Utraquism as a Commoners' Church

Zdeněk V. David (Washington, D.C.)

This article is part of a triptych. I have dealt respectively with the liberal ecclesiology and with the universalist aspirations of the Utraquist Church.[1] A third major intellectual legacy of Utraquism – in addition to its liberalism and universalism – which is discussed in this article was its plebeian character. The downgrading of social privilege would be in harmony with the spirit of the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment, which rediscovered the Utraquist intellectual ambiance in the eighteenth century, as well as with the subsequent liberal political culture of Bohemia.[2] In Utraquist Bohemia, cultural and scholarly creativity was carried on by the townspeople and its fruits reflected primarily their concerns and interests. The Utraquist Church by the mid-sixteenth century served by and large the urban and rural common folk, while the nobles turned predominantly to Lutheranism with a minority adhering to the Unity of Brethren or to the Roman Curia.[3] The religious division reached into the formative period of the Utraquist Church when the towns had provided the main impetus behind the religious reforms, while the interest of the nobles was rather lukewarm and their participation hesitant.

The character of Utraquism as a commoners' church fully crystallised during the religious discussions of 1575 around the so-called Bohemian Confession, which revealed the contrast between the quasi-democratic, plebeian culture of the townspeople, and the nobles' culture of aristocratic privilege. On one side stood the nobles with their Lutheran (and a few Calvinist) chaplains, the sectarians (mainly the Unity of Brethren), and the Lutherans of the German enclaves; on the other side stood the bulk of the Czech-speaking commoners of Bohemia who remained loyal to Hus and to fifteenth-century Utraquism, as defined in basic confessional documents from the Four Articles of Prague (1419) to the Consistory's critique of the Bohemian Confession in 1575 and in 1609.[4] This

[1] Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquism's Liberal Ecclesiology," BRRP 6 (2007) 1688; idem, "Universalist Aspirations of the Utraquist Church," BRRP 7 (2009) 1912.

[2] Concerning the relationship between Utraquism and the Austro-Bohemian Enlightenment on the basis of liberal Catholicism, see Zdeněk V. David, "Národní obrození jako převtělení Zlatého věku" [The National Awakening as a Reincarnation of the Golden Age], ČČH 99 (2001) 486–518.

[3] Zdeněk V. David, "The Plebeianization of Utraquism: The Controversy over the Bohemian Confession of 1575," BRRP 2 (1998) 131–135, 156–158.

[4] Concerning the Consistory's stand in 1575 and 1609, see David, *Finding*, 188–89, 303, 505 n.8.

article seeks to scrutinise the religious split along social lines in Bohemia and its positive contribution to the subsequent genesis of the political culture. In addition, it will address the allegations of provincialism, as well as low intellectual and artistic standards, which have hampered a fair assessment of the Utraquist burgher culture.

Utraquism as a Plebeian Church

As noted, the divergence in attitude toward Utraquism between the nobility and the townspeople had deeper roots than the political maneuvering which culminated in the negotiations at the Diet of 1575. These roots can be identified as partly historical and partly social. Historically speaking, the Utraquist Church, virtually from the beginning, had maintained a special relationship with the towns of Bohemia, particularly with Prague.[5] Thus already the basic document of the Bohemian Reformation, the Four Articles of Prague, was proclaimed in 1419 by: "We the mayor and the councillors and elders, as well as the entire community, of our capital city of the Kingdom of Bohemia, declare in our names and those of all the faithful in this kingdom…."[6]

During the wars of the Bohemian Reformation, the town of Prague held the top rank among the estates of the realm ahead of the barons, the Taborite community, the knights, and the other towns – in that order.[7] As early as 1420, Prague and other towns experienced the unreliability of the higher estates. The latter showed much less determination than the towns to defend the Bohemian Reformation at a critical stage against the royal pretender Sigismund of Luxembourg, who bore responsibility for Hus's execution at Constance. Hynek of Valdštejn was probably the only Czech baron who shared in the defense against Sigismund. Above all, most of the Czech aristocrats agreed to the pretender's coronation in Prague in 1420.[8] A year later, in a highly symbolic act, the leading baron of Bohemia, Čeněk of Vartenberk,

5 See, for instance, Frederick G. Heymann, "The Role of the Bohemian Cities During and After the Hussite Revolution," *Tolerance and Movements of Religious Dissent in Eastern Europe*, ed. Bela K. Kiraly. (New York, 1975) 27–28.

6 In the version of Vavřinec of Březová, cited by Rudolf Říčan, ed., *Čtyři vyznání* (Prague, 1951) 39, n. 1; see also *Dějiny Prahy*. v. 1: *Od nejstarší doby do sloučení pražských měst, 1784* (Prague, 1997) especially 225. On the linkage between towns and Utraquism see also: Robert Kalivoda, *Husitské myšlení* (Prague, 1997) 65–66.

7 Pravoslav Kneidl, *Městský stav v Čechách v době předbělohorské* [The Estate of Towns in Bohemia in the Era Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain] (Ph. D. Dissertation. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1951) 10.

8 Božena Kopičková, *Jan Želivský* (Prague, 1990) 81–83, 97–98, 118; František Kafka, *Poslední Lucemburk na českém trůně* [The Last Luxembourg on the Bohemian Throne] (Prague, 1998) 22. On denunciations of Czech barons who "betrayed the Czech language and nation" in the Budyšínský manuscript see Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Brookfield, VT., 1998) 268.

had to undergo the ceremony of a dramatic humiliation because of the vacillation of his class in 1420. Kneeling before the representatives of Prague, Čeněk confessed his sin against God and the city, and begged both for forgiveness. The Prague militia, not the nobles, secured in 1421 Kutná Hora and twenty other towns for the cause of the Bohemian Reformation.[9] It was in the name of Prague that late in 1420 the Czech embassy was sent to Poland in order to negotiate replacing Sigismund, as the King of Bohemia, by the Polish King Vladislav or the Lithuanian Grand Duke Vitold.[10] Prague was named before the barons, and Tábor before the knights and squires, in a document adopted by the assembly at Čáslav, which in 1421 formally nullified Sigismund's claim to the throne of Bohemia.[11]

The sole Utraquist King, George of Poděbrady, was crowned in 1458 at the city hall of the Old Town of Prague.[12] The Church of Our Lady before the Týn, the chief sanctuary of Utraquism (dubbed the "Utraquist Cathedral"), had traditionally been the principal church of the Prague townspeople since at least the turn of the thirteenth century.[13] It is little wonder, therefore, that the city of Prague continued to play a special role as a champion of Utraquism and as a protector of its Consistory into the sixteenth century. The inhabitants of Prague and other towns came out strongly against the teaching of Luther as early as the 1520s, while the nobles wavered in their loyalty to Utraquism.[14] Even in 1564 the Consistory turned to the governments of the Old and the New Town of Prague regarding the matter of priestly ordinations. The Praguers promised to intercede with the king and in the Diet to

