# The Integrity of the Utraquist Church and the Problem of Neo-Utraquism

## Zdeněk V. David

### *(Washington, D.C.)*

It has been a widely accepted opinion that, after the emergence of Luther's teaching, the Bohemian Reformation was irresistibly drawn to adopt a Protestant form, for which, some ninety years ago, the denotation of Neo-Utraquism was conventionally adopted. The concept of Neo-Utraquism proved (for opposite reasons) so convenient for both Rome and the evangelical churches that – as Voltaire said of God – if it had not existed, it had to be invented.[1] The objective of this study is to argue that Neo-Utraquism did not really exist but was invented for its extraordinary (almost magic) effectiveness.

At the start, it must also be noted that the process which gave birth to a concept of Neo-Utraquism required a disassembly of Utraquism by positing its "other" as an "Old Utraquism". This dialectical sally was necessary in order to account for the fact that the Bohemian Reformation continued to display phenomena which were not merely incompatible with, but diametrically opposed to, the Protestant stance. Since such cacophonous features could not, so to say, be swept under the rug, and simply ignored, the coming to life of Neo-Utraquism also gave birth to its fraternal antipodal twin, which by and large received the name of Old Utraquism. Thus, the dichotomy emerged between so-called Old Utraquism and Neo-Utraquism. In a broader context, such a deconstruction seems to be a professional hazard of those travelling on the via media flanked by Rome and the German Reformation. The Church of England was subject to a similar questioning of its integrity in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Some historians saw the Ecclesia Anglicana as an incoherent assemblage of Crypto-Puritans and of Crypto-Catholics, and the existence of true Proto-Anglicans or Anglicans was questioned.[2]

In this study I will outline (1) terminological and historical bases of the concept of Neo-Utraquism; (2) reasons for the utility of this concept and that of its antipode; (3) arguments for the improbability of the phenomenon of Neo-Utraquism, as well as of its antipode; and (4) the misleading influence of this concept for the understanding of Bohemia's religious history.

---

[1] "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him." François M. Voltaire, *Épître à l'Auteur du Livre des Trois Imposteurs,* 10 November, 1770, cited in John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations* (Boston, 1992[16]) 306:25.9.

[2] Thus Arthur G. Dickens has similarly minimized the role of real Anglicans or proto-Anglicans in Elizabethan England in favour of the relative extremes of Puritanism and Roman Catholicism: "Parker and Jewell were in very real sense forerunners of the 'balanced' Anglicanism of Hooker, yet even so the vast majority of Elizabethan Englishmen were either Roman Catholics or Anglican Puritans."Arthur G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (University Park, PA., 1991[2]) 368. Patrick Collinson chimed in speaking of the Elizabethan settlement: "...it is not easy to identify very many Anglicans who were positively attached to those features of the church that distinguished it from other churches of the Reformation...." Patrick Collinson, "Puritans," *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (New York, 1996) 3:366.

### The Modern Concept and Its Historical Roots

The credit for articulating the dichotomy in Utraquism belonged to Ferdinand Hrejsa, who argued in his famous *Česká konfesse: její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (1912) that the religious debates in the 1520s foreshadowed a split from the traditional or conservative Utraquists by a new progressive wing. These "Neo-Utraquists" would be linked not only to the teaching of the Lutheran Reformation but also to the Taborites' theological radicalism of the early Bohemian Reformation, which the mainstream Utraquists had definitely repudiated by the 1430s. In the meantime, according to Hrejsa, a conservative or reactionary wing clung to the fifteenth-century principles, embodied in the *Compactata* of 1436 and refused to listen to the voices of Luther and Melanchton.[3] This conservative wing was subsequently called Old Utraquists. Endorsed by Kamil Krofta in 1914,[4] Hrejsa's concept of Neo-Utraquism came to enjoy considerable vogue in Czech historical literature. In practice, its use however turned out to be ambiguous and confusing. The term was applied either superfluously to normal Czech Lutherans, or inaccurately to traditional mainline Utraquists. The two divergent and questionable designations of Neo-Utraquism and Old Utraquism have wrought considerable havoc in the taxonomy of the Bohemian Reformation. Nevertheless, the concept of Neo-Utraquism has had a long life and survival rate both in Bohemia and elsewhere.[5]

Although the term itself is of modern origin, there were also historical roots to the idea of Neo-Utraquism: (1) in the terminological complexity of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and (2) in the tendentious denominational writings of Czech Lutherans and the Counter Reformation.

As to the terminological problem, the concept of Neo-Utraquism received a spurious verisimilitude because Bohemian Lutherans either were forced or found it advantageous to use the designation *podobojí*, i.e. Utraquists. This was due to the requirements of the constitution of Bohemia, which recognized only those *sub una* and those *sub utraque* as legitimate religions. The adherence to this legalistic (albeit deceptive) nicety was bolstered by the insistence of the Habsburg monarchs, including Rudolf II. The Lutherans' own preference was for the term "evangelicals".[6] The

---

[3] Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse: Její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Prague, 1912) for instance, 4; his "Luterství, kalvinismus a podobojí na Moravě před Bílou horou," ČČH 44 (1938) 483-5.

[4] Kamil Krofta, "Nový názor na český vývoj náboženský v době předbělohorské," ČČH 20 (1914) 10-13. The concept was anticipated by Palacký, who had postulated a split in the Bohemian Reformation in the 1520s between the party of progress (*pokrok*) and the party of stagnation (*utkvělost*); František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého* 5 vv. (Prague, [1893]) 5: 514. The term Neo-Utraquists [*novoutrakvisté*] was used by Klement Borový already in his *Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, arcibiskup pražský* (Prague, 1873) 199.

[5] In his magnum opus, published in the 1990s, Josef Macek has claimed that in the 1520s a dichotomy opened up between the Old or Conservative Utraquists – ready to plunge into the embrace of the Roman Curia - and the traditional radical Utraquists – "returning to the Taborite impulses, and approximating the ideological bases of the Unity of Brethren." See his *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích* 4 vv. (Prague, 1992-1999) 3: 315. The prestigious series *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregors XV* (1997) states: "A split between the Old and Neo-Utraquists occurred in 1524 under the influence of Luther's teaching." See *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregors XV. Für die Nuntien und Gesandten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen, 1621-1623*, ed. Klaus Jaitner, 2 vv. (Tübingen 1997) 2:621, n. 45. See also Markus Reisenleitner, *Frühe Neuzeit, Reformation und Gegenreformation. Darstellung – Forschungsüberblick – Quellen und Literatur* [Handbuch zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs Band 1] (Innsbruck, 2000) 110.

[6] See Karel Stloukal, "Počátky nunciatury v Praze: Bonhomi v Čechách, 1581-84," ČČH 34 (1928) 252; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 462-463; Julius Glücklich, "Koncept Majestátu a vznik porovnání," ČČH 23

Utraquists proper, especially after 1575, could be distinguished from the Lutherans as those administered by the Utraquist Consistory of Prague.[7] The situation became more complicated in 1609 when the Letter of Majesty transferred the Utraquist Consistory to the control of the dissident religious estates in the Diet, which were confusingly called "party or estates *sub utraque*" [*strana* or *stavy podobojí*]. From then on the so-called Lower Consistory (or Consistory *sub utraque*) was to serve not only Utraquists proper, but also the Lutherans and the Brethren. In legal documents, the Utraquists proper were henceforth referred to as "those whose priests were ordained by the bishops".[8] The inclusion of the Utraquists together with the Lutherans and the Brethern under the "estates *sub utraque*", administered by a single Consistory, did not change the Utraquists into semi-Lutherans, or the Lutherans into semi-Utraquists.[9] As the Brethren remained Brethren, so the Lutherans remained Lutherans and the Utraquists remained Utraquists. Although the designation may have changed, the substance remained the same, thus following the Shakespearean dictum: "What's in a name? That which we call a rose – by any other name would smell as sweet."[10]

The construction of Neo-Utraquism also had roots in the misleading, if not mendacious, propaganda of sixteenth-century Czech Lutheranism and the Counter Reformation. The narratives stemming from these two sides tended to authenticate (although for opposite reasons) an evolution of the Bohemian Reformation into the Lutheran or evangelical direction. The Lutherans did so in order to appropriate, the *sub una* in order to discredit, the Bohemian Reformation. In particular, the image of a Lutheran upsurge in the 1520s was given a life of its own, and the propagandists of

---

(1917) 120, 126.

[7] Zdeněk V. David, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609-1620," BRRP 3 (2000) 178.

[8] *Druhá Apologie stavův království českého, tělo a krev Pána Ježíše Krista pod obojí přijímajících* (Prague, 1619) 205 (no. 27).

[9] The Letter of Majesty assumed the continued coexistence of a variety of *sub utraque*. The basic assurance came from the main architect of the arrangement under the Letter, Václav Budovec of Budov, on 25 June 1609, who specifically defined the party *sub utraque* which rallied under the banner of the Bohemian Confession as consisting of three distinct groups: (1) the Utraquists, that is, those administered hitherto by the Prague Consistory; (2) those administered by priests ordained in Germany, that is, the Lutherans, and (3) the Brethren. Interestingly enough, the Utraquists were named first before the Lutherans and the Brethren. Budovec went on to compare, rather infelicitously, the three distinct groups among the *sub utraque* to the various religious orders in the party *sub una* which differed as to their peculiar rules and rights in clothing, food, and religious rituals. He further compared the three kinds of *sub utraque* to the various of churches with which St. Paul had to deal in his Epistles, like the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians, and the Thessalonians. Although diverse in ritual, rules, and even doctrine, the Apostle did not seek to impose uniformity on these ecclesiastical communities. See Julius Glücklich, *O historických dílech Václava Budovce z Budova z let 1608-1610 a jejich poměru k Slavatovi, Skálovi a neznámému dosud diariu lutherána Karla Zikmundova* [Rozpravy České Akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění. Třída I., číslo 42] (Prague, 1911) 68; Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. Karel Tieftrunk, 5 vv. (Prague, 1865-1870) 1:108-109. See also Zdeněk V. David, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609-1620," BRRP 3 (2000) 180-185.

