Universalist Aspirations of the Utraquist Church

Zdeněk V. David
(Washington, D.C.)

An important legacy of Utraquism to the subsequent Czech political culture was its universalist outlook. This conclusion may appear paradoxical considering that the national accent seemed so strong in the Bohemian Reformation and especially during the Bohemian religious wars. Such an assumption of national exclusivity led to the mistaken view that the Bohemians might be satisfied with an exceptional ecclesiastical status, as Rome saw it at the Council of Basel in 1434-1436 and in the issuance of a special privilege of the lay chalice for the Bohemians by Pope Pius IV in 1564. These tactics of appeasement, however, failed. They ignored the basic fact that the Bohemians' goal was to reform the (Western) Church as a whole. In the eyes of the Utraquists, the purpose of the Czech nation was not to assert a peculiar set of ethnically grounded beliefs, but to serve as a vehicle for the realisation of a universal purpose. Subsequently, this outlook harmonised with the cosmopolitan character of the Enlightenment and eventually with that of political liberalism.

In an earlier article, I discussed the Utraquist legacy of liberal ecclesiology.[1] In this paper the Utraquists' universalism is treated in terms of their continued, albeit qualified, attachment to the Roman Church, as well as their relationship to other groups that sought to reform the entire scope of Western Christendom along the lines of liberal Catholicism.[2] This essay also seeks to answer the charges that the Utraquists' ambition to reform the Church of Rome revealed signs of sycophancy, quixotic idiosyncrasy, and megalomania in their actions.

The Fallacy of a Uniate Solution

Let us first consider the fallacy of what may be called the Uniate solution. The chiliastic aspect of the Bohemian Reformation can be said to reach back to Hus's precursors, particularly Milíč of Kroměříž and Matěj of Janov. The idea that the Bohemians were a chosen people to bring about the reform of the church was, during the wars of the Bohemian Reformation, transformed into a chiliastic vision that among radicals, particularly the Taborites, could escalate to viewing destruction as a new creation. Such eschatological enthusiasms were never shared by the Utraquist mainstream. Accordingly, after the calming of

---

1   Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquism's Liberal Ecclesiology," BRRP 6 (2007) 165-188.
2   In this paper I draw in large part on my previous work in Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, 2003) particularly chapter 10.

the revolutionary passions, the idea of a eschatological mission turned into a moderate, yet firm, aspiration to serve as a model for a universal ecclesiastical reform.[3] Aiming at cleansing the historical church of its late medieval corruption, the goal was now relatively modest compared to the Taborites' expectation that the Bohemian nation would establish the apocalyptic Kingdom of God on earth. Nevertheless, in its own terms it was ambitious enough. The Utraquists remained convinced that their church had preserved, on behalf of all Western Christianity, the true traditional catholic and apostolic faith against the deviations of the Roman Curia which eventually would come around to the Utraquists' point of view.[4] Figuratively speaking, the Utraquist Church had to make up for the fact that the immune system of Rome had temporarily failed to keep out the infectious corruption of material wealth and earthly power.

With their sight set on reforming the universal church, not on cultivating national peculiarities, the Utraquists never aimed at establishing a separate national church provided with distinct features. Therefore, they could not ultimately be satisfied with a mere permission for lay communion *sub utraque* as a special grant of indulgence, which the Council of Basel had offered in the form of the Compactata in 1436. As a result, the Compactata were not viewed as a solution, but as a step in the right direction. The ultimate goal was not even limited to just transforming certain aspects of liturgy, such as instituting communion for infants and the canonization of Jan Hus. It aimed more broadly at a recognition and *universal* adoption of the liberal Utraquist ecclesiology by Rome for the entire Western Church. The Compactata not only failed to resolve the remaining liturgical issues but, more importantly, they revealed the incompatibility between the Council's attempt to marginalise the Utraquists and the latter's adherence to the universal stance. Although the Council was willing to offer communion *sub utraque* as a special privilege for the Bohemians, the Utraquists refused to recognise the validity of lay communion *sub una* for the rest of the church.

On theological grounds, therefore, the Utraquists reacted calmly to Pope Pius II's revocation of the Compactata in 1462. Their response, written by Martin Lupáč (d. 1468), argued that the abrogation was a loss for Rome, and not for Utraquism. Accordingly, the Utraquist church still maintained the correct religious view, while Rome deprived itself of the cleansing benefit which it might have derived from the Four Articles of Prague (1421). This was in line with the Utraquists' established position. Although recognizing the papacy as

---

3   Rudolf Urbánek, "Český mesianismus ve své době hrdinské" [Bohemian Messianism in Its Heroic Period], *Od pravěku k dnešku: Sborník k 60. narozeninám J. Pekaře* [From Antiquity to the Present: A Festschrift for the Sixtieth Birthday of J. Pekař], 2 vv. (Prague, 1930) 1:262-284.
4   František Palacký, *Obrana husitství* [In Defense of Hussitism], tr. and ed. František M. Bartoš (Prague, 1926) 41.

a guarantor of the apostolic (historic) succession for their priesthood, they consistently rejected papal administrative or judicial competence. On the separate issue of papal teaching authority, their position was that – in the cases of conflict – Scripture (i.e., the Law of God) stood above the pope's edicts.[5] Furthermore, despite the revocation of the Compactata, the Utraquist Church continued to maintain its sense of belonging to the universal or Catholic [*obecná*] Church. The insistence on this connection, as well as the endorsement of liberal ecclesiology with the reservations vis-à-vis the papacy, were reiterated by Administrator, Václav Koranda the Younger, Rokycana's successor as the leader of Utraquism (1471-1497).[6]

The universalist aspirations of Utraquism continued into the sixteenth century. The mature position on the matter was most clearly postulated by one of the leading theologians, Bohuslav Bílejovský (ca. 1480-1555), in his *Kronyka česká* [Bohemian Chronicle], published in Nuremberg in 1537.[7] Despite his emphasis on the historical Bohemian roots of Utraquism, Bílejovský did not view his Church simply as a national religion. Instead, he saw the Utraquist Church as a receptacle for, and guardian of, an uncorrupted Western Christianity, one that was endowed with a global mission. His view of the reformed Church of Bohemia – as an integral part of the Western Church – corresponded to the traditional view of the Utraquists, going back to Jan Hus.[8] Bílejovský also retained, in a somewhat muted form, the Czech religious messianism which had glowed more brightly in the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation and, indeed, in the convictions of Jan Hus himself.[9] Above all, he saw the recovery of

---

5   Josef Macek, *Víra a zbožnost jagellonského věku* [The Faith and Piety of the Jagellonian Age] (Prague, 2001) 58.

6   Václav Koranda, Jr., *Manualník* [The Manual] ed. J. Truhlář (Prague, 1888) 50ff.; Václav Koranda, Jr., *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltáří* [A Treatise About the Divine Sacrament of the Altar] (N.p., 1493) 98a, 128a. See also Noemi Rejchrtová, "Obrazoborecké tendence utrakvistické mentality jagellonského období a jejich dosah," [Iconoclastic Tendencies of Utraquist Mentality and Their Reach] *Husitský Tábor* 8 (1985) 66; Eberhard, Winfried, "Zur reformatorischen Qualität und Konfessionalisierung des nachrevolutionären Hussitismus," in František Šmahel and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner, eds., *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, Schriften des Historischen Kollegs Kolloquien 39 (Munich,1998) 223. The humanists, Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení and Václav Písecký shared Koranda=s view. The latter summed up the grievance against Rome at the turn of the century: "...they never wanted to grant...what they had promised in Basel and confirmed with their seals." See Bohumil Ryba, "Václav Písecký, Eneáš Sylvius a Lukianos," *Listy filologické* 57 (1930) 145.