[9] Beroun, Slaný, Louny, Kadaň, Chomutov, Litoměřice, Bělá, Mělník, Kostelec nad Labem, Český Brod, Kouřim, Nymburk, Kolín, Čáslav, Chrudim, Vysoké Mýto, Polička, Litomyšl, Jaroměř, and Dvůr Králové, see Kopičková, *Jan Želivský*, 140–141; Ivana Raková, "Čeněk z Vartenberka, 1400–1425: příspěvek k úloze panstva v husitské revoluci," [Čeněk of Vartenberk, 1400–1425: Role of the Higher Nobility in the Hussite Revolution] SH 28 (1982) 73; Vavřinec z Březové, *Husitská kronika. Píseň o vítězství u Domažlic* [The Hussite Chronicle. The Song About the Victory at Domažlice] ed. Marie Bláhová (Prague, 1979) 223. Concerning the nobles attitude toward early Utraquism, see John M. Klassen, *The Nobility and the Making of the Hussite Revolution* (New York, 1978) 85–113.

[10] Jaroslav Prokeš, "K Pálčově Replice proti čtyřem articulům pražským," [Páleč's Response to the Four Articles of Prague] in Weingart, Miloš, and others, eds., *Z dějin východní Evropy a Slovanstva: Sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi k šedesátým narozeninám* [From the History of Eastern Europe and the Slavs: A Festschrift for Jaroslav Bidlo's Sixtieth Birthday] (Prague: A. Bečková, 1928) 254.

[11] "Zápis velikého sněmu Čáslavského proti králi Sigmundovi," [The Protocol of the Great Diet of Čáslav agains King Sigismund] AČ 3 (1844) 226–30.

[12] Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, *Kalendář Historický: To jest Krátké poznamenání všech dnů jednokaždého Měsíce přes celý rok* [An Historical Calendar: Brief Annotations of all the Days of Each Month During the Entire Year] (Prague, 1578) 131.

[13] Josef Šusta, *Král cizinec* [The Foreigner King], *České dějiny*, v. 2, pt 2 (Prague, 1939) 219. In comparison with its monumental stature, the torso of St. Vitus's Cathedral which, by and large, remained in the hands of the Roman Church, could appear as no more than an oversized chapel attached to the royal palace.

[14] Hrejsa, 4: 256–57.

obtain the services of another prelate, if the Archbishop of Prague continued to hesitate to serve the Utraquists.[15]

The ascending political power of towns during the wars of the Bohemian Reformation was reflected by their inclusion in the Bohemian Diet as a third estate (along with those of the barons and the knights). This achievement crowned the long-term efforts of the townspeople under the leadership of Prague and Kutná Hora to wrest a share of political power from the nobles, already strongly evident in the early fourteenth century during the reign of King John of Luxembourg.[16] Their success one hundred years later endowed the towns with a sense of self-confidence and a feeling of prudent distrust vis-à–vis the noble estates.[17] Voices were raised wondering whether Prague was not ready to transform Bohemia into a city state, as Florence had done with Tuscany.[18] That grandiose denouement, however, did not come to pass, and the nobles began to mount strong political counteroffensives against the towns, particularly after 1500.[19]

Nevertheless, the urban intelligentsia of Bohemia continued to exude self--confidence into the sixteenth century. Some of it had a real basis, as when the noble squads did not dare to challenge the town troops, led by Prague, on a campaign in southwest Bohemia in 1520.[20] At that time, representatives of towns met in congresses and formed leagues for mutual assistance.[21]

---

15 Tomek, *Dějepis*, 12:132; also Hrejsa recognizes the strength of Utraquism in royal towns, see his Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse: Její vznik, podstata a dějiny* [The Bohemian Confession: Origin, Substance, and History] (Prague, 1912), 59; Klement Borový, *Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, arcibiskup pražský; Historicko-kritický životopis* [Antonín Brus of Mohelnice, the Archbishop of Prague: A Historical and Critical Biography] (Prague, 1873) 183.

16 Particularly in 1309 and 1319, see, for instance, Šusta, *Král cizinec*, 25–39, 293–295.

17 Ivan Hlaváček, "Husitské sněmy [The Hussite Diets]," SH 4 (1956) 74, 81, 89, 94, 99–100, 102–03.

18 Šusta, *Král cizinec*, 298. Similarly strong cooperative, consultative, and diplomatic ties among cities existed in other regions of flowering urban culture, especially in the Netherlands, and among the Hanseatic towns. Most of these autonomous urban power structures were subsequently obliterated by the successive impacts of royal absolutism; see Pierre-Yves Saunier, "Taking Up the Bet on Connections: a Municipal Contribution," *Contemporary European History* 11 (2002) 514–15.

19 Jiří Pešek and Bohdan Zilynskyj, "Městský stav v boji se šlechtou na počátku 16. století [The Town Estate's Struggle with the Nobility at the start of the Sixteenth Century]," FHB 6 (1984) 140–42. On the development of the constitutional position of Bohemian towns, see František Šmahel, "Nástin proměn stavovské skladby Českého království od konce 14. do počátku 16. století [A Sketch of the Changes in the Estate Composition of the Bohemian Kingdom from the Late Fourteenth to the Early Sixteenth Centuries]," *Vladislavské zřízení zemské a počátky ústavního zřízení v Českých zemích, 1500–1619* [Vladislav's Charter of the Land and the Beginnings of the Constitutional System in the Bohemian Lands, 1500–1619], [Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 7.–8. prosince 2000 v Praze], ed. Karel Malý and Jaroslav Pánek (Prague, 2001) 70–81.

20 Jiří Pešek, "Některé problémy bádání o spojené Praze let 1518–1528 [Some Research Problems Concerning the United Towns of Prague, 1518–1528]," *Documenta Pragensia* 4 (1984) 188.