[10] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* II, ii, cited in John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations* (Boston, 1992[16]) 175:2. Sanuel Martinius z Dražova, *Obrana proti Ohlášení starších kněží bratrských* ([Pirna?], 1636] 445, refers to another example of the idea of cohabitation by very distinct religious denomination under a single administrative institution. Twenty-six Calvinist ministers petitioned King Frederick in 1620 to place them under the Upper Consistory together with the clergy under obedience to the Roman Curia. They wished to avoid the Consistory *sub utraque*, because the Lutherans and the Brethren were evidently more abhorrent to them than the papalists. See also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 570.

the Roman Curia on the right and those of the Lutheran movement on the left drew comfort, albeit illusory, from Luther's alleged upsetting of Utraquism's via media.[11] On the Roman side, Václav Hájek of Libočany in his *Kronika česká* [Bohemian Chronicle] (1541) claimed that with Administrator Havel Cahera's blessing the Lutherans took over the Bohemian church in 1523-1525.[12] Hájek's account was repeated with a considerable dose of *Schadenfreude* (over the repudiation of Hus and embracing of Luther) by Counter Reformation authors, like Symeon Evstachyus Kapihorský in his *Hystoria kláštera Sedleckého* [History of the Sedlec Monastery] (1630), and Jindřich Ondřej Hoffman, another Roman priest, in his *Ocularia, aneb oči sklenné starého Čecha* [Spectacles or the Glassy Eyes of an Old Bohemian] (1637).[13]

Czech Lutheran writers in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, like Matěj Kolín of Chotěřina (1574) and especially Zacharyáš Bruncvík (1613), made a similar historiographical use of the episode of the Candlemas Day Articles.[14] The most valiant attempt, however, to relate Luther to Hus was made on the Czech Lutheran side by Martinius of Dra±ov. In his *Hussius et Lutherus* (1618) he based this claim unconvincingly on a comparison of what were essentially two Lutherna texts: the Bohemian Confession of 1575 and the Augsburg Confession.[15] The former, which was in fact a derivation from the Augsburg Confession, was (mis)represented as an epitome of Hus's teachings.[16]

---

[11] On the events of 1523-1525 see Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquism's Curious Welcome to Luther and the Candlemas Day Articles of 1524," *Slavonic and East European Review* 79 (2001) 74-84.

[12] According to Hájek, priests who refused to follow Luther's teaching were expelled from Prague in 1523. Without any mention of the anti-Lutheran campaign under Jan Pašek of Vrat, he maintained that, on the contrary, Havel Cahera, the Administrator of the Utraquist Consistory, still advocated Luther's teaching in 1525; see Václav Hájek z Libočan, *Kronika česká*, ed. Jaroslav Kolár (Prague, 1981) 693-94, 696.

[13] Apparently basing himself on Hájek, Kapihorský claimed that in 1525 Cahera in "scandalous sermons" publicly extolled Luther, calling him a saint; see Symeon Evstachyus Kapihorský, *Hystoria kláštera Sedleckého*, (Prague, 1630) 66; Hoffman repeated Hájek's account, adding on his own: "[...] and that is how Luther's religion began in Bohemia, and Hus's – once considered the best – was held in contempt." See Jindřich Ondřej Hoffman, *Ocularia. Aneb oči sklenné starého Čecha, které podává Čechu nynějšímu skrze něž by hleděl na předešlou staročeskou nábožnost* (Prague, 1637) 201-03.

[14] As evidence that the Bohemian Reformation embraced much of Luther as early as the 1520s. See *Antiqua et constans confessio fidei ecclesiae Christi in regno Boiemiae et Marchianatu Moraviae, quam vulgo partem sub utraque sacramentum venerabile corporis et sanguinis dom. Jesu Christi communicantium appellant*, with intro. by Matěj Kolín z Chotěřiny (Prague, 1574) ff. E3b - F1b; Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Testamenti nostri Iesu Christi pia et fida assertio. To jest: Kšaftu Večeře Páněsvatá Starožitnost, pobožná posloupnost, dlouhověká ažprávě do dne soudného trvanlivost* (Prague, 1613) 163-69.

[15] Particularly in chapter four under the heading "Doctrinae Hussii et Lutheri collatio." See Samuel Martinius z Dražova, *Hussius et Lutherus, id est: collatio historica duorum fortissimorum Iesu Christi militum* (Prague, 1618) 130-142. See also Arnošt Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře, zejména německé* 3 vv. (Prague, 1917-1924) 2:6.

[16] The continuous identity of Utraquism was to some extent obscured by the fact that the Utraquists did not feel the need to issue formal and solemn theological pronouncements, or confessions of faith. The Bohemian religious radicals, as well as the sixteenth-century Protestant Reformers, made their religious distinctiveness more visible. Having repudiated the patristic and the scholastic tradition led them to produce new confessional and liturgical statements. The Utraquists simply adhered to the patristic faith and depended liturgically on the services of the mid-fourteenth-century archdiocese of Prague. See, for instance, Václav Koranda, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* (Prague, 1493) ff. S3a - S3b. Even the crucial and venerable Four Articles of Prague, later enshrined in the *Compactata*, were procedural (disciplinary), not substantive (doctrinal), that is not introducing new theological matters, such as the Lutherans' solafideism or *sola scriptura*. What for the Protestant Reformers was a necessity would have been embarrassment for the Utraquists, who neither saw themselves, nor wished to be perceived, as initiating a new departure in religion; see Bohuslav Bílejovský, *Kronyka cýrkevní*, ed. Josef Skalický

**The Utility of the Neo-Utraquist / Old Utraquist Dichotomy**

The tenaciousness and longevity of the Old Utraquist and Neo-Utraquist myths was assisted by their utility. The concept of Neo-Utraquism performed a useful function, primarily by seeming to domesticate the Protestant Reformation in Bohemia. (1) In the sixteenth century, Lutheranism was regarded as something alien [*přespolní*]. It became doubly so in the period after the Toleration Patent of Joseph II that permitted only heterodox denominations which were imported from abroad in either the Augsburg or the Heidelberg variant.[17] (2) Conversely, linking the Czech religious movement with the Lutheran Reformation seemed to enhance the historical stature of the Bohemian Reformation by making it the prototype of a world-class historical phenomenon instead of a merely limited local defection, no matter how dramatic and ominous in its implications. The model of Neo-Utraquism implied that the logical outcome of Bohemian Reformation in Bohemia was a Protestantism of the Lutheran type, which at the same time bore the distinct marks of the antecedent Bohemian Reformation. One was thus in the enviable position of having one's cake and eating it too. Herein lay much of the seductive charm of the concept of Neo-Utraquism.[18] (3) In addition, the idea of Lutheranism's prevalence under the form of Neo-Utraquism conformed on the metahistorical plane with an a priori assumption characteristic of the liberal and the Marxist historiography about the inevitability and virtually irresistible force of the Protestant Reformation. In this light the refusal of the Utraquists to turn Protestant seemed to defy the laws of history. The cogency of this view, however, has much diminished in the twenty-first century, once history stopped adhering to the deterministic sweep of Hegel's Absolute Reason, Comte's positive law, or Marx's economic dialectic, and the issue of Protestantism's appeal could be examined in a more empirical way.[19]

The antipodal Old Utraquist concept could perform three types of service. (1) The model of the imaginary "Old Utraquism" was useful for the purposes of the Counter Reformation because the existing Utraquism was guaranteed to appear deviant against

---

(Prague, 1816) Introduction, 24. The Anglicans similarly did not see their ecclesiastical origins in the reforms of Henry VIII, see Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis, 1989) 179.

[17] As Jaroslav Pánek has perceptively pointed out, the linking of these Protestant denominations with Utraquism through the construct of Neo-Utraquism served the purpose of co-opting them to the national historical tradition in the opening decades of the twentieth century. Pánek, Jaroslav, "Zápas o charakter české stavovské opozice a sněm roku 1575," ČČH 28 (1980) 865-866.

[18] Zdeněk V. David, "The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517-1621," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995) 641-668.

[19] The new research on England and Germany has tended to support the view that the peasantry, in fact, remained attached to traditional observances and rituals, and had to be cajoled, pressured or tricked by the nobles into accepting the Reformation's reductionism, austerity, and discipline. The Reformation was not "a Protestant walkover, but... a prolonged and uphill struggle against conservative sentiment;" Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49 (1998) 627; see also Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1993) 15-17; *idem*, ed., *English Reformation Revised* (New York, 1987) 1-17; J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984) 1, 136-161; Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London, 1986) 142-147; C. Scott Dixon, *The Reformation and Rural Society: The Parishes of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach, 1528-1603* (Cambridge, NY, 1996) 206-207; John Craig, "Reformers, Conflict, and Revisionism: The Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Hadleigh," *Historical Journal* 42 (1999) 1-23.

this standard. Utraquism could then be subject to suppression by the Roman Curia without the appearance of violating a previous recognition of the legitimacy of Utraquism, such as in the *Compactata*, or making it appear that the Habsburg kings were violating the oaths of their ancestors in condoning the suppression of Utraquism. The formation of this myth was especially apropos during the preparatory stage of the Counter Reformation during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[20] (2) The Utraquist Church could employ the fiction of "Old Utraquism" for proselytizing purposes for appeals to the adherents of the Roman Curia or communicants *sub una*.[21] While the claim of dogmatic similarity was not entirely false, it was only half-true since it passed over the substantial difference in ecclesiology. (3) The phantom of "Old Utraquism" was also useful to the Unity of Brethren, who could maintain a monopoly on the legacy of the Bohemian Reformation and justify their separation from the Utraquist Church by claiming that the Utraquists differed from the Roman Church just in the technicality of the lay chalice, and only they – the Brethren – were the true Utraquists [*pod obojí*].[22]

## The Problems of Neo-Utraquism

It is without doubt that the concept of Neo-Utraquism has enjoyed high favour and wide currency. The question is: did it denote, or correspond to, a reality? In arguing the opposite case, that of the integrity of Utraquism from its first throughout its second century of existence, it is possible to appeal to issues raised by theology, liturgy, the narratives of foreigners, institutional guarantees, and the Post-White Mountain legacy.

(1) Theological Question

Perhaps the main problem with Neo-Utraquism is that it is virtually impossible to unearth a Neo-Utraquist theological text or even make a suggestion along which lines a genuine dogmatic or liturgical synthesis of Utraquism and Lutheranism could proceed. The problem is how would one combine divergent views such as (1) the Utraquist emphasis on the sacramental orders of priesthood with the Lutheran belief in the priesthood of all believers; (2) the Utraquist adoration of the host outside the eucharistic service with the Lutheran condemnation of that as a blasphemy; (3) the Utraquist mass as a sacrifice with the celebratory Last Supper of the Lutherans; (4) the Utraquist insistence on, with the Lutheran abhorrence of, the communion for infants; (5) the Utraquist activism in seeking to fulfil the law of God with the Lutherans' passive acceptance of justification by Christ; (6) the Utraquist stress on the soteriological efficacy of good works with the Lutheran condemnation of them as a form of spiritual bribery; (7) the Utraquist belief in seven sacraments with the Lutheran rejection of all but two (at most three); (8) the Utraquist reliance on the intercession of saints with the Lutheran view of the practice as a form of spiritual adultery; (9) the Utraquists' venerating the images of saints with the Lutheran condemnation of that as idolatry; (10) the Utraquists' acceptance of the Western church as it had evolved during the first millennium with the Lutheran insistence on the (largely imaginary) church of apostolic

---

[20] Zdeněk V. David, "The Utraquists and the Roman Curia: The Coming Tragedy of Confessionalisation," a lecture at the symposium, "From Conciliarism to Confessional Church," University of Notre Dame, Indiana, 1 October 2000 (forthcoming).
[21] Bílejovský, *Kronyka* 27, 39-41.
[22] G. A. Skalský, "Spor Bratří s Vojtěchem z Pernštejna 1557," ČČM 83 (1909) 24.

times; (11) the Utraquists' retention of canon law with Luther's vesting of ecclesiastical, as well as secular, authority in the state.