7   The text of Bílejovský's work is available in a nineteenth-century edition by Jozef Skalický (pseudonym for Josef Dittrich) *Kronyka cýrkevní* [Ecclesiastical Chronicle] (Prague, 1816). Born around 1480 in Malín near Kutná Hora, Bílejovský was ordained priest in Italy (probably in Venice) and served in Mělník, Čáslav, and Kutná Hora. Except for a brief mission to Tábor, he lived since 1532 in Prague where he was elected to the Consistory two years later and died in 1555. For biographic data on Bílejovský, see Josef V. Šimák, "Bohuslava Bílejovského Kronika česká," ,,,,H 38 (1932) 92-93.

8   Božena Kopičková, *Jan Želivský* (Prague, 1990) 20.

9   Urbánek, "Český mesianismus ve své době hrdinské," 1:262-84, especially 263-64.

lay communion in both kinds as symptomatic of Utraquism's overarching ecumenical objective that marked its communicants as a people chosen to inspire and lead Western Christendom on a pilgrimage of return toward the authentic forms of Christian faith and worship.[10] As a confirmation of the outward thrust, influences of the Bohemian Reformation were felt in the neighbouring lands like Poland and Hungary, and even Romania.[11] Likewise, Bílejovský's learned colleague Pavel Bydžovský (1496-1559), illustrated a broad geographic vista when discussing the adoration of the host with his examples ranging from Bohemia to Italy, Netherlands, and France.[12] The increasing liturgical use of the vernacular language in Bohemia during the sixteenth-century did not interfere with the global objective.[13]

It is illuminating to make a comparison on the score of universalism between Utraquism and the kindred religious orientation of Anglicanism. The stirring of national messianism, viewing the English as the people chosen by God to purify all Christendom, was also present in the English Reformation. This aspiration, however, was less pronounced in (Proto-) Anglicanism than in the works of Puritan writers, such as John Foxe and John Bale.[14] In Richard Hooker, as well as in his Anglican successors like Archbishop William Laud, the focus on the contemporary national church tended to mute the global emphasis on ecclesiastical reform.[15] Moreover, because of their, albeit minimalist, recognition of the papacy, and insistence on clerical ordinations by bishops in communion with the Roman See, the Utraquists were better positioned to interact with the central organs of Western Christianity. One might say that, while the *Ecclesia Anglicana* chose the left side of the *via media*, the Utraquists processed on the right side, and that the Utraquists' situation vis-à-vis Rome resembled more of a qualified separation, or a high degree of autonomy, than a full fledged divorce.[16]

10 Bílejovský, *Kronyka* 39-41; Kamil Krofta, "Slovo o knězi Bohuslavu Bílejovském," [Aword About Priest Bohuslav Bílejovský] in idem, *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* [Pages from Bohemian Religious History] (Prague, 1936) 296-97.

11 See, for instance, Ewa Maleczy½ska, *Ruch husycki w Czechach i w Polsce* [Hussite Movement in Poland] (Warsaw, 1959); Richard Pražák, "Zu den Beziehungen zwischen den Böhmischen Ländern und Ungarn zu Zeiten Matthias Corvinus," in *Matthias Corvinus and the Humanism in Central Europe*, eds. Tibor Klaniczay and József Jankovics (Budapest, 1994) 193-202; Josef Macůrek, "Husitství v rumuských zemích," [Hussitism in Romanian Lands] *Časopis Matice moravské* 51 (1927) 1-98.

12 Pavel Bydžovský, *Odvolání jednoho Bratra z Roty Pikhartské* [Recantation of One Brother from the Pikart Band], 2nd ed. (Prague, 1588) ff. C5r-D1v.

13 The use of vernacular, as a part of the plebeian thrust of Utraquism, is discussed in chapter 4.

14 Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London, 1986) 17, 20.

15 Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603* (New York, 1990) 99; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (New York, 1995) 303.

16 In that sense the Utraquists similarly differed from other later churches, like the Dutch and German Old Catholics or the Polish National Catholics who, although embracing the apostolic and

Although the Utraquists did not despair of the rehabilitation of the Church of Rome in the future, for the time being Bílejovský openly invited the communicants *sub una* to join the Utraquists, independently of the Curia, and participate in the task of purifying Christendom. He assured the *sub una* that Utraquism, in fact, represented the uncorrupted form of Roman Christianity.[17] With a similarly proselytising intent, Bydžovský sponsored and published German translations of sermons and other theological works by Utraquist classics, namely Hus, Jakoubek of Stříbro, and Jan Příbram, for the use of those Germans who lived in Bohemia, but had not yet acquired a reading facility in Czech.[18] There was, in fact, some evidence of German interest in Utraquism.[19] Incidentally, vibrant proselytising messages of Bílejovský and Bydžovský conveyed a sense of genuine institutional purpose and conceptual vitality, and belie the critics' image of the sixteenth-century Utraquist Church as a stagnant, if not ossified, institution.

The Question of Sycophancy

Let us now review the entire issue of the awkward and unresolved ties between Utraquism and the Roman Curia that derived from the universalist aspirations of Bohemian reformism. In what follows, the meaning of the relationship will be examined from the viewpoint of both participants. On the one hand, the relationship has been tendentiously viewed as demeaning from the viewpoint of Utraquism. On the other hand, Utraquism's potential as a model for liberal reform of the Roman Church has been underappreciated.

As noted earlier, for the Utraquist Church the most conspicuous aspects of the relationship were (1) the ordination of clergy by bishops in communion with the Holy See; and (2) an insistence on belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. For both of these principles, the Utraquists have been sternly criticized, particularly by Czech historiography. Standard historical literature has, as a rule, viewed the umbilical cord of the historic (apostolic) succession, which tied the Utraquists to the Roman Church, as an obstructing, and even shameful, liabil-

---

sacramental principles, would maintain a full separation or schism from the Roman See.

   The Utraquists' esteem for Thomas More and John Fisher may be seen as a graphic reflection of this distinction. See, especially, Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est.* (Prague, 1554).

17 Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 27, 39-41.

18 Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české* [Handbook of the History of Czech Literature], 2 vv. (Prague, 1875-76) 1:116.