21 Pešek and Zilynskyj, "Městský stav v boji se šlechtou," 146. On the political strength of Prague in the 1520s see also G. P. Mel'nikov, "Iz istorii obshchestvenno-politicheskoi borby

On the historiographical level, Martin Kuthen of Špinsberk, a devoted Utraquist, dared to argue in his *Kronika o založení země české* [Chronicle of the Foundation of the Bohemian Land] (Prague, 1539) that the estate of towns was more ancient than those of the barons and the knights. In his opinion, the town estate originated in the foundation of Prague in A.D. 711, while the barons [*páni*] traced their origins only to the time of Duke Přemysl and the knights to even later elevations by the rulers of Bohemia. The towns in their contests with the nobility also emphasised their contributions to the prosperity of the country in commerce and manufacture.[22] The prominent publisher, Daniel Adam of Veleslavín considered the city of Prague a special guardian of the nation's interests.[23] Concerning the perfidy of the nobles, Sixt of Ottersdorf in his historical work, *Knihy památné o nepokojných letech 1546 a 1547*, [Memoirs About the Turbulent Years 1546 and 1547] dwelt on the injury to the Bohemian towns caused by their alliance with the barons and the knights during the quarrel with King Ferdinand I of 1547 about participation in the Schmalkaldic War. In a cavalier manner, the nobles let the towns bear the brunt of royal retribution for what had been a joint responsibility. The towns' indignation in this case was directed as much against the nobles, who betrayed them, as against the king, who actually punished them.[24] The scathing attack by Marek Bydžovský on Ivan the Terrible's harsh treatment of the citizens of Novgorod, Pskov and Tver in 157571 may be seen as another reflection of the high degree of estate consciousness on the part of Utraquist townspeople, transcending national and cultural boundaries and projected into a class solidarity with colleagues in faraway Muscovy.[25]

Chekhii v dvatsatye gody XVI v. [History of the Social and Political Struggle in Bohemia in the 1520s]," *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie*, 5 (1980) 61.

22 Kuthen of Špinsberk, *Kronika o založení země české* [Chronicle of the Foundation of the Bohemian Land], ed. Zdeněk V. Tobolka (Prague, 1929), f. C2(v); Pešek and Zilynskyj, "Městský stav v boji se šlechtou," 144.

23 Adam z Veleslavína, *Kalendář Historický,* introduction f. 3a–4b.

24 Sixt of Ottersdorf, *Knihy památné o nepokojných letech 1546 a 1547* [Memoirs of the troubled years 1546–1547], ed. Josef Teige, 2 vv. (Prague: [1920]), for instance, 2:1999; Riss, "Život a literné působení Sixta z Ottersdorfu," 163. See also Josef Janáček, "Královská města česká na zemském sněmu r. 1609–1610 [Royal Bohemian Towns in the Diet, 1609–1610]," SH 5 (1956) 227. Concerning other grievances against the nobles, see, for instance, P. M. Veselský, ed. "Žaloby měst na pány a rytířstvo z některých kusů jim škodných [Complaints of Towns against the Barons and the Knights Concerning Some Harmful Matters]," ČČM 26,2 (1847) 422–40. A similar distrust characterised the attitude of the inhabitants of Žatec toward the nobility; see Marie Tošnerová, ed., *Paměti města Žatce, 1527–1609* [Memoirs of the Town of Žatec, 1527–1609]. Žatec, 1996 in ČČH 98 (2000) 186–87.

25 Marek Bydžovský z Florentina, *Rudolphus rex Bohemiae XXI*, MS. Prague, NK XVI G 22, f. 88/90v. Subsequently, Ivan's tyrannical and lawless treatment of Russian towns would be pilloried in the *Kronika Moskevská*, published by Daniel Adam of Veleslavín in 1589; Aleksander Gwagnin (Alessandro Guagnini), *Kronika Moskevská* [The Moscow Chronicle], trans. Matouš Hosius z Vysokého Mýta (Prague, 1589) 199–206. 2nd ed.: *Kronyka Moskevská* (Prague: Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, 1602).

The Bohemian towns' protective attitude toward the Utraquist church was reciprocated by the Church's special concern for, and dedication to, the urban and other plebeian strata of society. This populist tendency could be traced historically to the teaching of John Wyclif, and to the early egalitarianism of the Bohemian Reformation, as among the radical Orebites.[26] This populism contrasted not only with the appeal of Lutheranism and the Roman Church to the Czech nobility, both higher and lower, but also with the streak of social snobbery in the Unity of Brethren. The Brethren in this respect resembled the English Puritans whose moral rigorism served as a mark of distinction from the poverty stricken and as a license for "their efforts to discipline the poor, to curb their drunken promiscuous ways, and to instill in them respect for sobriety, property and hard work."[27] The respect for the religious convictions of particularly the rural population was facilitated by legal protection. This principle had been clearly ingrained in Bohemia since the Peace of Kutná Hora of 1485, which explicitly granted the peasants the right to differ in religion from their feudal masters, and thus represented a notable reversal of the rule "cuius regio, eius religio" that would be adopted in the German lands.[28]

Among Utraquist theologians for instance, Vavřinec Leander Rvačovský of Rvačov, in his famous *Masopust* [Mardi Gras] (1580) clearly stressed the biblical injunctions concerning the dignity of the poor and ordinary people,[29] and ranked himself with the townsmen and the common people [*měšťané aneb lid obecní*] vis-à–vis their feudal superiors [*vrchnosti*].[30] The populist strand was also exemplified by the Utraquist clergy's concern regarding the

[26] On Wyclif's concern for the poor, Anne Hudson, "Poor Preachers, Poor Men: Views of Poverty in Wyclif and His Followers," in František Šmahel, ed., *Häresie und vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter* [Schriften des Historischen Kollegs Kolloquien, 39] (Munich, 1998) 44, 47, 53; Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride*, 173–74.

[27] John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 160689* (New York, 1998) 76.

[28] Recent research has also shown that, in contrast to the subsequent period, Central European peasantry enjoyed considerable bargaining powers vis-à–vis its feudal lords in the sixteenth century, if backed by the right of appeal to the royal officials or the monarch himself. Robert Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský* [The Hussite period and J.A. Komenský] (Prague, 1992) 25. Concerning peasant complaints against their seigneurs, see also, Ladislav Soukup, "Poddaní a jejich právní postavení v zemských zřízeních doby předbělohorské v Čechách [The Subject Classes and Their Legal Status in the Charters of the Land in the Pre-White Mountain Times in Bohemia]," *Vladislavské zřízení zemské,* 244; Kamil Krofta, *Dějiny selského stavu* [History of the Peasant Estate], Dílo sv. 3, ed. Emanuel Janoušek (Prague, 1949) 143–52. For comparative purposes of sixteenth-century peasants' self-confidence, see Govind Screenivasan, "The Social Origins of the Peasants' War of 1525 in Upper Swabia," *Past and Present*, 171 (May 2001) 40–55.

[29] Such as "Let there be not among you any difference; listen well to the little one as to the great one, to the poor one as to the rich one, without any regard for the person..," or "…God himself, when he wishes to punish or to show mercy, shows no regard for the status of the person…" citing Exodus 23 and Deuteronomy 1; Vavřinec Leander Rvačovský of Rvačov, *Masopust* [Mardi Gras] (Prague, 1580) f. 273r.

