York, 1992) 10: 260–261.

[71] Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A3v.

[72] Pavel Bydžovský, *Děťátka a neviňátka hned po přijetí křtu sv. Tělo a Krev Boží, že přijímati mají* [Infants and Innocents Should Receive the Holy Body and Blood of God Right after Baptism] (Prague, 1541) f. A7r-A7v.

[73] Pavel Bydžovský, *Tento spis ukazuje, že Biskupové Biskupa, a Biskup kněží, a kněží od řádných Biskupů svěceni Těla a krve Boží posvěcovati mají* (N.p. 1543) 6, 9, 14, cf. Friedberg. v. 1, col. 359, 977–980.

[74] Bydžovský, *Tento spis ukazuje*, 15, cf. Friedberg, v. 1, col. 317–318, 332.

[75] Ibid., 14, cf. Friedberg, v. 1, col. 1343–1342.

[76] Zikmund Winter, *O životě na vysokých školách pražských: kulturní obraz XV. A XVI. Století* [On the Life in the University Schools of Prague: A Cultural Image of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries] (Prague, 1899) 357. While Luther rejected classical canon law. the Anglican Church retained its substance after eliminating the elements of papal centralisation, see Gerald Bray (ed.), *The Anglican Canons, 1529–1947* (Woodbridge, 1998); MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 327, 351, 377, 449; see also James H. Provost, "Canon Law," *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York, 1987) 3: 70; *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, ed. Erwin L. Lueker

Reformation. According to Jiří Kejř, Jan Hus, in particular, had referred in his writings to the *Decretum* of Gratian more often than to any other source except the Scripture.[77]

Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology

On average, the churches of Bohemia and England showed great similarities in theology and liturgy in the latter part of the sixteenth century, essentially reflecting the Christianity of the first millennium of the Christian era. Their political situations, however, were very different. England, in the Elizabethan era was a great sea power, poised to launch spectacular global exploits. Landlocked Bohemia was confined to a rather parochial existence in the midst of the Hereditary Lands of the Habsburgs in Central Europe. Yet, in ecclesiology, the opposite was the case. The Utraquists, not even politically prevalent in their own homeland, turned their vision toward Roman universalism. The Anglicans, dominant in their own country – without abandoning the idea of Christian catholicity – focused on their own national church.[78] As discussed in this article, from the viewpoint of their ecclesiological universalism, the Utraquists were particularly sensitive to the domination of the church by particular national sovereigns. The fact that during the entire duration of the Bohemian Reformation (1415–1622) – except for George of Poděbrady (1458–1471) – none of the rulers of Bohemia were Utraquists may shed additional light on the intensity of their concern.

In contrast to the Anglicans becoming a fully defined independent church having experienced a full-fledged confessionalisation in the sixteenth century, the Utraquists – because of their ill-defined relationship with Rome – remained "a work in progress" as a church. The Utraquists never underwent the process of confessionalisation since their objective was not to exist as a separate entity, but to eventually rest in the bosom of the Roman Church once Rome reformed itself according to their own ecclesiological views, turning from a centre of administrative and judicial authority to one of pastoral care.[79] As a consequence, the Utraquists, accepting the traditional Roman

rev. ed. (St. Louis, 1975) 133. Bydžovský's and other Utraquist theologians' view of canon law may be assumed to have come close to that of Erasmus, see Wilhelm Maurer, "Erasmus und das Kanonische Recht," in *Vierhundertfünfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation, 1517–1967* (Göttingen, 1967) 222–232. See also on the bearing of canon law on ecclesiology Takashi Shogimen, "The Relationship between Theology and Canon Law: Another Context of Political Thought in the Early Fourteenth Century," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999) 417–431.

77 Jiří Kejř, "Jan Hus als Rechstdenker [Jan Hus as a Legal Theorist]," in: HENC 213–214.

78 On Bohemia, see Zdeněk V. David, "Universalist Aspirations of the Utraquist Church," BRRP 7 (2009), 194–212.

79 David, *Finding*, 234–236; idem, "Utraquism's Liberal Ecclesiology," BRRP 6 (2007), 165–188.

theology and liturgy, did not feel a need for issuing their own theological manuals or catechisms – a lack which has been held against them by some critics.

David R. Holeton notes that the World Council of Churches recognises four groups in Christendom: Anglican, Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant. Utraquism, if it survived, would form a fifth group and would entertain the closest ecumenical ties with the Anglican Communion. Holeton adds, "The dialogues with Rome would have continued and all the differences probably would have been in the end resolved with the exception of the exercise of authority, which would be too bitter a morsel for Rome to swallow."[80] This, of course, was not to be. Instead of finding their resting place in the bosom of a benign Roman Church, the Utraquists ended up being absorbed into the Tridentine ecclesiastical variant in 1622 and transformed into a quintessential model of a Counter Reformation entity, which represented the epitome of the characteristics that the Utraquists had abhorred since the execution of Jan Hus in 1415. The end of Utraquism was drastic and some might even say perverse. Yet, as David Holeton points out, the Utraquists might still serve as an example for some churches today.

[80] David R. Holeton, Review of Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way*, HT 14 (2004) 404–405.

APPENDIX

Executions under Henry VIII

4 May 1535 at Tyburn:
Richard Reynolds, priest, Bridgettine monk of Syon Abbey
John Houghton, priest, Carthusian monk
Robert Lawrence, priest, Carthusian monk
Augustine Webster, priest, Carthusian monk
John Haile, secular priest

19 June 1535 at Tyburn:
Humphrey Middlemore, priest, Carthusian monk
William Exmew, priest, Carthusian monk
Sebastian Newdigate, priest, Carthusian monk

22 June 1535 at Tower Hill:
John Fisher, cardinal, Bishop of Rochester

6 July 1535 at Tower Hill:
Thomas More, layman, Lord Chancellor

19 May 1536 at Tower Green:
Anne Boleyn, the second Queen of Henry VIII

28 May 1541 in the Tower of London:
Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, mother of Cardinal Pole

Sources: "Martyrs of England and Wales," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 17 vv. (New York, 1967–79) 9: 322–323; and "Anne, 1507–1536," DNB 1: 425–428.