19 See the Consistory's response of 28 July 1548 to a noble's request to replace the Lutheran minister on his estate with a Utraquist priest who would be able to serve a German-speaking congregation, Klement Borový, *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické a utrakvistické* [Protocols and Letters of the Catholic and the Utraquist Consistory] 2 vv. (Prague, 1868-69) 1:229.

ity.[20] Conventional historical literature also viewed the Utraquist insistence on maintaining their conceptual belonging to the Roman Catholic Church as a rather demeaning enterprise. Josef Pekař, for instance, depicted the Utraquists as standing at the Curia's door like humble petitioners asking to be tolerated, or like beggars imploring the authorities for their indulgence.[21]

Contrary to conventional historiography, the Utraquists' insistence on forming an integral part of the Roman Catholic Church may be viewed as a mark of empowerment rather than liability.[22] While in the short run, this linkage might have presented a dilemma, over the long run, the claim to Roman Catholic identity signalled the transcendent scope of Utraquism's historical mission. It gave the Church in Bohemia a standing, or an inside track, in seeking to reform the largest body in Western Christendom from within, instead of attacking it from the outside. Unlike (the otherwise kindred) Church of England, which – as mentioned – had for all practical purposes retreated into national isolation, the Utraquist Church of Bohemia clung to its universal mission. The sacerdotal link with the Roman Church was a concrete practical sign of this. Lapsing into Hegelian terminology it could be said that staying within the Roman Church (and serving as its Socratic gadfly) endowed Utraquism with a world-historical role. This would be lost if it had shrunk into an isolated provincial movement, or if it had simply merged with the Protestant mainstream. It can also be argued that remaining attached to the Roman Church – rather than turning Protestant – served a potentially useful function in the global division of labour. After all, Rome was more in need of a liberal leavening than the reformed churches were. Consequently, the Utraquists did not engage in the proverbial carrying of coal to Newcastle.

Contrary to conventional historiography, the Utraquists did not approach Rome as humble beggars. From their own point of view, the heirs of Hus adopted the self-confident stance of the prophets of righteousness, whom God had commissioned to exhort the Roman Curia to recognize its failings and to make amends. They did not plead with the Roman Church to admit them, rather they challenged the latter to listen and respond constructively to what they considered a divinely sanctioned critique.[23] The Utraquists saw themselves

---

20 For a reference to this issue see, for instance, Noemi Rejchrtová, "Role utrakvizmu v českých dějinách," [The Role of Utraquism in Bohemian History] in: *Traditio et Cultus: Miscellanea historica bohemica Miloslao Vlk, archiepiscopo Pragensi, ab eius collegis amicisque ad annum sexagesimum dedicata*, ed. Zdeňka Hledíková (Prague, 1993) 75.

21 Josef Pekař, *Žižka a jeho doba* [Žižka and His Times] 4 vv. (Prague, 1927-33) 3:327.

22 Macek, for instance, has characterized as benighted or retarded [*zpozdilá*] the continuing Utraquist ambition to reform the Roman Church, see Macek, *Víra a zbožnost jagellonského věku* 59.

23 Bílejovský, *Kronyka* 13-14; Vavřinec z Březové, *Husitská kronika* [Hussite Chronicle] ed. Marie Bláhová (Prague, 1979) 88-89. See also Kopičková, *Jan Želivský* 94.

as a voice of conscience, on behalf of the entire Western Christendom, representing a constant reproach to Rome for its errancy. The issue was not whether Rome was willing to readmit the Utraquists, but whether the Roman Church was willing to reform according to the Utraquist ecclesiological prescriptions. Looking at the relationship in another way, the Utraquists did not accept that there was a schism between them and the true Christian church, but rather that the perception of schism was on the part of the Roman Church, which had repudiated the Compactata in 1462.[24] They did not feel the need to be authenticated by Rome, but that Rome needed to be authenticated by them. To the Utraquists, Rome had not rehabilitated them by its approval of the Compactata, but, by adopting the latter, the Church of Rome might have started rehabilitating itself. As mentioned earlier, the Utraquists thought of themselves as exemplary Roman Catholics, who deigned to call themselves a part of the "Catholic Church" [*Církev katolická*].[25]

Question of Idiosyncrasy

Contrary to conventional historiography, the Utraquists' stand, with their papal minimalism and liberal ecclesiology, was neither idiosyncratic nor quixotic. The Utraquists were not unique or alone in casting a jaundiced eye from the vantage point of traditional orthodoxy at the model of church renewal taking shape at the Council of Trent (1545-1563), and in this respect may be viewed as participants, albeit distinctive ones, in a more general phenomenon, sometimes called Humanist Catholicism. Unlike the proponents of anathemas and exclusions, who prevailed at Trent, these reformers were advocates of dialogue and liberal moderation as a path to renewal.[26] Let us now situate the Utraquists within the landscape of these anti-Tridentine reformists within Roman Catholicism of the sixteenth century, many of whom were also known to the Utraquists.

To some extent, the Utraquist stance paralleled the reforms proposed by Georg Witzel (1501-1573); these were, in turn, endorsed by Ferdinand I.[27] Witzel, originally a Roman Catholic priest, was married and served as a Lutheran minister in Saxony in the 1520s. After the adoption of the Augsburg Confession in 1530, he rejoined the Roman Church as a married lay preacher, and lived in sev-

---

24 Amedeo Molnár, "Martin Lupáč: Modus disputandi pro fide," FHB 4 (1982) 161-177.

25 Valentin Polon, *Pomni na mne: Knížka obsahující v sobě kratičká spasidedlná Naučení a sebrání...* [Remember Me: A Book Containing Brief Salutary Precepts and Compilations...] (Prague, 1589) ff. Club 5-1b, A6-2b, A6-3a, A6-3b. Bílejovský states literally: "...we Czechs *sub utraque* are the true Romans" [...my Čechové pod obojí jsme praví římané] *Kronyka*, 27. In the ecclesiastical area, their resistance was comparable – in its tenor, if not in its results – to the political opposition of the North American colonies to the British Monarch claiming to defend the rights of Englishmen.

26 Peter Matheson, *Rhetoric of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1998) 215-37.

27 Winfried Trusen, *Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche: Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels* [Vereinsschriften der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe des Corpus Catholicorum 14] (Münster, 1957) 48-83.

eral German cities, in particular in Dresden, Berlin, and Mainz. His proposed remaking of the Roman Church resembled the goals of the Bohemian Reformation, including a liberal ecclesiology (based on patristic models and eschewing scholastic formulae), lay communion *sub utraque,* vernacular liturgy, and a de-emphasis on the veneration of saints.[28] It was after visiting Bohemia in the early 1540s that Witzel gained the favour of Ferdinand I, and subsequently of his son and successor, Maximillian II. Another figure in Germany seeking to mediate between Rome and the Lutherans was Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, who was also in touch with Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in England in the mid-1540s. The Curia, however, removed him from office in 1546.[29]

More surprisingly, the Utraquist standpoint was likewise akin to the liberal or populist ecclesiology of Thomas More, who – according to Brendan Bradshaw – also opposed "the institutionally oriented ecclesiology of late medieval clericalism," which would triumph at Trent.[30] Paradoxically – in view of subsequent developments – in his comments on Henry VIII's critique of Luther, *Assertio septem sacramentorum* (1521), More cautioned his sovereign to be less emphatic in stressing papal primacy.[31] Specifically, he did not consider the pope to be superior to a general council.[32]   The views of More, and also his fellow martyr John Fisher, were under the influence of the liberal ecclesiology of Erasmus (ca. 1466-1536),[33] and they both belonged to the circle of his correspon-

---

28 For an overview of Witzel's theology see Barbara Henze, *Aus Liebe zur Kirche Reform: die Bemühungen Georg Witzels (1501-1573) um die Kircheneinheit* (Münster, 1995) 91-151; on his and Georg Cassander's (1513/15-1566) activities, see idem, "Erasmianisch: Die "Methode' Konflikte zu lösen? Das Wirken Witzels und Cassanders," in M. E. H. N. Mout, H. Smolinsky, and J. Trapman, eds., *Erasmianism : Idea and Reality* (Amsterdam and New York, 1997) 155-168; see also *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 17 vv. (New York, 1967-1979) 14:984-985; *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 43:658-659.