[30] Rvačovský of Rvačov, *Masopust*, f. 273v–274r.

availability of religious books in Czech for the use of the common people [*lidé prostější*], as expressed by Jan Václav Cykáda, a member of the Utraquist Consistory (1605–1609), in the introduction to his *Hody křestanské* [Christian Feast Days] (1607). As if to further underline the plebeian character of his church, Cykáda portrayed an antagonistic relationship between the Utraquist priests and the manorial lords. He pointed out that the seigneurs often begrudged the village priests even the modest income from properties donated for the support of the clergy.[31]

The persistence of Utraquism's plebeian thrust into the seventeenth century can be illustrated from the principal surviving work of Matauš Pačuda, one of its intellectual leaders, who was slated for the post of administrator in an attempt to restore the Utraquist Consistory in 1617. Pačuda's populist sympathy is evident from his excoriation of the sinfulness of pride[32]. He aimed his rhetorical fire specifically at the hubris of the mighty, a quality which naturally tended to characterise the nobility in Bohemia as well as elsewhere.[33] Pačuda emphasised that already in pre-human history God had dealt severely with the pride of the angels. Subsequently, he delighted in casting down the mighty from their political and military offices, thus humiliating those thirsting after glory.[34] On the contrary, Pačuda extolled the ordinary people and the virtue of physical labour, which as such, according to him, was not a punishment for sin.[35] Calling attention to the biblical injunction that man should raise his bread by the sweat of his brow, he commented: "…some interpret this text so as to mean that emperors, kings, princes, and barons should plow

[31] Such nobles seized parish grazing lands, gardens and ponds, and refused to pay the tithes from their produce; Jan Václav Cykáda, *Hody křestanské* [The Christian Feasts] (Prague, 1607), f. B1v-B2r, p. 222. For similar charges of noble embezzlements see the Utraquist Consistory's letter to Rudolf II of August 8, 1578 in *Sněmy české*, 5:301.

[32] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 535; František Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610–1619* [Correspondence of the Utraquist Consistory, *1610–1619*] (Prague 1917–1925) x.

[33] Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích, 1471–1526* [The Jagellon Period in the Bohemian Lands, 1471–1526], 4 vv. (Prague, 1992–1999) 2: 140–41.

[34] Examples were the Prince of Tyre, suffering a ghastly death at the hands of foreigners (Ezekiel 28. 1–10), Sennacherib, the King of Assyria, murdered by his own two sons, King Antiochus of Syria, excluded from human society by a foul disease, and the Pharaoh, who with his entire army, perished in the Red Sea. Military power turned into weakness, heroism into cowardice, health into sickness. Belisarius, a captain of Emperor Justinian I, having fought brilliantly in Persia, turned into a beggar after his eyes were gouged out in captivity. Pačuda, in summing up, drew on the words of Isaiah (2:13): "Thus the Lord God knows how to cut down the high cedars of Lebanon and the impressive oaks of Bashan." Matauš Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje které věci (z stran lidského pokolení) předešly příchod a narození mesiaše pravého Krista* [A Treatise, Which Contains Matters (Concerning Humankind) Antedating the Coming and the Birth of the True Messiah, the Christ] (Prague, 1616), f. G6r-G6v, J4v-J5r. The central theme might have been based in part on Ecclesiasticus 10: 7–18.

[35] It was sin that overlaid the essentially joyful and fruitful process of physical work with the pall of pain, callouses, and sweat, and made the resulting benefits uncertain for succeeding generations; Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje*, f. K7r-v.

and till the land; the priests also should have their homesteads and, like the peasants and others, should be occupied with such work…."[36]

Finally, the liberal ecclesiology of the Utraquist Church had particular appeal to the Czech commoners compared to the drawbacks of either the Roman Church or the churches of the Protestant Reformation. The Utraquist Church offered its followers the enjoyment of their favourite liturgies without the financial burden of supporting the luxuriant clerical and monastic apparatus, or the threat of terrifying spiritual penalties, which the Roman Church would impose.[37] At the other side of the ledger, the Utraquists could avoid the discipline of catechisation and ban on secular festivities, which the Protestant Reformation customarily entailed.[38] Thus it might be said that the Czech commoners enjoyed ecclesiastically the best of all possible worlds.[39]

Vernacular Language

Another aspect of the plebeianism was the cultivation of the Czech vernacular. While the liberalism and universalism of the Utraquist century provided

[36] Although he implied a disagreement with the statement, simply raising it in the public forum may be seen as highly significant. Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje*, f. K8v [p. 152]. Unfortunately, Pačuda's answer to this challenging statement is unknown. The one available copy of his work, held by the Strahov Monastery Library in Prague under the signature BX VI 22, ends abruptly at this point.

[37] Both the costly clerical life style and the cloistered ideal had been pruned away in the Wyclifite spirit by the early Utraquist reforms at the start of the fifteenth century. See Zikmund Winter, *Zlatá doba měst českých* [The Golden Age of Bohemian Towns] (Prague, 1991) 167–68; also his *Kulturní obraz českých měst: život veřejný v XV. a XVI. věku* [The Cultural Image of Bohemian Towns: Public Life in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries], 2 vv. (Prague, 1892) 2: 576–77; David R. Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," BRRP 2 (1998) 103. The medieval ritual was offered in a way that was free of a menacing aspect, inasmuch as the Utraquist Church had renounced interdicts, anathemas, excommunications and other dreaded spiritual weapons employed conspicuously by the Roman Church in late medieval and early modern times; Kamil Krofta, "Václav Koranda mladší z Nové Plzně a jeho názory náboženské [Václav Koranda, the Younger, from Nová Plzeň and His Religious Views]," *Listy z náboženských dějin* [Pages from Religious History] (Prague, 1936) 258.

[38] On Puritan stress on "discipline" see Spurr, *English Puritanism*, 52; Richard Hooker characterized Calvin's ecclesiastical regime at Geneva as "little better than popish tyranny disguised and tendered… under a new form," Hooker, *Folger Library Edition of the Works*, vol. 1, p. 7 [LEP, Preface, 2.4]. As a parenthetical observation, the Utraquists likewise escaped the dread engendered by the Calvinist stress on predestination. Concerning its potentially deleterious effect see Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," JEH 49 (1998) 629.