For the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries, one can name Utraquist theologians like Jan Cykáda, Valentin Polon, Vavřinec Leander Rvačovský of Rvačov, Jakub Soffian Walkmberger of Walkmbergk, or Jan Straněnský, and one can name Lutheran theologians like Zacharyáš Bruncvík, Jiřík Dykastus (Miřkovský), Václav Slovacius, or Jan Štelcar Želetavský of Želetava; but who can name an authentic Neo-Utraquist theologian who has meaningfully combined elements of Utraquism and Lutheranism? Neo-Utraquism seems to be a phenomenon that none have actually seen. Certain imaginary objects can at least be depicted, like a unicorn or a three-headed dragon. In case of Neo-Utraquism one cannot even imagine, much less outline, the contours of the beast.[23]

Despite the theological incongruity, Czech Lutherans, however – as noted above – wished to appropriate the heritage of the Bohemian Reformation. Already in May 1575, arguing for the acceptance of the Bohemian Confession, the Supreme Justice, Bohuslav Hasištejnský of Lobkovice, portrayed Hus as a precursor of Luther.[24] The superficial and misleading attempt by Martinius in the same direction has been noted earlier. Even these vague and insubstantial claims to the Bohemian Reformation, irritated their German, particularly Saxon confrₚres, who did not wish to yield an inch of Lutheranism's Teutonic purity.[25] Although their flirtations with the Bohemian Reformation had nothing to do with real synthesis with Utraquism – or the creation of a Neo-Utraquism – Czech Lutherans became object of ill-tempered chastisement from Wittenberg, especially in the early seventeenth century, later during the Bohemian uprising against the Habsburgs, and finally as Bohemian exiles after the Battle of the White Mountain.[26]

Not only standard Utraquism, but also the more radical strands in the early Bohemian Reformation remained alien to Bohemian Lutheranism. This problem was addressed particularly by František Hrubý, following the doubts expressed by Josef Pekař and Karel Stloukal about calling Czech Lutherans Neo-Utraquists. Hrubý argued that the writings of Czech Lutherans (especially in Moravia but ultimately also in Bohemia) did not contain any recognisable elements of specifically Taborite theology, which would differ from standard Lutheran tenets. Accordingly, the sporadic references

---

[23] The Bohemian Confession of 1575 has been cited at times as a quintessential example of a Neo-Utraquist text, but in fact it is virtually identical with the Augsburg Confession. Its modest tilt is not toward Utraquism, but toward Calvinism for the sake of the Brethren; see Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 277, 279, 663. The Czech Lutherans themselves tended to view the text as identical, or virtually identical with the Augsburg Confession; see, for instance, Konstantin Kristian Bidones z Bidenthalu, *Výstraha: Proti v Římsko-Katolické náboženství ubíhání všechněm k Augšpurské neb České Konfesí se přiznávajícím...* (Np., 1624); likewise an assurance in that regard was given to German Lutheran ministers in Prague in October 1609; see Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 483. See also František Hrubý, "Luterství a novoutrakvismus v českých zemích v 16. a 17. století," ČČH 45 (1939) 40, 42-44.

[24] *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* vv. 1-11, 15 (Prague, 1877-1941) 4:392; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 103-104.

[25] *Uvážení Kurfirstských Saských Theologův v Vitenberce na otázku zdaliby stav Říše Římskému Císaři v této nynější Český válce napomáhati chtíc...* (Np., 1620) f. B2a.

[26] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 521-522; Eduard Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf in Sudetenraum* (Munich, 1938²) 205; *idem*, *Die tschechische und slowakische Emigration in Deutschland im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1955) 30-31; Lenka Bobková, *Exulanti z Prahy a severozápadních Čech v Pirně v letech 1621-1639* (Prague, 1999) 6-131.

to John Hus and pre-Reformation Utraquism were largely cosmetic. Hence not even this angle of vision justified referring to Czech Lutheranism as Neo-Utraquism.[27] In fact, if they did sin against the strict Teutonic norms of Lutheranism, it was not in a tendency to borrow from the Bohemian Reformation, but from Trans-Rhenish Protestantism, especially English Puritanism.[28]

(2) Liturgical Question

For the continuing integrity of Utraquism, the evidence is also supplemented and confirmed by the liturgical research of Zikmund Winter and, most recently, that of David R. Holeton.[29] The latter in particular has shown the prevalence of Utraquist worship in Bohemia into the seventeenth century through his unprecedented and meticulous comparative analyses. First, Holeton compared a typical Utraquist missal from the end of the sixteenth century and another of the fifteenth, and established an essential continuity of the Utraquist form of worship from the fifteenth into the sixteenth century.[30] Second, Holeton's comparison of the Utraquist liturgical texts with fundamental works of Lutheran liturgy determined that the late sixteenth century Utraquist texts failed to reflect the principles of Lutheran liturgy. In particular, the character of the mass as a sacrifice was clearly maintained, retaining the offertory and the canon, both banished by Luther as great abominations.[31] The distinctly Utraquist character of liturgical books

---

[27] Hrubý wrote about the sixteenth-century theological foundations of the alleged "Neo-Utraquism": "Show me some writings which were concerned with the theological views of Hus or the Taborites, and which would demonstrate that the road to the Evangelical faith in Bohemia led through a revival of interest in the Hussite reformation. There are no such writings..." František Hrubý, "Luterství a novoutrakvismus v českých zemích v 16. a 17. století," ČČH 45 (1939) 40, see also 42-4; Stloukal, "Počátky nunciatury v Praze," 16, n. 1; and Josef Pekař in ČČH 39 (1933) 356, n. 1. As noted earlier, this was also true of the Bohemian Confession of 1575, which has been occasionally (mis)represented as a Neo-Utraquist document, but it is essentially identical with the Augsburg Confession; Sněmy české 11 pt. 1:39.

[28] Among Lutheran theologians, the prominent Bruncvík, relied largely on English dissenting divines for his encyclopedic Zrcadlo Kacířství (1614). He also held in high esteem the collection Harmonia confessionum fidei, Orthodoxarum, et Reformatorum Ecclesiarum ed. Salnar de Castres (Geneva, 1581), and drew on Foxe's Book of Martyrs, and on Laurence Humphrey's Contra Edmundi Campioni rationes for information on Wyclif and the Lollards; Zacharyáš Bruncvík, Pravitatis et impletatis haereticae pia et fida ostensio. To jest: Zrcadlo Kacířství: Do něhož kdo zdravé nahlídne, Allegata, u Doktorů Církve vykázaná, přeběhne, pozná, že my Katolíci pod obojí nevinně, a bez náležitého vší Svaté Říše vyslyšání od některých se kaceřujeme (Prague, 1614) f. E2b; idem, Testamenti nostri Iesu Christi pia et fida assertio. To jest: Kšaftu Večeře Páně svatá Starožitnost, pobožná posloupnost, dlouhověká až právě do dne soudného trvanlivost: V níž z nařízení Kristového, z učení evangelistského a apoštolského, z doktorů a sněmů osvícených, z kanonu a práv duchovních, z historií církevních, a nejvíce našich českých, etc. Náboženství naše podobojí pravé Katolické, Křesťanské a Starožitné, mocné, patrné a bez falše, od času Krista Pána, až do našeho věku, posloupně se dokazuje a dovodí (Prague, 1613) 113, 115, 122. The moralistic works of the English Puritan divine, William Perkins were translated into Czech, between 1610 and 1620, by three clergymen: Jiří Oekonomus of Chrudim, Jan Regius of Žatec, and Simeon Valecius of Louny; see Zdeněk V. David, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609-1620," BRRP 3 (2000) 205, 208-210.

[29] Zikmund Winter, Zlatá doba měst českých (Prague, 1991) 139-142, 144-145; David R. Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," in BRRP 2 (1998) 97-126.

[30] The comparison is between Voltářní knihy Adama Táborského [The Altar Books of Adam Táborský] (1588), transcribed by Václav Čáslavský of Písek, and Misál Kutné Hory [The Missal of Kutná Hora] (1483), transcribed by Jan of Humpolec; Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," 102-115.

[31] Likewise, invocations of the saints and prayers for the dead remained. The comparison was based on Luther's Formula missae pro ecclesia Wittemburgensis (1523) together with other works of Lutheran liturgy, especially his Deudsche Messe und Ordnung Gottis Diensts (1526); Holeton, "The Evolution of

used in Bohemia in the late sixteenth century is also confirmed by older research into liturgical veneration (as saints) of Jan Hus, Jerome of Prague, and other martyrs of the Bohemian Reformation.[32] The honour paid to Hus and other martyrs of the Bohemian Reformation was not merely setting them up as moral example, a usage which the Lutherans might still accept, but an appeal for an outright interaction between the church militant on earth and the church triumphant in heaven. For the Lutherans, such a cozy relationship was clearly taboo.[33]

The style of liturgy was an important source of evidence for the integrity of Utraquism. It provided not just empty words or gestures but rather signs or implications of belief. Holeton has cited, in that regard, the dictum of Prosper of Aquitaine, a pupil of St. Augustine, "*lex orandi sit lex credendi*" [let the rule of prayer be the rule of belief].[34] Next it is necessary to examine the argument that the evident ascendancy of Utraquist liturgy in Bohemia could be explained by the fact that it was actually Lutheran clergy that simulated the Utraquist rites.[35] Aside from what these assertions tell us about the actual religious preferences and beliefs of the Czech commoners, such Machiavellian explanations fail to take into account the putatively blasphemous and idolatrous character of the Utraquist ceremonies from the Lutheran point of view.[36] It is not

---

Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," 115-120. On traditional Utraquist liturgy see also Enrico Molnar, *The Catholicity of the Utraquist Church of Bohemia* (Sewanee, Tenn., 1959) especially 6-8; David R. Holeton, "On the Evolution of the Utraquist Liturgy: A Precursor of Western Liturgical Reform," *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995) 51-67; and for documentation, Klement Borový, ed., *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické i utrakvistické* 2 vv. (Prague, 1868) 1:10-13, 260-2; and Bílejovský, *Kronyka Cýrkevní* 98-105. Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," 116-120.