29 Trusen, *Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche* 22-26; Henze, *Aus Liebe zur Kirche Reform* 23. On von Wied see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, Conn., 1996) 393. Although growing out of Erasmian influences in the Lower Rhineland, the situation in Cologne got out of hand in the Lutheran direction, when von Wied entrusted the reform project in 1542 to Martin Bucer who in turn collaborated with Melanchton, see August Franzen, *Bischof und Reformation: Erzbischof Hermann von Wied in Köln vor der Erscheidung zwischen Reform und Reformation* (Münster, 1971) 80-81; see also Conrad Varrentrapp, *Hermann von Wied und sein Reformationsversuch in Köln* (Leipzig, 1878).

30 Brendan Bradshaw, "The Controversial Sir Thomas More," JEH 36 (1985) 564.

31 Thomas More, *Complete Works*, 21 vv. (New Haven, Conn., 1963-1997) 5, pt. 2: 721; John Guy, *Thomas More* (London, 2000) 115.

32 William B. Patterson, "Hooker on Ecumenical Relations: Conciliarism in the English Reformation," in Arthur S. McGrade, ed., *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community* (Tempe, AZ, 1997) 289; Guy, *Thomas More* 178. This position was consistent with the canon law, Ordinary Gloss to the Decretum on Dist. 19 c. 9, cited by Brian Tierney, *Origins of Papal Infallibility, 1150-1350: A Study on the Concepts of Infallibility, Sovereignty and Tradition in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 1988) 309-310.

33 Ernest E. Reynolds, *Thomas More and Erasmus* (New York, 1965). On Erasmus's influence on Fisher, see James Kelsey McConica, "The English Reception of Erasmus," in Mout, Smolinsky, and Trapman, eds., *Erasmianism : Idea and Reality* 41-46.

dents, usually called the Erasmians.[34] In addition, More and Fisher shared Erasmus's interest in Greek patristics, as well as in the ecclesiological ambiance of the first millennium, and defended his translation of the New Testament from Greek.[35] The deep admiration for the Greek Fathers on the part of Erasmus and his circle was coupled with distinct reservations toward medieval scholastics and their ecclesiology.[36]

Recently, even Henry VIII has been added to the faction that was inspired by Erasmus's program of ecclesiastical reform. George W. Bernard maintains that Henry's vision was to reform the Catholic Church along the ideas of Erasmus, such as the need to deal with the issue of monasticism.[37] He cites as a key piece of evidence Henry's letter to Erasmus from the period 1527-1528, in which Henry declares himself Erasmus's disciple, as well as a fellow worker in purifying Christianity and thus safeguarding it from the assaults of the heretics.[38] In particular, he agreed with Erasmus that Luther's solafideism compromised the concept of free will.[39]

Erasmus's aversion to papal monarchism involved him in a qualified sympathy with Luther's views, and his clear-cut rejection of the German Reformer was delayed until 1524. Even afterwards Erasmus was highly critical of the curial establishment which he considered corrupt and in a sense unchristian.[40] He also seemed rather indifferent to the restrictions or even suppression of monas-

34 On Erasmianism, see Cornelis Augustijn, "Verba valent usu: was ist Erasmianismus?" in Mout, Smolinsky, and Trapman, eds., *Erasmianism : Idea and Reality* 6-11.

35 Irena Backus, "Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church," in Hilmar M. Pabel, ed. *Erasmus= Vision of the Church* [Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 33] (Kirksville, MO, 1995) 95-114; Wilhelm Maurer, "Erasmus und das Kanonische Recht," in Helmar Junghans and others, eds. *Vierhundertfünfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation, 1517-1967: Festschrift für Franz Lau zum 60. Geburtstag* (Göttingen, 1967) 222-232. On Erasmus=s and Fisher=s shared interest in Greek patristics and in humanistic learning see Maria Dowling, *Fisher of Men: A Life of John Fisher, 1469-1535* (New York, 1999) 30-40; George W. Bernard, *The King=s Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven, Conn., 2005) 101-102. See also Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence*, 11 vv. (Toronto, 1974-1992) 8:202.

36 Erica Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995) 89-91, 103-111, 134-140. Erasmus himself inveighed against "certain monks and theologians, who under the guise of religion established a tyrannical empire for themselves, and whose aim it was to prey upon men=s souls and property alike." Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 11:193.On Erasmus=s liberal ecclesiology see also Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 8:207-09; 415, no. 46; Hilmar M. Pabel, "The Peaceful People of Christ: The Irenic Ecclesiology of Erasmus of Rotterdam," in idem ed. *Erasmus= Vision of the Church* 57-93

37 See Bernard, *The King=s Reformation* 236-237, 598.

38 Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami*, ed. Percy Stafford Allen and others, 12 vv. (Oxford, 1906-1958) 7:179-181, cited by Bernard, *The King=s Reformation* 236-237, 644 n. 58. Henry, of course, did the cleansing in a brutal way that was utterly abhorrent to the Dutch sage; see ibid. 225, 237. On Henry=s knowledge of Erasmus=s writings, see also P. Marshall, "Mumpsimus and sumpsimus: the Intellectual Origins of a Henrician *bon mot*," JEH 52 (2001) 512-520.

39 Bernard, *The King=s Reformation* 239.

40 Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 11:xii.

tic communities.[41] Consequently, he was steadily attacked from the Roman side by Belgian, Spanish, and French theologians, who were particularly concerned about his reformist views on mandatory fasting, private confession, and clerical celibacy.[42] In their overall attitudes, Erasmus and the Erasmians, therefore, stood close to Utraquist points of view. Likewise, the combination of humanism and theology, which Erasmus advocated, was characteristic of Utraquism.[43]

To the company of liberalisation's later advocates, kindred to the Utraquists, we may add the group of the Italian *spirituali,* including Cardinal Gasparo Contarini and the poetess Vittoria Colonna, who strove for a reform of the institutional church. Improbable as it might seem, in view of the bloody image of the Marian Counter Reformation in England, the *spirituali* grouped around Cardinal Reginald Pole during his exile in Italy.[44] The Cardinal himself is said to have adhered to a Catholic humanism, seeing much that was correct in Luther's theory of salvation. Moreover, he belonged among Erasmus's correspondents.[45] Among Pole's protégés in Italy was the Hungarian bishop of Croatian origin, Andreas Dudič (Dudith) (1533-1589), successively bishop of Knin, Csanád, (1562) and Pécs (1563), who accompanied the English cardinal as his secretary to England in 1553-1554 and subsequently (1562-1563) tried to promote a liberal line at the Council of Trent on behalf of emperors Ferdinand I and Maximilian II including toleration of lay chalice and clerical marriage.[46] In a way, both Ferdi-

---

41 Ibid. 11:xviii.

42 Particularly by Noël Béda of the University of Paris. Ibid. 11:xv-xvi.

43 Ibid. 11:xx.

44 Francesco Gui, *L'attesa del concilio: Vittoria Colonna e Reginald Pole nel movimento degli "spirituali"* (Rome, 1997); see also Dermot Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge, Eng., 1972) 21-23.