[39] The Czech Lutheran minister, Jan Štelcar Želetavský of Želetava, confirmed the people's attachment to the Utraquist faith, even as he ridiculed it as a blind attachment to ancestral beliefs. He had an imaginary congregation address its pastor: "…if you wish to be with us, perform for us the ancient rituals; for we do not want to be otherwise than our ancestors." [Faráři chceš-li u nás býti, vykonávej nám staré pořádky, neb my nechceme býti jináč než jako předkové naši.] Jan Štelcar Želetavský z Želetavy, *Kázání dvoje* [A Double Sermon] (Prague, 1586) f. B8v.

a supra-national guide for cultural development, the Utraquist Golden Age also offered an example for guarding the specifity of the national community. It showed that culture could be national in form, while it remained universal or international in content. To this effect, a recurrent theme in the literature of the sixteenth century was the praise for the Czech language and the desideratum of using it as a literary medium. Unlike their counterparts in the Roman Church, who were interested mainly in aristocratic audiences, the Utraquist adherents to Humanism frequently used the Czech language as a means of maintaining contact with the common people.[40]

Also the Utraquist Church, in its own operations, typically favoured the use of the Czech language in the ecclesiastical sphere. The administrator of the Consistory, Václav Koranda the Younger, devoted an entire section of his major treatise of 1493 to the use of Czech in liturgy.[41] Further calls on behalf of the vernacular were sounded early in the sixteenth century in the writings of Utraquist priests. Jan Bechyňka urged parents to lead children to know and love their native tongue, and to avoid communicating in an alien speech.[42] In his seminal work, *The Bohemian Chronicle*, Bohuslav Bílejovský argued strenuously against the Church of Rome's opposition to liturgical use of vernacular languages. According to him, liturgy was sung in Czech since the beginning of Christianity in Bohemia, ushered in by the mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. Afterwards, the vernacular singing was augmented by St. Adalbert [Vojtěch] (a figure distinctly of Western Roman ecclesiastical orientation), cultivated in the Sázava monastery by St. Procopius and his successors, and finally by the monks of the Slavic abbey of Emmaus in Prague. Bílejovský claims that, despite the opposition of the champions of Latin, the Czech liturgical chant was generally used in the churches of Bohemia until the reign of the Bohemian King and Holy Roman Emperor, Charles IV (134378).[43] The line of continuity in the development of Czech liturgical

[40] Walter Schamschula, *Geschichte der tschechischen Literatur* 2 vv. (Cologne, 1990–96) 1: 225–26.

[41] Václav Koranda, *Traktát o velebné a božské svátosti oltářní* [A Treatise About the Venerable and Divine Sacrament of the Altar] (Prague, 1493) f. T1r-V6r.

[42] Jan Bechyňka, *Děkování z večeře Dorotě Řéhové* [Thanks for Supper to Dorota Řéhová], cited in Noemi Rejchrtová, "Jan Bechyňka: Kněz a literát" [Jan Bechyňka, a Priest and a Writer] in *Praga Mystica: Z dějin české reformace*, ARBI 3 (1984) 8, 23.

[43] Bohuslav Bílejovský, *Kronyka cýrkevní* [Ecclesiastical Chronicle], ed. Josef Skalický (Prague, 1816) 21–22.There were occasional setbacks. Thus German monks who used Latin were settled in the Sázava Monastery in the eleventh century to replace the Czech-speaking denizens. Bílejovský recounts the legend, based in part on the fourteenth-century Chronicle of So-Called Dalimil, and also contained in the *Kališnický pasionál z roku 1495*, that thereupon the monaster's dead founder St. Procopius made three ghostly appearances exhorting the Germans to leave. When his admonitions failed, he materialised temporarily and expelled the intruders by wielding his abbatial crozier and inflicting deep cuts on these promoters of Latin; Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 20. See also *Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila* [The Chronicle of So-Called Dalimil], ed. Marie Bláhová (Prague, 1977) 121; *Kališnický pasionál z roku 1495* [The Utraquist Passional from 1495], ed. Zdeněk Tobolka, [Monumenta Bohemiae typographica, vol. 2] (Prague, 1926) f. F16v.

chant that Bílejovský postulates, of course, must be considered more symbolic or allegorical than real. It reflects an ideal ancestral line on which the Utraquists wished to be seen.

According to Bílejovský, it was only with the drastic enforcement of communion *sub una* that the campaign against the use of Czech in the liturgy started in earnest in the late fourteenth century. During this ecclesiastical vandalism, liturgical books written in the vernacular were destroyed or mutilated. The insistence on Latin, Bílejovský maintained, reflected the Italian hubris of the papal establishment, and the Germans, always eager to please those perceived as their superiors, became dedicated apostles of Latinisation.[44] It was absurd to argue, as some had done, that the use of Czech or other vernaculars had led to heretical writings. Bílejovský asked: Had not Greek and Latin been used to express the most horrendous heresies, against which the Fathers of the Church had to defend the true faith?[45] Heresy, for Bílejovský, stemmed not from the language, but from "evil heart" and "perverted reason."[46] Even more dramatically, the author of the Utraquist homiliary of 1540 evoked the biblical image of the Philistines who filled in the wells of Abraham's and Isaac's shepherds. So also the opponents of vernacular tongues tried to block "with Latin like with wisps of straw" the fountains of the Apostles' teachings in order to keep the common people from imbibing their salutary waters.[47]

Later in the century the clamour for the rights of the Czech language intensified, for instance, in the preface of Václav Plácel of Elbing to his translation of Josephus Flavius, *Historie židovská* [*Jewish Antiquities*] (1592), as well as in the preface Jan Kocín of Kocinét to his translation of Flavius Magnus Cassiodorus, *Historie církevní* [*Chronicon: Historia tripartita*] (1594).[48]

[44] Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 22–23, 46. He compares the mutilitation of liturgical books to when a certain Alchymus in Jerusalem had sought to destroy the books of the Prophets. The "Alchymus" is probably the Hellenized member of a Jewish priestly family, Alcimus, who was appointed high priest in Jerusalem (162–160/59 B.C.) with the assistance of Demetrius I Soter, the Seleucid ruler of Syria, to combat Judah Maccabee and his followers; see *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971) 2:550.

[45] Closer to home, he also pointed out that Latin was used for heretical writings, as by Nicholas Biskupec of Pelhřimov to compose the Taborite *Acta*, and by the Bohemian Brethren for their theological works, including an *Apology*, recently published in Nuremberg; Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 23. He probably refers to Nicholas's *Confessio Taboritarum* of 1431, see Zeman, *The Hussite Movement and Reformation*, 179; and to the *Apology* of the Bohemian Brethren, published in 1511, which also attracted the attention of Erasmus and Luther, see Rudolf Říčan and others, *Jednota Bratrská, 1457–1957: Sborník k pětistému výročí založení* [The Unity of Brethren, 1457–1957: A Memorial Volume for Its Quinquecentenary (Prague, 1956) 29.

[46] Bílejovský, *Kronyka*, 23. Anne Hudson describes similar arguments against the use of English for theological writings at the turn of the fourteenth century, citing in part from a manuscript in the Brno University Library, see her "Lollardy: the English Heresy?" in her *Lollards and Their Books* (London, 1985), 157–58.

[47] Odložilík, "Utrakvistická postilla z r. 1540," 20.