[32] The missals of the last two decades of the sixteenth century include the propers (*propria*) for Hus as a saint, including the collects (said before the epistle) and the graduals (sung between the epistle and the gospel), which form parts of the traditional order of the mass. Hus as a saint is also the centrepiece of officia (*officium de sancto Iohanne Hus*), which normally cover the eight daily times of prayer traditionally required of priests in the Western Church. These are not isolated instances but multiple cases and so much more remarkable because most Utraquist liturgical books later succumbed to the Counter Reformatory mutilation. See "Bohoslužebná skládání o Husovi z XV a XVI století," ed. Václav Novotný, in *Prameny dějin českých* 8 (Prague, 1932) especially 431-444, 458-472. David Holeton discovered an additional liturgical text for the feast of Jan Hus and the Bohemian martyrs in a Utraquist antiphonary deposited in the Metropolitan Library of Esztergom, Hungary. The antiphonary contains complete propers for the feast day of Jan Hus, as well as a partial text for the *officium*, covering the first vespers, matins and first nocturns, and some of the second vespers. See David R. Holeton, "The Office of Jan Hus: An Unrecorded Antiphonary in the Metropolitan Library of Estergom," *Time and Continuity*, ed. J. Neil Alexander (Washington, D.C., 1990) 141-142.

[33] See, for instance, Peter Fraenkel, "Utraquism or Co-Existence: Some Notes on the Earliest Negotiations Before the Pacification of Nuernberg, 1531-1532," *Studia Theologica* 18,2 (1964) 130 n. 2. Archbishop Cranmer had to labour hard in revising liturgical texts, particularly the collects, under King Edward VI to make them consonant with the sola fide position by eliminating any semblance of the invocation of saints; see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1996) 420.

[34] Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," 99.

[35] Zikmund Winter, for instance, confirmed the dominance of Utraquist rituals, vestments and vessels in Bohemian churches into the seventeenth century, but according to him that was because Lutheran ministers were by and large willing to simulate Utraquist rites. Their motive was either to please the populace or to avoid antagonizing it. This charade was facilitated, according to Winter, by the Lutheran conviction that ceremonies were irrelevant to salvation; see Winter, *Zlatá doba měst českých* 139-142.

[36] What to the twentieth-century agnostic historian might have appeared as an inconsequential custom was of utmost seriousness to the sixteenth-century believer. Czech Lutherans, in fact, explicitly condemned the use of traditional liturgical books, such as missals, breviaries and the Agenda or Rubrics, which formed the very backbone of Utraquist liturgy. The Lutheran ministry was specifically defined in 1609 as rejecting such compendia of traditional rituals; see, for instance, Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* 214-215. It is also relevant to cite the categorical refusal by the English Puritans to tolerate – for the sake

necessary to argue just abstractly about the implausibility of Lutherans indulging in Utraquist rituals. There are specific rejections on the Lutheran side of such duplicitous practices. Štelcar Želetavský, in his *Kázání dvoje* [Two Sermons] (1586), threatened terrible divine retribution for clergymen who would knowingly engage in idolatry for a gainful purpose or to please their parishioners.[37] Another Lutheran theologian, Zacharyáš Bruncvík, viewed the Utraquists' veneration of images as a spiritual adultery which violated the mystical marriage between Christ and his Church. The reluctance of Lutheran pastors to perform religious rites in the Utraquist manner is attested somewhat later by the famous case of a Czech Lutheran, Jiří Dykastus. Appointed pastor of the Týn Church in 1614, he refused the congregation's demands for the traditional manner of worship, and the impasse had to be resolved by the appointment of an Utraquist chaplain.[38]

(3) Foreigners' Narrations

The fact that religious services in Bohemia, outside the German-inhabited border regions, preserved their Utraquist character was witnessed by the reactions, both positive and negative, of travellers from abroad.[39]

The English traveller, Fynes Moryson, records the following observations concerning the Utraquist religious practices in 1591:

> For wheras the Papists give not the Cupp to the layety, but only the bread, ... the Hussites give both kyndes, not only to lay men, but to very Infants, because Christ sayth, suffer little 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... They sing the Masse in lattin, but they reade the Epistle, the Gospell, the forme of Baptisme and buyriall, in the Bohemian Tounge. ... They agreed with the Papists for the number of Sacraments....[40]

---

[37] of church unity – "a few ceremonies" of the Church of England, which they regarded as "the rags of Rome;" John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (New York, 1998) 50.

[37] In uncompromising terms, he condemned any pandering to the people's erroneous ideas, even if based on historical precedents, or ancestral customs. Any such misguided individuals would face the divine wrath depicted by the Prophet; see Jan Štelcar Želetavský z Želetavy, *Kázání dvoje* (Prague, 1586) ff. B8b-C1a; see also ff. C1b-C2a.

[38] Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Idolorum pia suplantatio. Kázání o tom, že obrazové* (Prague, 1613) f. C7a; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536 n.3, 544 n. 4; "Dikastus," *Ottův slovník naučný* 7:533.

[39] This type of evidence is sometimes essential to document events in the remoter half of Europe where internal evidence may have been altered or destroyed by the Counter Reformation or other forces of cultural depredation. In Bohemia, the scale of destruction was impressive (and depressing). A single Jesuit missionary, Antonín Koniáš (1691-1760) – although undoubtedly an overachiever – has been credited by his would-be hagiographer with consigning 60,000 Czech books to the flames in the early eighteenth century; see J. J. Hanuš, "O působení Jesuity Antonína Koniáše v literatuře české," *ČČM* 37,1 (1863) 77-90, 194-210. Subsequent research has scaled the figure down by half to 30,000, *Malá československá encyklopedie* 6 vv. (Prague, 1984-1987) 3:499; Jiří Bílý, *Jezuita Antonín Koniáš: Osobnost a doba* (Prague, 1996) 161-162. The foreigners' narrations are known in East European historiography by the technical Russian term as *skazaniia inostrantsev*. On the foreigners' narratives as a historical genre, see Vasilii O. Kliuchevskii, *Skazaniia inostrantsev* (Petrograd, 1918). It would be useful to have for Bohemia an inventory comparable to Marshall Poe's *Foreign Descriptions of Muscovy: An Analytic Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources* (Columbus, Ohio, 1995); or if Werner Paravicini continued his coverage past the year 1531 in his *Europäische Reiseberichte des späteren Mittelalters: Eine analytische Bibliographie*, of which so far only Part 1 has appeared, entitled *Deutsche Reiseberichte*, ed. Christian Halm (Frankfurt, 1994).

[40] Fynes Moryson, *Shakespeare's Europe: A Survey of the conditions of Europe at the end of the 16th*

A foreign Lutheran visitor in the 1580s could barely conceal his disappointment when noting that Bohemian worship did not differ significantly from the rites of the Roman Church except in the German-speaking enclaves, such as Jihlava, where indeed Lutheran liturgical practices could be observed. This voyager was Henrick Kilian, a scholar and a citizen of Rostock in Mecklenburg, who passed, in the course of a study tour, through Bohemia and Moravia on his way from Lusatia to Austria. Kilian was much annoyed by what he considered a "papist" character of religious services in the Utraquist churches of Prague, and also by finding there an evident reliance on good works instead of an adherence to solafideism, especially among the feminine gender.[41]

At the other end of the religious spectrum, the essential conformity of the church services in Bohemia with those of the Roman Church, that is their Utraquist character, was noted with some wonder – even at the start of the seventeenth century – by west European Catholic travellers. The secretary of a French embassy, Pierre Bergeron, left an account of the Utraquists' dominance in the Bohemian capital in 1600. He noted that the Utraquist masses were virtually the same as the Roman ones. The Utraquist priesthood and Eucharist, which was displayed in Corpus Christi processions, were considered genuine by local Roman experts, including the Jesuits. The Utraquists held all the churches in Prague. *Sub una* services were confined to monasteries.[42]

Though he was only spiritually, not ethnically, a foreigner, it seems fitting to include here the testimony of the Jesuit Václav Šturm. Writing in 1584 about the attitudes of the various confessions in contemporary Bohemia, he used the term Utraquists as synonymous with "the Czechs", and the term Utraquist priests as a synonym for "Czech priests".[43] Moreover, Šturm characterized the "Czech priests" as

*Century*, ed. Charles Hughes (London, 1903) 277. See also his *An Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell*, 4 vv. (New York,1907-1908) 4:332-333.

[41]. He wrote in his travel account, dating to April 1592: "The people are papist and especially the women folk who hold more onto the works than onto the faith." [Das volck ist papistisch und sonderlich das weiberfolck, welche ohne das vielmehr von den wercken alss von dem glauben halten,] See Henrick Kilian, *Reise Beschreibung*, printed as an appendix to Jaroslav Pánek, "Čechy, Morava a Lužice v německém cestopisu ze sklonku 16. století," FHB 13 (1990) 221. The north German excursionist was much better pleased with the church conditions in Jihlava: "...in die stadt Igelau, die ist nicht gross, aber sehr schone gebawet, liegtt noch in Mehrenlandt, da gehet auch wiederumb die reine Luttersche lehre an und ist eine feine wolbestalte particular schule doselbst." *Loc. cit*.

[42]. The French embassy under Marshall Urbain de Laval de Boisdauphin from Henry IV to Rudolf II spent a month from July 15 to August 15, 1600 in Prague. Bergeron wrote: "The Hussites inhabit over two thirds of the city and the rituals of their mass are virtually the same as ours. On the Feast Day of Corpus Christi they even conduct processions through the city and carry the host in the streets. The Jesuits and the others of our faith judge that they should not be impeded in adoring the host because, as far as known, it is touched by the hands of a genuine priest... The Hussite priests distribute communion in both kinds... The Hussites have no other images of saints than paintings on boards in their churches; they hold the chief temple of the city [i.e. Our Lady Before Týn] and also all the other churches, while the Catholics can dispense the sacraments only in the monasteries." See *Tři francouzští kavalíři v rudolfínské Praze*, ed. Eliška Fučíková (Prague, 1989) 44-5, 116 n. 29; see also Anna Skýbová, "Cesta po Čechách v roce 1561," *Český lid* 63 (1976) 99 for the reaction of papal emissaries.