45 Had he not missed the papal election by a single vote in 1549, the Council of Trent might have exuded more the spirit of Vatican II than that of Vatican I; Thomas F. Mayer, " >Heretics be not in all things heretics=: Cardinal Pole, His Circle, and the Potential for Toleration," in John C. Laursen and Cary J. Nederman, eds., *Beyond the Persecuting Society: Toleration Before the Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 1998) 107-24; Diarmaid MacCulloch, review of *The Time Before You Die* by Lucy Beckett in *Times Literary Supplement,* 28 January 2000, 23; Michael A. Mullett, *The Catholic Reformation* (London, 1999) 33, 36, 43-44. For Pole=s correspondence with Erasmus, see Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 11:314-317. Pole shared Erasmus=s admiration for the theology of the Greek Fathers; Thomas F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole: Prince and Prophet* (Cambridge, Eng., 2000) 4; on missing the papal election by one vote, see ibid. 175. It is probably characteristic of his stance that he declined the Jesuits= help during the brief campaign (1553-1558) to restore the sway of the Roman Church in his homeland, despite (or perhaps because of?) his acquaintance with Loyola in Rome; Thomas M. McCoog, "Ignatius Loyola and Reginald Pole: A Reconsideration," JEH 47 (1996) 257-73; Thomas F. Mayer, "A Test of Wills: Cardinal Pole, Ignatius Loyola, and the Jesuits in England," in *Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog (Woodbridge, 1996) 21-37; for other essays on this topic by Thomas F. Mayer see his *Cardinal Pole in European Context: A Via Media in the Reformation* (Burlington, VT., 2000).

46 Howard Louthan, *The Quest for Compromise: Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna* (New York, 1997) 164; Pierre Costil, *André Dudith, humaniste hongrois 1533-1589: Sa vie, son oeuvre et ses manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 1935) 64-67 (with Pole in England); 101-17 (at the Council of Trent); 108 (lay chalice); 109, 126 (clerical marriage). Dudič eventually became Protestant. See also Domenico

nand and Maximilian served as protectors of this liberal camp surrounding themselves by reform-minded clergy, such as the two successive bishops of Vienna, Johannes Faber (Fabri) (1530-1541) and Friedrich Nausea (1541-1552), as well as Witzel, and Dudič.[47] Faber, in particular, had formed a personal friendship with Erasmus during an early extended stay in Basel, and initially sympathized with the Protestant reformers.[48] Finally, to round out the survey of the orthodox reformers, there was a group of Erasmus's followers in France, now called "critical Catholics". Aside from rejecting the authoritarian ecclesiology of the Roman Curia, they devised, under the leadership of Bishop of Valence, Jean de Monluc, in 1557-1561 Utraquist-like reforms of the liturgy, including lay communion under both kinds and the use of the vernacular in the mass.[49]

Within this welter of liberal, yet loyalist and orthodox, criticism of the Roman Church, the Utraquists represented, above all numerically, the most significant group, although their role in that regard has not yet been widely acknowledged.[50] Utraquist authors were, in fact, familiar with their liberal counterparts abroad. Utraquist Bohemia showed an active interest in Christian humanism, and virtually fell in love, intellectually speaking, with Erasmus and his reformist ideas of Christian life, often at odds with current Roman ecclesiology. Three of his important works were translated into Czech early in the sixteenth century: *Chvála bláznovství* [Praise of Folly] by 1513, *Enchiridion militis Christiani* in 1519 in translation by Oldřich Velenský of Mnichov, and *Výklad na Otčenáš* [Explanation of the Lord's Prayer] in 1526 by Jan Mantuan and Jan Pekk in Plzeň. Eight more of Erasmus's works were published in Czech translations in Bohemia in 1519-1595, some in several editions.[51] A Bohemian Humanist, Jan

Caccamo, *Eretici italiani in Moravia, Polonia e Transilvania, 1558-1611. Studi e documenti* Corpus Reformatorum Italicorum, ed. Luigi Firpo and Giorgio Spini (Florence and Chicago, 1970) 109-31.

47 On Ferdinand=s attitude see also Alois Kroess, "Kaiser Ferdinand I und seine Reformationsvorschläge auf dem Konzil von Trient bis zum Schluss der Theologenkonferenz in Innsbruck," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 27 (1903) 455-90, 621-51.

48 Until 1522, when he turned decisively against Luther, but he still continued to work for a compromise solution between Rome and the German Reformation. He attended several imperial diets, including Augsburg (1530); see *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 5:782.

49 Thierry Wanegffelen, *Une difficile fidelité: Catholiques malgré concile en France, XVIe-XVII-e siècles* (Paris, 1999), 152-162. Among later Catholic reformers in the second decade of the seventeenth century, the erratic Marco Antonio De Dominis, archbishop of Split in Croatia, sought to purge the Western Church of the papal monarchism and restore it to the episcopal collegiality of the first millennium. His critique of papal monarchism appeared in Czech translation in 1619, as Mercantonio de Dominis, *Ohlášení a zpráva* (Prague, 1619). See also William B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (New York, 1997) 220-24; Noel Malcolm, *De Dominis (1560-1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic* (London, 1984).

50 For instance, there is no mention of the Utraquists, or for that matter the Bohemian Reformation, in the recent collection: *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation* , eds. Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot, Hants. and Burlington, VT, 2005).

Šlechta of Všehrdy corresponded with the Dutch sage and invited him to visit Prague in 1519.[52] The latter, in turn, shared Šlechta's information about the Bohemian religious situation with Thomas More.[53] In 1520, another Czech correspondent, the nobleman, Arkleb of Boskovice, assured Erasmus of the popularity of his writings and the great weight his opinions carried in the country. Significantly, he supplied the Dutchman with reliable information on the character of the Bohemian Reformation.[54]

Other proponents of the Roman Church's renewal were known in Bohemia and could supply support and authentication for the Utraquist via media.[55] For instance, Bydžovský, the outstanding Utraquist theologian of his day, knew Bishop Faber and supplied him with information on Utraquist theology in 1537.[56] In 1554, Bydžovský published a treatise in which he praised Witzel and exhorted any Evangelicals or Lutherans [*Euangelicastros, intelligo Luteranos*], who might be in Bohemia, to listen to Witzel's voice.[57] In the same pamphlet, Bydžovský included eulogies of Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher, as exemplary Christian martyrs. The Utraquist translator of Robert Barnes's *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum* (Basel, 1535) and Bydžovský's contemporary, Šimon Ennius Klatovský was likewise familiar with Witzel's irenic position and, while in Vienna, he was in contact with the reform-minded Bishop Nausea. In addition, Klatovský voiced his admiration for More.[58] The fact that More and Fisher wished to drastically diminish the papacy, yet not to see it disappear, as they demonstrated most dramatically by sacrificing their lives, pointed to their kinship with the Utraquists. The latter voiced their grievance vis-à-vis the papacy even more emphatically and harshly, yet when it came to the question of its