[48] Flavius Josephus, *Historie židovská. Na knihy čtyři rozdělená* [Jewish History. Divided into Four Books], trans. and intro. Václav Plácel of Elbing. (Prague, 1592) f. (*) 2v; and Flavius

The plea was expressed with particular force in Adam of Veleslavín's preface to Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historie církevní* [*Ecclesiastical History*], also translated by Kocín. Noting the use of Czech in the official record-keeping in Bohemia, Adam praised the edict of Charles IV, to the inhabitants of Prague to teach their children Czech, and to conduct municipal affairs in that language. He also referred to Hus's admonition to the Czechs to value their tongue.[49] The famous reformer in fact had drawn a parallel between the situation of the Jews under the Persian Empire and the Czechs under the Holy Roman Empire, with each nation defending its language against alien encroachments.[50] Veleslavín further argued that foreigners lost respect for the Czech language upon seeing that the Czechs did not value it themselves. He hoped that the situation might be improved by making books for solid erudition available in the local tongue.[51] According to Veleslavín, all significant areas of knowledge should be accessible in the Czech language and, on this ground, he justified his publication of a translation of Georg Lauterbeck's voluminous and learned tome of political science and administration, *Regentenbuch…allen Regenten und Oberkeiten zu Anrichtung und Besserung erbarer und guter Policey* (Leipzig, 1567).[52] I have noted earlier Cykáda's concern with the supply of Czech-language religious literature in the early seventeenth century.

The actual liturgical use of the vernacular by the Utraquist Church had a rather checkered history. In the early phase of the Bohemian Reformation in the fifteenth century, Czech penetrated into various sections of the mass.[53] The use of Latin as the liturgical language in the early sixteenth century paralleled the glamour of the classical languages which the Humanist vogue had aroused in Bohemia's educational system from the University of Prague

Magnus Cassiodorus, *Historie cyrkevni* [Ecclesiastical History], trans. Jan Kocín of Kocinét (Prague, 1594).

49 Eusebius of Caesarea (Pamphilus), *Historie církevní* [Ecclesiastical History], trans. Jan Kocín of Kocinét (Prague, 1594), f. A5v. See also Bedřich Spiess, "Jan Kocín z Kocinétu co historik církevní" [Jan Kocín of Kocinét as a Church Historian], ČČM 46 (1872) 69–70.

50 Jan Hus, *Výklady* [Explications], Magistri Iohannis Hus Opera Omnia, 1 (Prague: Academia, 1975) 18, referring to Nehemiah, 13: 23–25.

51 Eusebius, Pamphilus, *Historie cyrkevní,* trans. Jan Kocín z Kocinétu (Prague: Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, 1594) f. A5v

52 Georg Lauterbeck, *Politica historica: O vrchnostech a správcích světských knihy patery* [Politica historica: Five Book About Secular Authorities and Administrators], tr. Daniel Adam of Veleslavín., 2nd ed. (Prague: Dědici Daniele Adama z Veleslavína, 1606) f. 6v.

53 Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: A Textual Study," 123–24; idem, "The Role of Jakoubek of Stříbro in the Creation of Czech Liturgy: Some Further Reflections," in Ota Halama and Pavel Soukup, eds., *Jakoubek ze Stříbra: Texty a jejich působení* Jakoubek of Stříbro: Texts and Their Effects] (Prague, 2006) 60–66, 76–86; idem, "Převedení liturgie do národního jazyka v Čechách: Spletitá otázka [Translation of Liturgy into the Vernacular in Bohemia: A Complex Question]," an unpublished paper, delivered at the Conference on Bohemian Reformation, at the Evangelical Theological Faculty of Charles University, Prague, 31 March 1999.

down to the local grammar schools.[54] At last, by the later sixteenth century, Czech had surpassed Latin in Utraquist liturgical texts, although there was no abrupt linguistic change, such as occurred in the Church of England in 1549.[55] Writing in 1589 and 1592 respectively, nuncios Antonio Puteo and Antonio Caetano already found the spread of liturgical Czech in Bohemia quite reprehensible.[56] The ultimate extension of vernacular liturgy, therefore, represented a return to the initial Utraquist practice rather than an imitation of the Lutheran example.

Nobles' Aversion to Utraquism[57]

While the special ties of townspeople and other commoners to the Utraquist Church are clear, the more puzzling question is the strong attraction of Lutheranism for the Bohemian nobles. What impelled most of the aristocracy and gentry to separate from the national community and to turn their backs on the entrenched religious traditions of the nation? Although the impression of the intensity of the nobles' interest in Lutheranism may be somewhat exaggerated due to the urban Utraquist bias of the principal source for the events of 1575, namely Sixt of Ottersdorf's "Diarium o sněmu 1575,"[58] it seems undeniable that a clear majority of the nobles pressed for the legalization of the Augsburg Confession – in the guise of the Bohemian Confession – during the 1575 discussions in the Bohemian Diet.

Part of the answer may be traced exactly to the symbiosis between the towns and Utraquism. Because of the long-standing association of Utraquism with the urban commoners, some of the nobles' low regard for the common man also affected their view of the Utraquist Church. The social standing of the Utraquist ecclesiastical leadership was not likely to impress the nobility either. The Roman Church, particularly during the Counter Reformation,

[54] See, for instance, Schamschula, *Geschichte der tschechischen Literatur*, 1:219; Zikmund Winter, *Děje vysokých škol pražských od secessí cizích národů po dobu bitvy bělohorské, 1409–1622* [History of Prague University from the Secession of the Foreign Nations until the Time of the Battle of the White Mountain. 1409–1622] (Prague, 1895) 20; idem, *Život a učení na partikulárních školách v Čechách v XV. a XVI. století: Kulturně-historický obraz* [The Life and Teaching at the Secondary Schools in Bohemia in the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Centuries: A Cultural and Historical Portrait] (Prague, 1901) 517–599; idem, *Zlatá doba měst českých*, 141–42.

[55] The Church of England had adopted liturgical vernacular by 1549. At that time all liturgical books in Latin were ordered to be burned, see MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, 410, 455–456.

[56] Josef Matoušek, "Kurie a boj o konsistoř pod obojí za administrátora Rezka" [The Curia and the Struggle for the Utraquist Consistory under Administrator Rezek] ČČH 37 (1931) 27, 32.

[57] This section is based on my book, David, *Finding*, 174–78.