[43]. His terminology clearly implied that it was a normal state for the Czechs to be Utraquists, but a rare or exceptional state to be a Brother, a Lutheran, or a communicant *sub una*. The impression that the Lutherans were not normally Czech speakers was strengthened by the Brethren's taunt that Šturm wrote in Czech (rather than Latin or German) to avoid a dispute with the supporters of the Augsburg Confession. (To this the Jesuit disarmingly replied that he did not know German.) Apparently, the standard assumption was that the producers and consumers of Lutheran theological texts in late sixteenth-century Bohemia were mainly Bohemian Germans. See Václav Šturm, *Krátké ozvání ... proti kratičkému ohlášení Jednoty Valdenské neb Boleslavské* (Prague, 1584) 3, 19-20. Concerning the limited

engaging in the anti-Lutheran practice of communion for infants, which would disqualify them for the status of "Neo-Utraquists".[44]

## (4) Institutional Infrastructure

A clear affirmation concerning the actual strength and solid position of standard (non-Protestant) Utraquism early in the seventeenth century came from a report of 14 December 1602 by the Administrator and Consistory to Rudolf II which noted (twenty-seven years after the oral approval of the Bohemian Confession) that priests surveyed in royal towns under the Consistory's jurisdiction, except three, had proper ordination by bishops and pledged to serve "according to the missal and the rubrics" [*podle mšálu a rubriky znění se říditi a spravovati*].[45] As the use of the Book of Common Prayer would come to distinguish the Anglicans from the Puritans, so the use of the missal and the rubrics of the pre-Tridentine Archbishopric of Prague distinguished the Utraquists from the Lutherans and the Brethren.[46] The report, just cited, contradicts two mantras of sixteenth-century Bohemian historiography that after 1575 (1) the royal towns turned irresistibly Lutheran; and (2) that the Utraquist clergy were a vanishing species.[47]

Questionable inferences about the weakness of the ecclesiastical infrastructure of Utraquism were habitually drawn from the Consistory's correspondence with the Emperor and with the town councils in 1575-1608, much of it recorded in the prestigious series, *Sněmy české*. These exchanges must be seen in their relevant perspective. First, the Consistory's jeremiads, evoking the images of imminent disasters for Utraquism, were designed to elicit action from the procrastinating and ultimately unfriendly Emperor, not to reflect despair about an inevitable Lutheran takeover.[48] Second, the issues between the Consistory and the towns involved by and large internal administrative matters within the Utraquist family, not extra-confessional inroads from the Lutherans. Third, the large volume of correspondence reflected the Utraquists' liberal ecclesiology, namely the replacement of the command mode of ecclesiastical governance, characteristic of the Roman Curia, by a largely consensual method, requiring argumentation with the aim of persuasion. Hence resorts to pleading by the

---

currency of German, another witness is Erasmus, who claimed that he did not know enough German to read Luther's non-Latin tracts, Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence*, 11 vv. (Toronto, 1974-1994) 9:391-392.

[44] When Šturm spoke of the Utraquists, he clearly did not mean the Lutherans or Crypto-Lutherans (Neo-Utraquists). To him "the Czechs" were synonymous with those Utraquists who distributed communion to infants, a practice firmly rejected by both the Lutherans and the Brethren. He noted: "... if it were true what the Brethren...write about us, who are administered by the general Holy Christian and Catholic Church, and about those, who are administered by the Czech and Prague priests [*Českými a Pražskými kněžími se spravují*], then none of us can be saved. Namely, that we Romans or Papists – as they call us – are idolators, and the Czechs [*Čechové*] are still worse, only because they give the venerable Sacrament of the Altar...to little children." In Šturm, *Krátké ozvání* 3.

[45] The exceptions were Mladá Boleslav, Týn nad Vltavou, and Kutná Hora, but even for them the Consistory had available proper priests, ordained by bishops; see *Sněmy české* 10:371.

[46] Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (New York, 1998) 113-129.

[47] See, for instance, Tomek, *Dějepis* 12:336-337; *Sněmy české* 11:56. Even the less than friendly observer, Josef Janáček, admitted the continuation of Utraquism in the towns after 1600, though he referred to an "ossified Utraquism". The comment on *zkornatělý utrakvism* is in his "Královská města česká na zemském sněmu r. 1609-1610," SH 5 (1956) 229.

[48] Concerning Rudolf's tendency to procrastinate, see Jaroslav Pánek, "K povaze vlády Rudolfa II. v českém království," FHB 18 (1997) 79-80.

Consistory should not be viewed as signs of diminished self-confidence, or of waning authority, but rather as a normal modus operandi.[49]

The exchanges between the towns and the Consistory showed that the Kingdom of Bohemia in the sixteenth century, though a happy and prosperous realm, had not yet reached the eschatological status of the Kingdom of God on earth in which all internal strife and litigation would cease (despite the original aspirations of the Bohemian Reformation). The very amount of litigation – covering, however, more than thirty years – can be taken as evidence that the mandates to protect Utraquism were taken seriously rather than that Maximilian II's decrees were mere window dressing, masking a massive Lutheran entrenchment in the towns and the countryside. The copious evidence of the Consistory's concern with matters of orthodoxy and discipline also belie the assertions in historical literature about the condition of a theological and institutional chaos under the Consistory.[50]

Another factor distorting the significance and the size of Utraquism's following was the defection (by 1575) of the nobles from Utraquism to Lutheranism or the Unity of Brethren.[51] This group was, of course, highly visible because of its political power and social prestige, but its actual numerical weight was slight, constituting less than one percent of the population with the number of families estimated at 1,400 in 1600.[52] If one took into account only the "feudal" nation excluding the commoners, then indeed the Utraquists would be meagre in numbers in Bohemia. Only three per cent of the nobles could be classified as Utraquists in the opening decades of the seventeenth century.[53] As noted in the stories of Utraquist believers deceived by Lutheran preachers, Czech historical literature exhibited a bias toward the views of the upper classes and a scepticism about ordinary people's intellectual commitments.[54] It is ironic

[49] The consensual system of administrative discipline was stipulated, for instance, in the Candlemas Day Articles of 1524, points 1-6, see Bartoš Písař, *Kronika pražská*, ed. Josef V. Šimák FRB 6 (1907) 21-22.
[50] For instance, Antonín Rezek, *Dějiny prostonárodního hnutí náboženského v Čechách od vydání tolerančního patentu až na naše časy* (Prague, 1887) 12-14.
[51] The nobles' striking, and one may add unpatriotic, lack of empathy for Utraquism may be related in part to social snobbery. The Utraquists from the start rallied their principal support from the milieu of the commoners, particularly the townspeople. In part, the nobles' fickleness may be traced to their cosmopolitan orientation. While the Unity might do as an acceptable variant of Calvinism, Utraquism had no distinct analogues in the world divided between the Protestant Reformation and Rome in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries – hence the seductive appeal of Wittenberg and the Counter Reformation. Parenthetically, it may be added that the denominational division along the class lines was not unique to Bohemia. In England the upper classes held the more traditional (High Church) religion, while the commoners tended to the more innovative religious dissent. Also in Poland the nobility, but not the common people, was attracted to Lutheranism, Robert Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský* (Prague, 1992) 50 n. 44. On the disjunction in religion between the upper classes and the commoners see also Peter Burke, *Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1978).
[52] Reliable estimates indicate that in 1600 Bohemia's barons and knights comprised 1,400 families; Jan Kapras, 3 vv. *Právní dějiny zemí koruny české* (Prague, 1913) 2:436.
[53] Josef Pekař, *Dějiny československé* (Prague, 1991) 91.
[54] For instance, in its trivialisation of the popular enthusiasm for Utraquism aroused in Prague in 1618 by the Easter liturgical procession conducted by Jan Locika of Domažlice; see Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder* 2 vv. (Prague, 1861-2²) 2:413. See also Hrejsa, *Česká konfese* 533-7; and Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí* x-xi. A similar problem has been noted in the English historiography of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, where the emphasis on the upper classes has thwarted the proper understanding of the religious orientation of the populace at large, "especially the laity below the rank of the landed gentry; " Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49 (1998) 621.

that historians, writing in the age of liberal democracy, should view the religious scene through the eyes of the noble elites, which constituted less than one per cent of the total population of Bohemia. Those writing in the era of egalitarian socialism had at least some excuse, inasmuch as a measure of contempt for the un-manipulated mentality of the common man was not alien to the Leninist variant of Marxism.[55]

Actually, there were strong barriers against converting the bulk of Czech-speaking commoners to Lutheranism or Neo-Utraquism, despite the prevalence of Lutheranism and the Unity among the aristocrats and the gentry. The manorial seigneurs were barred from forcing their subjects to conformity with their own religious preferences. The roots of these injunctions reached to the Peace of Kutná Hora of 1485 and even to the *Compactata* of 1437. The legislation of Maximilian II issued after the debates about the Bohemian Confession in 1575 in effect froze the status quo of the Utraquist parishes both in royal towns and demesnes, and on noble manors,[56] and this legislation remained in effect even after 1609.[57] At issue was the religious affiliation and practice of some seventy-five to eighty-three percent of Bohemia's Czech-speaking population, if we discount the adherents of the Unity and of the Roman Curia (the communicants *sub una*).[58] It is, therefore, plausible that as much as two thirds to four

[55] The classical statement of Lenin's contempt for the intelligence of the unmanipulated masses is enshrined in his seminal *What Is To Be Done?* (1902). See Vladimir I. Lenin, *Chto delať? Nabolevshie voprosy nashego dvizheniia* (Stuttgart, 1902); also in *ibid.*, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* 55 vv. (Moscow, 1967-1970⁵) 6:1-192.

[56] For royal towns by his decree of September 16, 1575; see *Sněmy české* 4:474, 484; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 246, 446 n. 3; and his *Dějiny křesťanství v Československu* 6:315; for segneurial towns and villages by a decree of 30 November 1575; see "...strany far jich ... kteréž sou od starodávna ... víry katolické pod jednou bývaly, též také pod obojí, kteréž se konsistoří pražskou spravovaly, v tom prvním způsobu zůstanou..." *Sněmy české* 4:484; Tomek, *Dějepis* 12:256; Kamil Krofta, "Od kompaktát k Bílé hoře," in his *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* (Prague, 1936) 349. While, under the oral approval of the quasi-Lutheran Bohemian Confession, the nobles were free to pursue their idiosyncratic religious preferences in their family chapels, the established religious traditions of the bulk of the Czech people were shielded against outside interference. On the practice of private chapels for heterodox purposes in sixteenth-century Europe see also Benjamin J. Kaplan, "Fictions of Privacy: House Chapels and the Spatial Accommodation of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe," *American Historical Review* 107 (2002) 1031-1064.

[57] In the form of the so-called *Porovnání* which accompanied and qualified the Letter of Majesty. On its face, the document pledged protection of the existing Utraquist priests and parishes in their beliefs and rituals. Utraquist priests could be freely appointed on both royal and private estates, and Utraquists in towns were also to have free access to their services. The language of the *Porovnání* made it clear that "adherence to the Bohemian Confession" was not synonymous with acceptance of its religious doctrines; see *Sněmy české* 10:330, 333; Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 1:111. There is evidence for the continued preponderance of traditional Utraquism in both the towns and countryside. Somewhat surprisingly Hrejsa affirmed that even in 1620 the churches of royal towns adhered to the traditional Utraquist liturgy, to which the faithful were attached and would have resented a reform in the Protestant direction; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 564. As for the countryside, a survey of the parishes in 1613 by Tobiáš Cocius for the Archbishop of Prague is significant, though rather confused in indicating the Utraquist strength. It covered the deanery of Kouřim with thirty-two parishes. Only eight of the clergy were viewed as possible Lutherans, i.e. Neo-Utraquists. Most of the priests were described as preserving traditional rites, hence recognisable as standard (non-Protestant) Utraquists. Even among the eight clergymen classified as "heretics" (presumably Lutherans, or possibly Brethren), there was at least one, the pastor of Lysá, who was actually a Utraquist.; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 539 n. 2.