51 Jaroslav Kolár, *Návraty bez konce: Studie k starší české literatuře* [Returns Without End: Studies in Old Czech Literature], ed. Lenka Jiroušková (Brno, 1999) 120, 141, 175-77; *Knihopis českých a slovenských tisků* [Bibliography of Czech and Slovak Imprints], 2 vv., v. 2 in 9 parts (Prague, 1925-1967) nos. 2348-2369. See also Mirjam Bohatcová, "Erasmus Roterdamský v českých tištěných překladech 16. – 17. století," [Erasmus of Rotterdam in Printed Czech Traslations from 16. and 17. Centuries] ČNM, řada historická 155 (1986) 37-58. For instance, a translation of Erasmus=s paraphrase of St. Matthew=s Gospel appeared in 1542, as Desiderius Erasmus, *Evangelium Ježíše Krista syna Božího podle sepsání Svatého Matouše*, tr. Jan Vartovský of Varta (Litomyšl, 1542).

52 Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 6:321-23. See also ibid. 7: 89-95, 119-28.

53 More, *Complete Works*, v. 6, pt. 1, 192; pt. 2, 658.

54 "For pray take it as certain that, whatever opinion you come to, people in my country will easily and gladly agree with you, and will value what you say far more than if one were to confront them with decrees of the supreme pontiff or any thunderbolt of opposition launched by men." Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 8:75-76.

55 Kolár, *Návraty bez konce* 179.

56 Borový, *Jednání a dopisy* 1:124; David, *Finding the Middle Way* 112-113.

57 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum* f. Br.

58 Robert Barnes, *Kronyky. A životů sepsání nejvrchnějších Biskupů římských jináč Papežů*, trans. Ennius Glatouinus (Nuremberg, 1565) ff. 195v, 198r-198v. See also *RukověÙ humanistického básnictví* [Handbook of Humanist Poetry] ed. Josef Hejnic and Jan Martínek, 5 vv. (Prague, 1966-1982) 2:103; Henze, *Aus Liebe zur Kirche Reform* 50. 81.

very existence, they found the papal office indispensable.[59] Witzel's collection of prayers and his exegesis of religious texts were published in Czech in the latter part of the sixteenth century.[60]

Question of Megalomania

Even if, from the viewpoint of the *Realpolitik*, their mutual power relations made the confrontation of Rome by the Utraquists not make much sense, it was significant as a clash of ideas. Utraquism offered to the Church of Rome an alternate model of non-Protestant reform to that which the latter embraced at the Council of Trent. It was a service which an outright Protestant movement could not provide, and indeed would not have cared to undertake, because of the Protestants' rejection of the church as it had developed during the first millennium, with the principle of apostolic (historic) succession and its adherence to canon law. From the beginning, the Utraquists drew support for their audacity from the sacred history – the precedent of the chosen people of Israel struggling for God against discouraging odds.[61] The Utraquist stand in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries required a considerable degree of moral courage, as they resisted the leadership of the church, which they recognized as the necessary historic centre of Western Christendom, and of which they themselves were a part. It was in a sense a non-violent extension of the war which their ancestors had fought against the imperial and papal crusaders in the early years of the Bohemian Reformation. It was also a continuing and continuous reprise of the predicament which Jan Hus had experienced in a personal and more painful way at Constance – the dilemma between moral conviction and established authority. Historical literature by and large has neglected the inspirational side of the Utraquists' role as champions of renewal within the Roman Church. Instead, subsequent historiography seemed to be drawn to the seamy side of their relations with the Holy See, filled with a variety of deceptions and misleading moves.[62]

---

59 If B as Brian Tierney suggests B the pope=s ecclesiastical power had three components: magisterium, jurisdiction, and holy orders, then the Utraquists accepted the third, and rejected the second. As for the first they accepted it even in matters which were extra-biblical, unless they actually contradicted the Scripture (as in the denials of lay chalice, and communion for infants), see Tierney, *Origins of Papal Infallibility* 310; on the Utraquist view of the papacy, see Zdeněk V. David, "A Brief Honeymoon in 1564-1566: The Utraquist Consistory and the Archbishop of Prague," *Bohemia: A Journal of History and Civilization in East Central Europe* 39 (1998) 269-70.

60 Georg Witzel, *Modlitby pobožné a právě křesÙanské* [Pious Prayers and Truly Christian] (Np., 1586), see *Knihopis* no. 16.999; and idem, *12. Článků víry. Výklad na Desatero a na Otče náš* [Twelve Articles of Faith. Explanation of the Decalog and Pater Noster] (N.p., n.d.), see *Knihopis* no.16.999a.

61 Bílejovský, *Kronyka* 14.

62 Such as the bribing of the Utraquist Administrator Fabian Rezek into apostasy in the early 1590s. See Ernst Denis, *Fin de l'indépendance bohême*, 2nd ed., 2 vv (Paris, 1930) 2:298-301; Zdeněk

Aside from those proponents of Roman renewal, whose ideas paralleled the Utraquist ecclesiology or/and had tangential contacts with the Utraquists, there were those for whom the experience with Utraquism provided a practicable model for Rome's accommodation with the German Reformation. Particularly notable among such figures was once more Erasmus and his close Italian friend, Cardinal Jacopo Sadoleto.[63] The latter, although more cautious, was willing like Erasmus to sidetrack the scholastics and appeal directly to biblical and patristic authority on issues of ecclesiology. The cardinal had "an inveterate contempt for the scholastics and a clear preference for the Greek fathers, John Chrysostom in particular..."[64] He would in turn participate after 1535 in the commission on church reform, headed by Cardinal Contarini, another Erasmian, who endeavoured to find a modus vivendi with the Lutheran challenge, particularly at the Diet of Regensburg in 1541, offering the last chance of an amicable settlement between Rome and Wittenberg.[65]

Erasmus himself saw in Rome's replicating vis-à-vis Lutheranism the approach, which it had earlier adopted toward Utraquism, as a way of averting a disastrous confrontation with Luther's reform movement. In his eyes the Compactata, in particular, could serve as a basis for Rome's response to the issues raised by the Reformation in Germany and in Switzerland.[66] With much interest he followed the renewed Roman negotiations with the Utraquists at Buda in the spring of 1525, which were conducted by his good friend, Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggi (1472-1539), as a papal legate. The Curia then hoped that a settlement with the Utraquists might off-set Luther's defection in Germany by regaining Bohemia. Moreover, Campeggi and his entourage expected that eventually the Erasmian formula of non-confrontational approach might succeed in appeasing the dissent in Germany. This might have happened, if religious passions were allowed to subside through benign neglect rather than

---

V. David,"The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517-1621," JEH 46 (1995) 648-51.

63 Richard M. Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547: Humanist and Reformer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959) 74.