[58] *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* [The Bohemian Diets from 1526 to the Present], vv. 1–11, 15 (Prague, 1877–1941) 4: 318–392.

pioneered by the Jesuits, focused its interest and favour on the aristocracy and the gentry.[59] While the Roman archbishops of Prague were usually drawn from the aristocracy, the higher Utraquist clergy was generally of non-noble origin. Ultimately – due to its liberal ecclesiology – the Utraquist Church did not even provide for bishops as governing figures, but merely as dispensers of sacraments, while ecclesiastical administration and judiciary were entrusted to the Consistory, staffed with priests-commoners. Moreover, the authority of Utraquist higher clergy was based on theological learning and scholarship, not on political, diplomatic, or military skills. An overt questioning of the value of hereditary nobility and an opposition to the appointment of nobles to episcopal positions had a long tradition in the Bohemian Reformation stretching as far back as Vojtěch Raňkův in the late fourteenth century. Similarly, Jakoubek adopted a reserved attitude toward the privileged classes as early as his sermons of 1415 and 1416.[60] Moreover, the plebeian bias of Utraquism could be partly ascribed to the early influence John Wyclif, who had sternly denounced the possession of earthly riches and the wielding of political power by the clerical establishment.[61]

For their part, the nobles found it evidently problematic to show religious reverence to an institution staffed by those whom they perceived as socially inferior. The nobles' normal contempt for, and aversion to, the city-dwellers was sharpened by the towns' acquisition of political influence in the fifteenth century, and by their role as agents of economic and cultural modernization in the sixteenth century.[62] The gradual increase in the transnational loyalties and in the national heterogeneity of Bohemia's nobles also widened their social distance from the towns that, on the contrary, acted as guardians of local national traditions. The aristocrats' sojourns abroad, particularly their exposures to foreign Protestant and Catholic universities, further broadened

[59] Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," JEH 49 (1998) 630.

[60] Josef Tříška, ed., *Starší pražská univerzitní literatura a karlovská tradice* [The Early Prague University Literature and the Caroline Tradition] (Prague, 1978) 40; František M. Bartoš, ed. *Betlémská kázání Jakoubka ze Stříbra z let 1415–1416* [The Bethlehem sermons of Jakoubek of Stříbro from the years *1415–1416*]. Theologická příloha KR 20 (1953) 65, 114; Artur I. Ozolin, *Biurgerskaia oppozitsiia v gusitskom dvizhenii: Sotsial'no-politicheskie trebovaniia* [The Burghers' Opposition in the Hussite Movement: Social and Political Demands] (Saratov, 1973) 21.

[61] David, *Finding*, 87. Some would even see Wyclif, the critic of ecclesiastical riches, as a social radical whose writings helped to inspire the English Peasant Revolt of 1381 see Anne Hudson, *"Poor Preachers, Poor Men,"* 44, 47, 52.

[62] Josef Petráň, "Skladba pohusitské aristokracie v Čechách [The Composition of the Post-Hussite Aristocracy in Bohemia]," and Anna Skýbová, "Česká šlechta a jednání o povolení kompaktát r. 1525 [Bohemian Nobility in Discussions about the Recognition of the Compactata in 1525]," in *Proměny feudální třídy v Čechách v pozdním feudalismu* [Transformation of the Feudal Class in Bohemia under Late Feudalism], Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et historica 1 (1976), Studia historica, 14, ed. Josef Petráň (Prague, 1976) 44, 74, 83–85.

the gap.[63] Accordingly, an adversarial relationship between the nobles and the townsmen, as well as arrogant behaviour of the nobles toward the townspeople increased during the sixteenth century, especially after 1547.[64] Not even the highest degree of education could absolve a townsman from the social stigma of a commoner. For example, Petr Vok of Rožmberk nursed a lifelong feeling of humiliation because his early upbringing was entrusted briefly to a burgher of Soběslav and master of the University of Prague, Jan Makovský.[65]

An indication of the social distance was the nobles' apparent inability to deal courteously with the Utraquist authorities. Thus, in 1571 Maximilian II reprimanded the nobles for rudeness toward the Consistory. The king chastised them for writing in a menacing manner, and for addressing Utraquist Administrator, Martin of Mělník, in a discourteous way, denying him his proper title.[66] Three subsequent incidents are illustrative of the nobles' skewed interaction with the personnel of the Utraquist Church. In 1589, Sidonie of Michalovice, refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the Utraquist Consistory in a matrimonial case on the grounds that: "the baronial and knightly estates can be summoned only to the courts of the Land and the Chamber, not to any lower courts." In her appeal to the Emperor, she gratuitously added the alleged public view that the Administrator and the clerk of the Consistory's Court were "scoundrels and evident adulterers."[67] Also on record is the uncivil treatment of Administrator Václav Dačický by the Chancellor Zdeněk of Lobkovice in 1604, when the former tried to object to the Chancellor's describing his two daughters as "bastards" [*pankhartice*].[68]

[63] Jiří Kovařík, "Proměny feudální třídy v Čechách v předbělohorském období [Transformation of the Feudal Class in Bohemia in the Pre-White Mountain Period]," in *Proměny feudální třídy v Čechách v pozdním feudalismu*, ed. Petráň, especially 138–141; see also Míka, "Národnostní poměry v Čechách před třicetiletou válkou" [Nationality Relations in Bohemia Prior to the Thirty Years War]ČČH 20 (1972) 214–15, 217, 220, 222, 227; Josef Polišenský and Frederick Snider, "Změny ve složení české šlechty v 16. a 17. století" [Changes in the Composition of Bohemian nobility in the Sixteenth and the Seventeenth Centuries] ČČH 20 (1972) 518; and František Šamalík, *Úvahy o dějinách české politiky: Od reformace k osvícenství* [Reflections on the History of Bohemian Politics: From the Reformation to the Enlightenment], 2d ed. (Prague, 1996) 70. The loci of foreign study were normally the Protestant universities of Germany and the Roman Catholic universities of Italy, which might have affected the religious choices of the Bohemian blue-bloods; see Marie Koldínská, *Každodennost renesančního aristokrata* [Everyday Life of the Renaisance Aristocrat] (Prague, 2001) 10–11.

[64] Janáček, "Královská města česká na zemském sněmu r. 1609–1610," 248; Winter, *Kulturní obraz českých měst*, 1: 108–111.

[65] Jaroslav Pánek, "Spor o Voka z Rožmberka" [Controversy About Vok of Rožmberk] JSH 56 (1987) 174.

[66] Kamil Krofta, "Boj o konsistoř pod obojí v l. 1562–1575 a jeho historický základ," [Struggle for the Consistory in 1562–1575 and Its Historical Basis], ČČH 17 (1911) 395, n. 4.

[67] "…lotři a zjevní cizoložníci;" *Sněmy české*, 7: 406–407.

[68] *Sněmy české*, 11, pt. 1:76; Vilém Slavata, *Paměti nejvyššího kancléře království českého* [Memoirs of the Supreme Chacellor of the Kingdom of Bohemia], ed. Josef Jireček, 2 vv. (Prague, 1866–68) 1:47.