[58] The proportion of the Brethren and the *sub una* (i.e. the adherents of the Roman Church) within Bohemia's population is not contested. It has been estimated respectively at 5 to 10 per cent, and 12 to 15 per cent for the second half of the sixteenth century; see, for instance, Pekař, *Dějiny československé* 91-92. We are leaving aside the German-speaking population of Bohemia's fringe areas. While the ordinary Czechs seemed to be largely satisfied with Utraquism, Lutheranism appeared virtually irresistible

fifths of the Czech speakers – consisting of urban and rural commoners – remained Utraquist and did not turn Protestant or "Neo-Utraquist" to the bitter end of the Counter Reformation's victory.[59] Hence it is misleading to speak – as it is fairly common in historical literature – of the Czech population on the eve of the Battle of White Mountain in 1620 as being "evangelical", when in fact it had not strayed from the traditional non- (or anti-) Protestant via media.[60]

(5) Utraquism's Afterlife

The continued prevalence of non-Protestant Utraquism up to the Battle of the White Mountain can be deduced from the subsequent treatment of Utraquist faithful and priests by the authorities of the Roman Curia. Thus the papal instruction to nuncio Carlo Carafa, dated 12 April 1621, depicted the majority of Bohemian dissidents as Utraquists ("Hussiti") and the other dissidents as marginal. It was clear that by Hussiti the document referred to the standard Utraquists and not to the Lutherans or Crypto-Lutherans ("Neo-Utraquists"). It spoke of the Hussiti not as heretics, but as those eligible for reunion with the "Catolici", that is as mere schismatics.[61] Another sign that the Bohemian dissidents were considered only schismatics by Rome was that to legitimize their ecclesiastical status the candidates were not required to abjure particular heresies, which would be the case with Lutherans or Calvinists. In Bohemia,

---

for the stolid Teutonic mountaineers of Loket, Žatec, Litoměřice, the Giant Mountains [Krkonoše], and K⫠odzko; see Josef Vávra, "Počátky reformace katolické v Čechách," *Sborník historického kroužku* Sešit 3 (1894) 3; also *Sněmy české* 7:432; 9:451; 10:371-373.

[59] Refining these figures further is at best a risky process that involves hazardous assumptions and can offer only the most tentative results. Yet, with these caveats in mind, an attempt can be made to arrive at illustrative numbers, both relative and absolute, for Czech non-Protestant Utraquists. Václav Líva's analysis of the religious exiles from Prague after the Battle of the White Mountain, including 600 families, indicated that more than a third were Germans, and a third Brethren or Calvinists, which would leave less than a third for Czech Lutherans or Neo-Utraquists; see Václav Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hl. města Prahy* 6 (1930) 413-415. Assuming that this ratio was representative of the country, the number of Czech Lutherans (or "Neo-Utraquists") would comprise between five and ten per cent of the population, based on the percentage of the Brethren, established in Pekař, *Dějiny československé* 91-92. According to this formula, the Brethren and Lutherans within the Czech-speaking population would together constitute between ten and twenty per cent. This would come close to the ratio of twenty-five Utraquist parishes to seven Protestant ones in the ecclesiastical district (deanery) of Kouřim in 1613, cited by Hrejsa, *Česká konfese* 539 n. 2. If we further accept the proportion of twelve to fifteen per cent of the *sub una*, cited by Pekař, *Dějiny československé* 91-92, for the speakers of Czech, this would yield between 65 and 78 per cent of Non-Protestant Utraquists among the Czech-speaking population of Bohemia with five to ten per cent being Lutherans or Neo-Utraquists, five to ten per cent Brethren, and twelve to fifteen per cent *sub una*. According to this formula, assuming that Bohemia on the eve of the Bohemian uprising of 1618 had 1,700,000 inhabitants [see František Kafka and Josef Válka, *Dějiny Československa, 1437-1781* (Prague, [1970$^2$]) 201] of whom 1,200,000 were Czechs, the number of Utraquists would be between 780,000 and 936,000, the number of Czech Lutherans and Brethren each between 60,000 and 120,000, and the number of Czech *sub una* between 144,000 and 180,000.

[60] For instance, Stanislav Polák, *T. G. Masaryk: Za ideálem a pravdou* 2 vv. (Prague, 2000-2001) 2:6; Lewis W. Spitz, *The Protestant Reformation, 1517-1559* (New York, 1985) 127. Walter Schamschula, *Die Anfänge der tschechischen Erneuerung und das deutsche Geistesleben, 1740-1800* (Munich, 1973) 22, characterized the situation prior to the battle of the White Mountain as: "etwa 90% der Bevölkerung Böhmens und Mährens gehörten den verschiedenen protestantischen Konfessionen an...."

[61] *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregors XV. Für die Nuntien und Gesandten* 2:621-622. That the Roman authorities, by the term "hussiti," designated Utraquists, not Protestants, is attested by no less a figure than Johann E. Platejs, whose Tridentine orthodoxy was beyond doubt; see Josef Pekař, "Bílá Hora: její příčiny a následky," *Postavy a problémy českých dějin* ed. František Kutnar (Prague, 1990) 182-183.

simple auricular confession and reception of communion under one species were sufficient.[62]

Similarly, most of the Bohemian clergy were viewed as non-Protestant, equipped with canonical ordinations, even in the uncompromising eyes of the Curial representatives. In March 1621, Johann E. Platejs made it clear that when he spoke of "parochi hussitici" he referred to Utraquist priests who had episcopal ordination [*sacerdotes rite consecrati*].[63] When later in September 1621 he convoked a gathering of Czech priests, he offered the clergymen an admission to the fold of Roman priesthood without the condition of re-ordination.[64] This could not have applied to Lutheran ministers who would have been instituted outside the historical episcopal framework and thus unacceptable as Roman priests without being ordained afresh. Technically speaking, the process of the Utraquists' integration into the Roman Curia's fold resembled more a "reunion", than a "conversion".[65] Platejs required of the Utraquist clergymen (1) to declare officially that communion *sub una* was no less beneficial than one *sub utraque*; (2) to admit none to communion without a prior auricular confession; and (3) to use Latin, instead of Czech, as the liturgical language.[66]

The strength of Utraquism is indicated by the major presence of its priesthood after the Battle of the White Mountain, as cited by Tomek.[67] In addition to this group of clergy, which must have been substantial, another group of six Utraquist priests had submitted unconditionally to Archbishop Lohelius in March 1621.[68] The continued presence of former Utraquist clergy was dramatically demonstrated by the case of Jan Locika of Domažlice, pastor of the principal church of Utraquism, that of Our Lady Before the Týn in Prague, and an authentic hero of Utraquist resistance. In the absence of an Utraquist Consistory, he may be viewed as Utraquism's head or chief representative, who was also a learned man with at least two theological treatises to his credit.[69] When Karl Lichtenstein, the Royal Governor of Bohemia – contrary to the

---

[62] Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace* 92. Looking at the procedure from the opposite shore, this is reminiscent of the simple admission of converts from *sub una* by the Utraquists. In comparison, more elaborate procedures were required for the reception of members of the Unity of Brethren, such as a profession of belief in the veneration of saints. See Chlíbec, "K vývoji názorů Jana Rokycany na umělecké dílo," 54; Pavel Bydžovský, *Odvolání jednoho Bratra z Roty Pikhartské* (Prague: Jan Jičínský, 1588²) [1st ed. Prague: Jan Kantor, 1559]. Available in photocopy at the National Library in Prague, sign. f Zc 54.

[63] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 10 nn. 37 and 40.

[64] For instance, Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 18; earlier in Václav Líva, "Jan Arnošt Platejs z Platenštejna: Příspěvek k dějinám pobělohorské protireformace," *Časopis Matice moravské* 54 (1930) 51, creates a confusion by using the term non-Catholic for these clergyman, although it cannot be doubted from the conditions offered that they held canonical ordinations.

[65] Looking at the procedure in another context, it may be compared to the forcible reunion of the Uniates of Belarus with the Eastern Orthodoxy in 1839 and 1875. See Theodore R. Weeks, "Religion and Russification: Russian Language in the Catholic Churches of the 'Northwest Provinces' after 1863," *Kritika* 2 (2001) 93.

[66] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 18.

[67] Václav V. Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách, od r. 1415 až 1622," ČČM 22 (1848) 463; see also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 574-5; Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen,* ed. Theodor Tupetz. (Leipzig, 1894) 107-111; Tomáš Bílek, *Reformace katolická; neboli Obnovení náboženství katolického v království českém po bitvě na Bílé Hoře* (Prague, 1892) 16-17.

[68] Against Hrejsa's opinion, Líva shows that the two groups were not identical in Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 9, 11 n. 42; referring to Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 575. See also Líva, "Jan Arnošt Platejs z Platenštejna," 45.

[69] *Kázání o posledním soudu* [Sermon About the Last Judgment] (1618?), and *O užitcích velikých z útrpného umučení Syna Božího* [On the Great Merits of the Suffering and the Death of the Son of God]

wishes of Archbishop Johann Lohelius – permitted distribution of communion *sub utraque* in the churches of Our Lady before Týn in the Old Town, as well as St. Henry's [Sv. Jindřich] in the New Town, at Easter of 1622 (27 March),[70] Locika administered communion in two kinds to more than a thousand faithful. On Easter Monday he again invited the faithful to receive communion in both kinds.[71] Subsequently, he defied the Archbishop's reiterated prohibition of lay chalice, and two weeks later he still preached fidelity to the Utraquist practices to his congregation, although anticipating his own imminent demise.[72] Although Pavel Michna of Vacínov, Lichtenstein's secretary, who favoured at least a temporary toleration of Utraquism, attempted to save him, Locika was captured in his lodgings in the early morning of 13 April. Thereupon he was deposed by the Archbishop and taken to jail where he soon died.[73] He might have been beheaded in the castle of Křivolát.[74]

Most of the Utraquist priests had little choice, but to accept assignments from the Roman Church after 1621. The incorporation of the Utraquist clergy and their congregations in the Roman ranks was a rough and ready process. A typical example was its application in the deanery of Litomyšl. The Dean, Vojtěch Hájek, called together the priests of the deanery on 23 May 1622, and read them a directive that henceforth the lay communion in both kinds was proscribed. Lay persons who refused communion *sub una* should be denied marriages and church burials. Those turning to any remaining unauthorized priests were to be punished more severely by confiscation of property or otherwise.[75] We can assume that, with rare exceptions, the priests submitted resentfully, and the Roman Church just as naturally did not trust them to advance its objectives of imposing a post-Tridentine rigid conformity. According to Eduard Winter these reunited Utraquist priests were initially assigned to rural parishes, although toward the end of the 1620s a few returned to Prague.[76] Archbishop Lohelius's reports from August 1621, cited by Líva, however, indicate that the pastors of most churches in Prague at that time consisted of reunited Utraquist priests with episcopal ordination.[77] This conclusion is supported by other evidence. In July 1622 it was assumed that most Prague churches would mark the feast day of Jan Hus and such celebrations would almost necessarily presume the officiating by former Utraquist

(1618)  The wholesale destruction of Utraquist literature during the Counter Reformation has probably deprived us of ever knowing more about Locika's books, see *Knihopis českých a slovenských tisků* 2 vv., vol. 2 in 9 parts (Prague, 1925-1967) 2, pt. 4  (1948) 316, nos. 4923 and 4924.