64 Ibid. 80-81, 116.

65 Contarino showed his spirit of accommodation in negotiations at the Diet of Regensburg in 1541 when he tried to find a common ground with the Lutherans on justification; see Elisabeth G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome, and Reform* (Berleley, Cal., 1993) x, 241-45; James Atkinson, "Die römisch-katholische Kirche und die Reformation in anglikanischer Sicht," in Junghans and others, eds. *Vierhundertfünfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation* 14-15.

66 Josef Macek, "Osudy basilejských kompaktát v jagelonském věku," [The Fate of the Compactata of Basel During the Jagellonian Age] *Jihlava a Basilejská Kompaktáta* [Jihlava and the Compactata of Basel] Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodního sympozia k 555. výročí přijetí Basilejských kompaktát, 26-28. Červen 1991 [Collection of Papers from the International Symposium on the 555th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Compactata of Basel, 26-28 June 1991] (Jihlava, 1992) 199-200. See also Alain Dufour,"Humanisme et Reformation," in his *Histoire politique et psychologie historique* (Geneva, 1966) 54.

being aggravated by Rome with "excessively violent and elaborate threats".[67] Erasmus was also a good friend of Nausea, whose interests at the Habsburg court he tried to promote through mediation guided by Campeggi. [68] Erasmus's interest in a "Hussite" solution of the conflict between Rome and the German Reformation is voiced in his correspondence with Sadoleto in 1530.[69] In other words, Rome's treatment of the Utraquists was to become a recipe for damage control – to engage in negotiations and compromises, even if temporary, rather than risk a head-on collision.

Erasmus and his circle's views of Utraquism, however, were not just cynical or manipulative; they also discerned positive values in the Utraquist mainstream of the Bohemian Reformation. Erasmus's correspondent Maarten van Dorp had high respect for Jerome of Prague, Hus's fellow martyr at Constance, whom he called more learned than any of the Council fathers.[70] The Dutch sage himself maintained that the Council executed Hus and Jerome without refuting their ideas;[71] accordingly, he considered the Bohemians schismatics rather than heretics.[72] More seemed to reach the same opinion by the time he wrote the *The Letter Against Frith* in 1532.[73] If from no other source than his Bohemian correspondents, Erasmus was in a position to secure reliable information about the character of the mainline Utraquist Church, in particular, to distinguish it from the more radical spin-offs of the Bohemian Reformation, such as the Taborites and the Unity of Brethren.[74] His Roman opponents in turn accused Erasmus of siding with the Utraquists in seeking to scale down papal authority.[75]

---

67 Letter from Floriano Montini (secretary to Cardinal Campeggi) to Erasmus, 22 February 1525, from Buda, in Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 11:48-49; on Erasmus=s friendship with Campeggi see ibid. 11:84, 323. On the negotiations in Buda, see also Anna Skýbová, "Česká šlechta a jednání o povolení kompaktát r. 1525," [Bohemian Nobility and the Negotiation for the Recognition of the Compactata in 1525] in *Proměny feudální třídy v Čechách v pozdním feudalismu* [The Changes in the Feudal Class in Bohemia under Late Feudalism] Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et historica I, Studia historica XIV, ed. Josef Petráň (Prague, 1976) 81-112; Tomek, *Dějepis* 10:544-47, 575-82.

68 Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 11:322-23.

69 Erasmus's letter to Sadolet is cited in Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547* 115.

70 " ...indeed it is the opinion of that great man Jerome the Hussite that universities do no more good to the church of God than the Evil One himself. Nor does it move the schoolmasters in the slightest that his opinion was condemned at the Council of Constance, for it is notorious that the council did not contain a single educated man or one who knew Greek." Letter from Maarten van Dorp, 27 August 1515, in Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 3:160.

71 Ibid. 6:15.

72 Letter to Ricardo Bartolini, 10 March 1517, in ibid. 4:279.

73 More, *Complete Works* 7:257, 391; compared with his view of the Bohemians as heretics in *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* (1529?) see ibid. 6, pt. 1:315, 379, pt. 2:473-474.

74 See, for instance, the disquisition of Jan Šlechta of Všehrdy in his letter of 10 October 1519, to Erasmus in Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 7: 91-94. For Erasmus=s awareness of the ferocity of the Taborites, see ibid. 8:25.

In addition to those who saw the usefulness of Utraquism in the procedural sense, as an aid in finding a modus vivendi instead of a confrontation, others proposed to use Utraquism in a positive sense that would lead to a degree of "Utraquistisation" of the Roman Church. Peter Fraenkel suggests that the discussions preceding the Pacification of Nuremberg of 1531-1532 between the Lutherans and the Roman Church were inspired by, and aimed at, a "Utraquist settlement." In his opinion, it was particularly Charles V who – with the advice of Bishop of Augsburg, Christoph von Stadion – sought such a solution. It included lay communion *sub utraque*, vernacular mass, married clergy, and a de-emphasis, if not an outright abolition, of monasticism.[76] What was relevant in the Utraquists' experience was their objection to the medieval popes' tendency to impose on the faithful rules and regulations that the Bohemian reformers called 'human inventions' [*nálezky lidské*], and which actually may have contradicted biblical injunctions.[77] In Utraquism this discriminatory scepticism went back all the way to the precursors of Hus, such as Matěj of Janov. Matěj designated as 'human inventions' [*adinventiones, traditiones hominum*] all that was not in direct harmony with the lives, practices and examples of Christ, the apostles, and the church of the first millennium.[78]

For a time, it seemed that Charles V had successfully persuaded Pope Clement VII to attempt concessions along the Utraquist lines. The emperor's ambassador Micer Mai reported on Clement's willingness in 1531 to embrace a more liberal ecclesiology. This approach would tolerate practices, if they merely opposed the existing church laws, but did not violate the injunctions of the law God. Accordingly, cardinals Tomasso Cajetan and Pietro Accolti were commissioned to prepare background papers on the lay chalice, on clerical marriage, and on dispensation from numerous laws of the Church (as distinct from the laws of God).[79] Charles V in 1531 continued to promote the Utraquist model in liberalising the obligation of obedience to such Church laws.[80] Ferdinand I pressed in the same direction even at the time of the Council of Trent.[81] Nevertheless, during the course of the 1530s and 1540s, the Utraquist formula proved inadequate for a settlement between Rome and Wittenberg. As Fraenkel

75 Letter of Diego Lópes Zúžiga to Juan de Vergara of 4 May 1522, in ibid. 8:345; 460 n. 8

76 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, 132-34.

77 Barnes, *Kronyky. A životůsepsání* ff. 3v-4r.

78 Jana Nechutová, "Matěj of Janov and His Work *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*: The Significance of Volume VI and Its Relation to the Previously Published Volumes," in BRRP 2 (1998) 16; see also František M. Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce* [The Hussite Revolution] 2 vv, v. 7-8 of *České dějiny* [Czech History] (Prague, 1965-1966) 1:21, 37; and Augustin Neumann, *K dějinám věku poděbradského* [On the History of the Poděbradian Age] (Brno, 1933) 7.

79 Fraenkel, "Utraquism or Co-Existence," 135-36, 144.

80 Ibid. 140.

81 Miloš Pojar, *Jindřich Matyáš Thurn: Muž činu* [Jindřich Matyáš Thurn: A Man of Action] (Prague, 1998) 14.

suggested, the Lutherans' differences from Rome were not only ecclesiological, but also dogmatic.[82] The crux of the problem was that the Utraquists rejected only those extra-biblical rules and regulations which were, in their view, contrary to the Scripture, particularly those introduced after the first millennium. For the Lutherans, most of the extra-biblical tradition since apostolic times was suspect, and by and large, to be rejected.

Universalism and Liberalism

Ultimately, all the proponents of Roman renewal who preferred the scriptural theology based on the insight of the Greek fathers were defeated at Trent, which reinstated the scholastic doctors and their authoritarian ecclesiology.[83] Instead of embracing the patristic ecclesiological tradition, populist and communitarian in orientation, Rome decided at the Council of Trent to perpetuate and reaffirm the model of "the late medieval clericalist ecclesiology, moulded by the canonists and the scholastics, and preoccupied with the categories of power, authority, and institutional function."[84] The Utraquists, however, differed from the other orthodox opponents of the Tridentine model in two important respects. First, Utraquism was viewed as a more radical phenomenon than was warranted. Thus, except for Erasmus and Maximilian II, the liberal reformists did not recognize it as an acceptable alternative. The main reasons for this misperception were its association with the radical trends (particularly Taboritism) in the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation, and the unshakable commitment to the veneration of Jan Hus. Hus had been shaped into an heretical icon in the eyes of the Roman Church as a result of the events in Constance, and this stature was later confirmed, on the Reformation side, by Luther's initial provocative, albeit merely tactical, endorsements of Hus. These warped images proved effective, despite being specious.[85] Parenthetically, similarly unwarranted linkages of Erasmus with Luther appeared in both the Roman and Protestant literature during Erasmus's lifetime. The difference

---

82 Fraenkel, "Utraquism or Co-Existence," 137, 150. On these issue, see also Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquism's Curious Welcome to Luther and the Candlemas Day Articles of 1524," *Slavonic and East European Review* 79 (2001) 50-89.

83 Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoleto 1477-1547*, 93.

84 Bradshaw, "The Controversial Sir Thomas More," 563-64.

85 As pointed out, the Utraquists successively repudiated, rather than accepted, radical teachings which would have compromised their traditionalist orthodoxy – those of the Taborites, the Unity, and the Lutherans. As for Hus, his personal doctrines did not affect their theology. His name hardly ever appeared in their formal theological pronouncements. Thus the compendium Borový, ed., *Akta konsistoře utrakvistické* [Documents of the Utraquist Consistory], v. 1 of *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické a utrakvistické*, contains only four references to Hus; one to books about him (p. 174), and three about his feast day (pp. 61, 230, 264). Moreover, it is arguable, especially on the basis of De Voogt's researches, that there was nothing unorthodox in Hus's own writings; Paul De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Huss*. 2nd ed. 2 vv. (Louvain, 1975); see also Brian Gogan, *The Common Corps of Christendom: Ecclesiological Themes in the Writings of Sir Thomas More* (Leiden, 1982) 53-54, 56.

was that, while Erasmus could object in person, Hus was no longer alive to do so.[86] Second, unlike Erasmus, More, Witzel or De Dominis, who offered their proposals as individuals, the Utraquists had the actual model of an ecclesiastical organisation functioning for two centuries. The suggestions of men like Erasmus, More or Witzel, some of whom incidentally were soft on Utraquism, could be simply ignored by Rome, or even placed on the Index of Prohibited Books.[87] Particularly ironic in this regard was the placement of Cochlaeus's *Historiae Hussitarum libri duodecim* (1549) on the Index by Sixtus V (1585-1590).[88]

The ultimate solution of the Utraquist problem, however, eventually required the deconstruction of an entire church.

If the Utraquist stance appears as the proverbial case of a megalomaniac tail attempting to wag the dog, in this particular instance – at least for the long run – the tail of Prague proved to be more correct than the dog of Rome. It is certainly arguable that, had the Roman Church listened to the strictures of Jan Hus and the Utraquist Church, it would have avoided much grief. Above all, without abandoning any essentials of Christian orthodoxy, it would not be saddled with its closed intellectual system, its authoritarian bureaucratism, its intolerance, and its inquisitorial techniques – features which would be seen by many as distinct liabilities in the post-Tridentine times. In fact, the relevance of a more liberal stance would be demonstrated in the late twentieth century by the *aggiornamento*. To say that the Curia did not appreciate the Utraquists' solicitude for the well-being of the Roman Church would be, of course, an understatement. In fact, the Utraquist Church came to represent a well nigh intolerable nuisance from the viewpoint of the Tridentine Rome. It could be neither written off as an heretical institution, nor sidetracked – in view of its universalist pretensions – with an autonomous Uniate-like status (as, for instance, was granted to the Belarusians and the Ukrainians by the Union of Brest in 1596). Within the sixteenth-century context, the Roman Curia rejected the Utraquist model with its liberal ecclesiology and consensual governance, which offered an un-Protestant model of renewal in line with the rejected ideas of Humanist Catholicism, as represented by figures, such as Thomas More, Erasmus, and Witzel.

86 Erasmus, *The Correspondence* 8:208-09; 415, n. 54.

87 Erasmus encountered this fate at the Council of Trent, see Bireley, *The Refashioning of Catholicism* 52; Erasmus's works were placed on the Index of 1559, and a 1566 ruling of the Holy Office made it "an error and heresy" to claim that Erasmus had not erred, see Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Erasmus als Ketzer: Reformation und Inquisition in Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Leiden, 1993) 390-391. Subsequently, in the 1580s, Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, working for the Congregation for the Index, exhibited some qualms about labelling Erasmus an outright heretic, see Peter Godman, *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine Between Inquisition and Index* [Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought] 80 (Leiden, 2000) 108-115.

88 Theodor Kolde, "Cochlaeus," *Realenzyklopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1896-[1913?]) 4:200.

Hence the two distinguishing marks of Utraquist legacy to the Bohemian Enlightenment of the late eighteenth century were its aspiration toward universalism combined with a liberal ecclesiology. The issue of universalism involved the Utraquists' insistence on forming an integral part of Western Christendom and on their consequent purpose to reform the Roman Patriarchate in its entirety. Unlike the Anglicans, the Utraquists were not satisfied with the status of a separated national church, nor could they be bought off by Rome's granting them the status of a Uniate-like autocephalous community. While recognizing the pope as the head of the Western Church, they asked that the papacy accept their ecclesiological point of view which would require nothing less than a drastic shift from a focus on authority to a focus on pastoral care. Because of their liberal outlook, the Utraquists opposed the behemoth of bureaucratic control and autocratic enforcement, and called for replacing the command mode of governance with a consensual approach. Even though the Utraquists were physically suppressed in the aftermath of Bilá Hora of 1620, their ideals continue to live in the modern world.