[70] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 23. Lohelius had promulgated the prohibition of lay chalice on 28 February 1622 declaring that the communion in both kinds for the laity, sanctioned by Pope Pius IV in 1564, was henceforth forbidden as harmful by a new decree of Pope Gregory XV; Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 22-23; Tomek, "O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463.

[71] He then declared that "some wish to prevent it, but it is more proper to obey God than people. Although they want to suppressed your hereditary faith, remain faithful and do not be misled. I will stay with you of one mind like a shepherd with his flock." Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí* 447.

[72] A contingent of troops, with loaded muskets and flaming torches, which, at the archbishop's behest, actually came to seize him in the midst of a religious service on 10 April 1622, was repelled by the assembled congregation.

[73] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 580-1; Tischer, ed., *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí* 447-8; Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf* 203; Alois Kroess, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu* 2 vv. in 3 (Vienna, 1910-1938) 2:167.

[74] This was asserted by Skála ze Zhoře; see his *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* 5:213. See also Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání* 4:443; Bílý, *Jezuita Antonín Koniáš* 69.

[75] Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání* 4:444-445.

[76] Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf* 203-204.

[77] Líva, "Jan Arnošt Platejs z Platenštejna," 67-69.

priests.[78] It is virtually unthinkable that clergy *sub una* would lend themselves to such observances, considering the Roman Curia's deep-seated view of Hus as an arch-heretic, and Czech Lutheran ministers – together with Brethren and Calvinist clergy – had already been exiled from Prague in December 1621.[79]

Covert practice of the old rites by former Utraquist priests was impeded by the Counter Reformation's enforcement system, the operatives of which were not natives with even a vestigial empathy with the local ways, but harshly unsentimental outsiders.[80] Nevertheless, there were known instances of resistance and evasion, which produced yet another authentic Utraquist martyr in addition to Locika. A former Utraquist priest, Vavřinec Hanžburský of Kopeček, served as pastor at St. Henry's Church in Prague from April 1621 till the spring of 1624. After a year of rustification in Velvary, he returned to Prague in October 1625 as pastor of St. Adalbert [Vojtěch]. There he secretly distributed communion *sub utraque*, and issued the officially required certificates of confession and communion *sub una* to faithful not only in Prague, but also from elsewhere in Bohemia as far as Týn nad Vltavou and Kostelec nad Orlicí. His trial can be used as a prism for understanding the vulnerability of former Utraquist priests under the Counter Reformation. First, the defendant was unjustly charged with breaking the law by publicly distributing communion *sub utraque* at St. Henry's Church at Easter of 1622, although the rite was ordered (presumably at Lichtenstein's behest) by Sezima of Vrtba, the captain of the New Town of Prague. Second, Hanžburský declined to appeal to Rome against the verdict of the archiepiscopal court, which was apparently in line with the traditional Utraquist denial of papal jurisdiction, and which harkened back to Hus's refusal to recognize either papal or conciliar authority to judge him. Third, he was charged with apostasy for having left Roman obedience after his original ordination by Archbishop Zbyněk Berka (1592-1606). Inasmuch as Utraquist priests in general were ordained by bishops in communion with Rome, all lived under the threat of this indictment. Sentenced to death, Hanžburský was beheaded in Prague on 7 April 1631, on a scaffold appropriately erected in front of the Týn Church, the former "Cathedral" of Utraquism.[81] The investigatory commission, which

---

[78] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 27-28; Pavel Balcárek, "Z korespondence Carla Caraffy [sic], nuncia na císařském dvoře v letech 1621-1628," in *Facta probant homines: Sborník příspěvků k životnímu jubileu prof. dr. Zdeňky Hledíkové,* ed. Ivan Hlaváček and Jan Hrdina (Prague, 1998) 38.

[79] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 19. Of course, former Utraquist priests with episcopal ordination had even earlier replaced Lutheran clergy in major Prague churches. Thus Locika relieved Viktorin Vrbenský at St. Nicholas' [Sv. Mikuláš] in the Old Town on February 20, 1621, and Vavřinec Hanžburský of Kopeček took the place of Vít Fagellus (Bouček) Písecký at St. Henry's [Sv. Jindřich] in the New Town on April 1, 1621. *Ibid.* 20 n. 79; Hrejsa, *Ceská konfesse* 576-577.

[80] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 22. Needless to say, the local population resented the outsiders. Complaints about foreign priests and monks in the Roman Church could be heard frequently in Bohemia since the late sixteenth century, not only from the Utraquists, but also from the *sub una*; see, for instance, *Sněmy české* 7:439-440.

[81] His case in the archiepiscopal court was zealously promoted by the notorious Platejs who, however, lacked the courage to witness the execution, although twelve other high ecclesiastical dignitaries were present. *Dopisy Reformační komisse v Čechách, z let 1627-1692*, ed. Antonín Podlaha (Prague, 1908) 138-140; Václav Líva, "Jan Arnošt Platejs z Platenštejna," 322-327. Hanžburský may be regarded, next to Locika, as one of two leading candidates for canonisation in the Utraquist pantheon. It is hardly surprising, however, that both Hanžburský and Locika became targets of slanderous attacks from the Roman, as well as the Evangelical side. Locika was portrayed as a calculating opportunist, who had several times changed his religious affiliation, and Hanžburský as an avaricious trader with ecclesiastical goods. These slanders against the pursuers of the religious via media were subsequently recycled and diffused by modern historiography; see Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 536; Líva, "Jan Arnošt Platejs

"unmasked" Hanžburský, claimed or suspected other cases of secret Utraquism, especially in the countryside. Thus another priest, Havel Zemánek of Sadská was tried also in 1630 for having issued false certificates to forty families.[82]

An indication of the Utraquists' prevalence in Prague came also from the behaviour of the common believers. When in 1622, the observance of the feast day of Jan Hus and the Bohemian martyrs on 6 July was prohibited without a prior public announcement, it was reported that the people of Prague gathered in droves in front of the locked churches.[83] Since Lutherans normally opposed the veneration of saints, and their attitude toward honouring Hus and other Bohemian martyrs was, to say the least, ambiguous, the conclusion can be drawn that most of Prague's population was Utraquist at that point.[84] The prevalence of Utraquists is supported by the report that more than a thousand believers came to receive communion in both kinds from Jan Locika of Domažlice earlier in the year at Easter.[85] According to a report of Lichtenstein's secretary, Pavel Michna z Vacínova, Locika subsequently distributed communion *sub utraque* to not fewer than five thousand faithful on the last Sunday before his arrest, 10 April 1622.[86] It was unlikely that Lutherans figured among these communicants, inasmuch as the Evangelicals detested the Utraquist rites in general, and Locika in particular, as much as they abhorred the Tridentine masses and the clergy *sub una*.[87] An impression of the Praguers' prevalent Utraquist (rather than Protestant) sympathies emerged also from their unenthusiastic reception of the Czech Lutheran ministers, who returned briefly during the Saxon occupation of Bohemia's capital from 15 November 1631 to 25 May 1632.[88]

Looking at the situation from another angle, the fact that there were relatively few Czechs among the Lutheran exiles from Bohemia would indicate that most of the Bohemian Lutherans were German, while most of the Utraquists were Czechs and hence not attracted by refuge in Lutheran countries.[89] For instance, the town of Pirna in

z Platenštejna," 323. Hence Locika and Hanžburský shared the historiographical fate of their main precursors on the Utraquist via media, Bohuslav Bílejovský and Pavel Bydžovský. The campaigns of defamation against these earlier theological scholars and outstanding ecclesiastical statesmen aimed at representing them as devoid of moral scruples, if not as outright deceivers. See, for instance, Josef V. Šimák, "Bohuslava Bílejovského Kronika česká," ČČH 38 (1932) 103; Jan Jakubec, *Dějiny literatury české,* 2 vv. (Prague, 1929-1934²) 1:653.

[82] *Dopisy Reformační komisse v Čechách* 194; Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace* 97.

[83] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 27-28.

[84.] Even Pope Gregory XV was disturbed by Nuncio Carafa's account about the attempt to celebrate the feast; see Balcárek, "Z korespondence Carla Caraffy [sic], nuncia na císařském dvoře," 38. As noted earlier, all Lutheran confessions rejected the saints' role as mediators of redemption, and prohibited prayers to saints, see *Lutheran Cyclopedia* ed. Erwin L. Lueker (St. Louis, 1975) 692.

[85] Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf im Sudetenraum* 203.

[86] In a letter of April 13, 1622, to the supreme chancellor, Zdeněk Vojtěch of Lobkovice; see Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 25 n. 105.

[87] On the Lutheran loathing of Locika see Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách: Kulturně-historický obraz v XV. a XVI. století* 2 vv. (Prague, 1895) 1:272; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse* 537 n. 4; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610-1619* 447. Even after several years of Counter Reformatory suppression, there were signs of distinctly Utraquist feelings within the rural population. When rumours of renewed religious tolerance spread in 1627 in the district of Litomyšl, peasants from many villages demanded from the Catholic dean of the town masses in the Czech language and communion under both kinds; *Dopisy Reformační komisse v Čechách* 5-6. In view of the Lutherans' rejection of the canonical mass, these were evidently Utraquist, not Lutheran (or "Neo-Utraquist"), desiderata.

[88] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933) 68-70.

[89] Jaroslav Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin* 2 vv. (Prague, 1991) 2:83-84.

Saxony was one of the principal gathering sites for religious refugees from Bohemia, and the lists of exiles, compiled there in 1621-1639, showed a striking prevalence of German names.[90] Even making allowance for Czech speakers with German names, or for Czech names mutated into German, it would still appear that most of the Lutheran exiles were Germans rather than Czechs, supporting the idea that the Czechs were mostly Utraquists rather than Lutherans in 1620. Likewise, Václav Líva's analysis of the religious exiles from Prague after the Battle of the White Mountain, including 600 families, indicated that more than a third were Germans, and a third Brethren or Calvinists, which would leave less than a third for Czech Lutherans.[91]

## The Problems of Old Utraquism

Once the model of Neo-Utraquism is viewed as an imaginary fiction, the need for constructing the Old Utraquist model by and large loses its raison d'être. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to examine briefly the feature of Utraquism, which – by and large taken out of context – could furnish building blocks for the construction of a fictitious Old Utraquism, which wished to fuse with the Roman Church under the Curia's conditions.[92] The features, which have lent quasi-credibility to the concept of "Old Utraquism", included the use of the term "Catholic", the attachment to the liturgical books and rubrics of the archdiocese of Prague, and the recognition (albeit minimalist) of the Roman See.

(1) Actually, proclamation of devotion to the Catholic faith and/or practices, contrary to the twenty-first-century terminological usage, did not constitute a pledge of obedience to the Roman Curia or the archbishop of Prague, or of acceptance of the edicts of the Council of Trent. Similarly, professions of love for the Catholic Church did not signify affection for the cardinals of the Roman Curia but for the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic church" professed in the Nicene Creed.[93] (2) Statements that the Utraquist Consistory did or should have followed the rules of the archdiocese of Prague have been erroneously cited as evidence of obedience to the post-1564 edicts of the archbishops of Prague.[94] There was nothing new or compromising in this directive inasmuch as the Utraquists had traditionally, since the fifteenth century, expressed their essential agreement with pre-Tridentine liturgical books of the Prague archdiocese.[95] In

---

[90] Bobková, *Exulanti z Prahy a severozápadních Čech v Pirně* 6-131.

[91] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 6 (1933) 413-415.

[92] In real life, there is no evidence for the existence of a significant group of Utraquists who would gladly join the obedience of the Roman Curia for a mere temporary permission of lay communion *sub utraque*. This alleged solution missed the point. The key issue in the Utraquist stance was not the rite as such but the underlying opposition to an authoritarian ecclesiology, namely the power of the ecclesiastical authorities to declare sinful something that did not oppose the divine law but actually may have been in accordance with the law of God. In fact, the Old Utraquists did not exist, and the Roman Curia was not interested in promoting the communion *sub utraque* in Bohemia even as sanctioned by the papal decree of 1564. In any case, the Jesuits after offering it briefly in Prague soon discontinued the option. This created the impression in Bohemia that the papal concession had been abrogated.
See Josef Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř pod obojí za administrátora Rezka," ČČH 37 (1931) 32-33, 261. In actual fact, this would not happen until the aftermath of the battle of the White Mountain in December 1621, see Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," (1933) 22-23.

[93] Zdeněk V. David, "The Utraquists and the Roman Curia, 1575-1609: Institutional Aspects," BRRP 4 (2000) 251-253.

[94] *Ibid*. 250.

[95] Bydžovský, *Dětátka a neviňátka,* f. B1a-B1b, largely citing from Václav Koranda, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* (Prague, 1493) f. S3a - S3b.

fact, the administrator and the Consistory considered themselves, and in Bohemia were officially recognized, as a part of the historical structure of the archdiocese.[96] (3) Finally, the refusal to demonize the Pope entirely, as an eschatological Antichrist, was seen as evidence of the Consistory's Old Utraquist proclivities. Actually, the highly qualified endorsement of the papacy was in line with the continuous Utraquist tradition. The Utraquists firmly rejected papal administrative and judicial jurisdiction and reserved their judgment as to the Pope's magisterial authority, but they considered him an essential component in the area of orders as a guarantor of authentic priesthood in the Western church.[97] This papal minimalism was a far cry from the papal maximalism of the High Middle Ages, against which Hus revolted, and from its re-emphasis by the Council of Trent, which the Utraquists continued to oppose adamantly.[98]

**The Pitfalls of Neo-Utraquism**

What were the detrimental effects of the concept of Neo-Utraquism on the historical perception of the Bohemian Reformation? (1) First, the concept of Neo-Utraquism distorted the image of Czech Lutheranism. Although Czech Lutherans tended to claim the heritage of the Bohemian Reformation, there were no identifiable borrowings or tendencies toward syncretism with standard Utraquism. As an entirely separate issue, there were formal resemblances between Lutheran tenets and practices, on the one hand, and those of the more radical strands of the Bohemian Reformation, the Taborites of the Unity, on the other hand. As noted earlier, the idea of a direct causal relation between the teaching of the Czech Lutherans and the earlier religious radicals in the Bohemian Reformation has been discredited by the meticulous analyses of František Hrubý.[99] In deviating from the strict Teutonic pattern, Czech Lutheranism tended to borrow, not from the Bohemian Reformation, but from English Puritanism, which placed its theology further away, rather than nearer, standard Utraquism. Thus calling the Lutherans Neo-Utraquists was baseless and misleading.[100] It was also offensive to the Lutherans, if it claimed that the Neo-Utraquist clergy engaged in anti-Lutheran liturgical rituals with the intent of deceiving the faithful.

(2) Second, the concept of Neo-Utraquism distorted the image of authentic Utraquism, and virtually denied and obliterated its existence. With the imaginary weapon of Old Utraquism at hand, characteristics, which in fact applied simply to mainline Utraquism, were reinterpreted as quasi-Lutheran or Neo-Utraquist. Under this approach, significant deviations from the practices of the existing Roman Church other

---

[96] As "administrator et parochi consistorii archiepiscopatus Pragensis sub utraque communicantium." E.g., in 1579, *Sněmy české* 5:516.

[97] In this pattern of relationships, the Utraquists combined a determined opposition to the papacy in administrative and judicial jurisdiction with acknowledging Rome's sacerdotal role and having their priests ordained by the hierarchy in communion with the Roman See. As, for instance, Luther has pointed out, see P. Fraenkel, "Utraquism or Co-Existence: Some Notes on the Earliest Negotiations Before the Pacification of Nuernberg, 1531-1532," *Studia Theologica* 18,2 (1964) 129.

[98] Thus, the features, which were posited as the marks of Old Utraquism and as indications of readiness to unite with Rome, where actually the marks of standard Utraquism, and they delineated Utraquism's boundaries against the Tridentine Roman Church.

[99] František Hrubý, "Luterství a novoutrakvismus v českých zemích v 16. a 17. století," ČČH 44 (1939) 40; see also 42-4; Stloukal, "Počátky nunciatury v Praze," 16 n. 1; and Josef Pekař in ČČH 39 (1933) 356 n. 1.

[100] As noted earlier, this was also true of the Bohemian Confession of 1575, which has been occasionally (mis)represented as a Neo-Utraquist document, but it is essentially identical with the Augsburg Confession with some alterations, not toward Utraquism, but Calvinism. *Sněmy české* 11 pt. 1:39.

than lay communion in both kinds,[101] could be viewed as ipso facto symptoms of quasi-Lutheran or Neo-Utraquist leanings. Actually, such attitudes as papal minimalism, anti-monasticism, or rejecting of the command approach to ecclesiastical administration, were normal features of standard Utraquism, as it had existed for hundred years before and for hundred years after the emergence of Luther, and consistent with its anti-Protestant character. This approach ignored the clearest line of demarcation between Utraquism and Lutheranism: the issue of sacramental priesthood in the historical apostolic succession. The ultimate injury to Utraquism was the destruction of its integrity and imaginary dismemberment into Crypto-Lutherans and virtual adherents of the Roman Curia. This study has sought to lay to rest the image of Utraquism after 1517 as a battle field of two contradictory forces, one which steered Utraquist theology (and liturgy) "left" toward a synthesis with Lutheranism; the other which veered "right" toward an ecclesial merger with the Roman Curia.[102]

(3) Third, the concept of Neo-Utraquism tended to skew the assessment of the Counter Reformation in Bohemia. The latter could be portrayed as primarily an anti-Protestant campaign, aiming at suppression of the Lutheran or quasi-Lutheran Neo-Utraquism.[103] As paradoxical as it may seem, with the restoration of the image of an integral Utraquism, the Counter Reformation may be viewed as essentially an anti-Catholic crusade. This integral Utraquism despite its anti-Tridentine stance, adhered to the medieval theology and, despite the allegation of Lutheran features, it was anti-Protestant. On balance, it might be described as a form of liberal Catholicism and, in fact, of Roman Catholicism, inasmuch as the Utraquists insisted on belonging to the historical Western Church, or the Roman Patriarchate. In the mid-sixteenth century Bohemian Utraquism might have served as a model for the reform of the Church of Rome which was liberal, yet non-Protestant, and which could be juxtaposed to the authoritarian model, which would prevail at Trent. Such a liberal alternative was not purely theoretical, it was envisaged particularly by the circle of Erasmus.[104] It would have involved an "Utraquistisation" of the Roman Church.[105]

If this is granted, the Counter Reformation can be viewed in Bohemia not as a Re-Catholicisation but as a De-Catholicisation. It was a process which aimed at replacing a customary, indulgent, plebeian, optimistic, and realistic Catholicism with

[101] For such a definition see, for instance, Otakar Odložilík, "Utrakvistická postilla z r. 1540," *Věstník České společnosti nauk* (1925) 24-25.
[102] (1) Utraquism remained loyal to its fifteenth century theological stand, rejecting the papal monarchism but retaining pre-Protestant theology. (2) The Consistory maintained its liberal ecclesiology which in fact increasingly diverged from (rather than converged with) the Roman Curia's position after the Council of Trent.
[103] Old Utraquism, if it was noted at all, was presumed to have painlessly succumbed to the blandishments of the Roman Curia.
[104] Erasmus's views are evident particularly from his contacts with cardinals Lorenzo Campeggi and Jacopo Sadoleto; see letter from Floriano Montini (secretary to Cardinal Campeggi) to Erasmus, 22 February 1525, from Buda, in Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 11:48-49; on his friendship with Campeggi see *ibid*. 11:84, 322-323; Erasmus's letter to Sadolet in Richard M. Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547: Humanist and Reformer* (Cambridge, MA., 1959) 115. See also Josef Macek, "Osudy basilejských kompaktát v jagelonském věku," *Jihlava a Basilejská Kompaktáta: Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodního sympozia k 555. výročí přijetí Basilejských kompaktát, 26-28. červen 1991* (Jihlava, 1992) 199-200; and Alain Dufour, "Humanisme et Reformation," in his *Histoire politique et psychologie historique* (Geneva, 1966) 54.
[105] On Utraquism as a liberal model for the reform of the Church of Rome see Fraenkel, "Utraquism or Co-Existence," 130, 132-34.

a rigorist, aristocratic, ascetic, mystical, and ultimately an alien, one. The inherently trusting and tolerant Catholicism of Bohuslav Bílejovský had to yield to an inherently suspicious and intolerant Catholicism of Bohuslav Balbín. Metaphorically speaking, Catholicism with a human face had to yield to a Catholicism with a face that was superhuman. The success of the Counter Reformation can be thus viewed as a success of De-Catholicisation. The domestic, rooted, Utraquist Catholicism was erased from memory. The imposed Tridentine Catholicism lacked domestic roots and tradition. It would maintain the aura of an incongruous, inorganic implant. It remains to add – for the sake of balance and fairness – that, in the absence of a pervasive authentically Protestant tradition, the evangelical Wittenberg or the reformed Heidelberg/Geneva would appear to the majority just as exotic as Tridentine Rome.[106]

---

[106] Whatever slight traces of the Bohemian Reformation there may have been in Czech Lutheranism were purged from it in the post-White Mountain exile in Germany.