In another notable incident in 1618, two burgher women of Prague interceding with Count Heinrich Matthias von Thurn for the Utraquist priest Jan Locika of Domažlice, threatened with exile from Prague, pleaded that they had entrusted their souls to his care. The Count humiliated them by quipping whether the same was true of their bodies.[69] These are but a few examples of the boorish behaviour of Bohemian aristocrats vis-à–vis the townspeople.[70]

Against this background, it is possible to speculate further about the attraction of Lutheranism for Bohemia's nobles, and (for fewer of its members) of the Roman Church. Part of the answer probably lay again in the via media, the ecclesiological centrism of Utraquism. Two basic reasons may be advanced as to why the Utraquist church did not appeal to the aristocracy on ecclesiastical grounds. On the one hand – as noted earlier – unlike the Roman Church, the Utraquist Church could not provide employment consistent with a noble status inasmuch as it embraced the ideal of clerical poverty.[71] On the other hand, the Utraquist authorities and their priests were unsuited for the same degree of domination as their Lutheran counterparts. Although the Utraquist Church had implemented the fourteenth-century reformist injunctions against clerical pride and ostentation, it had preserved much of the aura of "sacredness" of the Roman Church due to the observance of canon law and the constitutional guarantees of royal protection. It is relevant to cite in this connection the complaint of Jan Facilis, parish priest of the church of St. Giles (Jiljí) in Prague in January 1594 that the willful entry into the parish house of the town judge with his scribe and henchmen, as agents of secular law, was in violation of the canons and ecclesiastical immunities [*contra canones et immunitates spirituales*].[72]

Lutheranism, to the contrary, frankly vested ecclesiastical power in secular authorities with Luther himself having demonstratively burned the book of canon law together with the papal bull of his excommunication in 1520.[73] Hence the noble laymen came to enjoy a greater pliability and a wider scope for assertion in the ecclesiastical field. Thus Vojtěch of Pernštejn (153561) aspired to become a lay bishop of a Moravian Lutheran Church. Similar ambitions for personal aggrandisement and ecclesiological inventiveness

[69] Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623* [History of Bohemia from 1602 to 1623], ed. Karel Tieftrunk, 5 vv. (Prague, 1865–70) 2:181.

[70] The aristocratic contempt for the townspeople, of course, was not a monopoly of the Bohemian nobility; it was current in other European countries; for the example of Denmark see Josef Kollmann, *Valdštejn a evropská politika, 162630: Historie 1. generalátu* [Valdštejn and European Politics, l625–1630: History of the First Generalate] (Prague, 1999) 58.

[71] Concerning the appeal of Catholic priesthood to the nobles during the Counter Reformation, see for instance, Gregory Hanlon, "The Decline of a Provincial Military Aristocracy: Siena 1560–1740," *Past and Present* 155 (1997), especially, 106–108; also Bohumil Navrátil, *Biskupství olomoucké 1576–1572 a volba Stanislava Pavlovského* [The Bishopric of Olomouc. 1576–1572, and the Election of Stanislav Pavlovský] (Prague, 1909) 198.

[72] *Sněmy české*, 11 pt. 1:70, n. 293.

[73] "Luther, Martin," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 16 vv. (New York, 1967–1974) 8:1088.

could not be accommodated in the traditionalist Utraquist Church. Even the Unity of Brethren looked askance at Pernštejn's free-lance entrepreneurship in ecclesiology.[74] Pernštejn may have been inspired by the "Saxon" type of Reformation in neighbouring Germany.[75] The Utraquist Consistory characteristically voiced its distaste over the zest of "the great lords" to manipulate religious concepts to their liking, as in composing the text of the Bohemian Confession in May 1575.[76] In short, the aristocracy could neither use the Utraquist Church as a welfare safety net (for its junior members), nor treat its clergy as its subjects. The Church did not seem to offer an adequate scope for the nobility's self-expression, self-indulgence, or exercise of influence, and the aristocrats were casting envious glances at the opportunities offered to their confreres in Lutheran and Calvinist lands abroad.[77] The Lutherans merged the ecclesiastical jurisdiction with secular power, while the Roman Church had separated and juxtaposed the two and the Utraquists pursued a *via media* of a cooperative balance between the church and the state.[78]

In an almost prophetic way, Jan the Elder of Valdštejn saw the onset of an even more radical split between the Czech nobility and the rest of the Czech nation at the Bohemian Diet of 1575. Defending eloquently and with determination the distinctive status of the Utraquist Church, Valdštejn raised his solitary voice to warn his fellow aristocrats against choosing an unfamiliar path by embracing the Augsburg Confession. He argued that the hundreds of thousands of Bohemian Christians would not welcome a new and alien

[74] Jan V. Novák, "Spor Bratří s p. Vojtěchem z Pernštejna a na Prostějově r. 1557 a 1558 [A Conflict of the Brethren with Lord Vojtěch of Pernštejn and Prostějov in 1557 and 1558]," ČČM 65 (1891) 44, 48, 54 n. 9; ["Z Pernštejna, Vojtěch," *Knihopis českých a slovenských tisků*, 2 vv. (Prague, 1925–), v. 2, pt 6:91;] Petr Vorel, *Páni z Pernštejna: Vzestup a pád rodu zubří hlavy v dějinách Čech a Moravy* [The Lords of Pernštejn: The Rise and Fall of the Dynasty of Bison's Head in the History of Bohemia and Moravia] (Prague, 1999) 212–213.

[75] According to which the prince simultaneously served as *summus episcopus*, possessing ecclesiastical, as well as secular, power, or by the placing of junior princes as bishops into secularized dioceses of northern Germany; see Kollmann, *Valdštejn a evropská politika,* 27, 51, 57.

[76] *Snemy české*, 4:412; Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 128, cf. 120–121; "Jakož pak obyčejně velicí Páni z náboženství hříčky sobě strojí, a v tom co se jim dobře líbí dělají." Václav Plácel z Elbingu in his introduction to Flavius, *Historia židovská. Na knihy čtyry rozdělená*, 3.

[77] Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem, Pa., 1992) 203. It has been suggested by Roman propagandists, like the energetic and vitriolic John of Capistrano in the 1450s, that the freedom from religious taxes and dues, and the right to seize ecclesiastical estates, explained in part Utraquism's appeal to the Bohemian nobles. If so, Lutheranism offered these licenses even more clearly; Rudolf Urbánek, *Věk Poděbradský* [The Poděbradian Age], 4 vv., České dějiny, vol. 3, pt. (Prague, 191962) 2:560.

[78] Ralph Keen, *Divine and Human Authority in Reformation Thought: German Theologians on Political Order, 1520–1555*. (Nieuwkoop, 1997) 6, characterised the Lutheran attitude toward political power: "when the Reformers appealed to secular authorities, they did so with a conception of authority that secularised the ecclesiastical order and subordinated it to the political order."

religion, but would rather cling to the established religious order sanctified by ancient tradition.[79] The nobles, in their elitist snobbery, evidently did not care about the religious views or feelings of the common man as long as their own special interests were satisfied and their particular tastes indulged. The disassociation of the nobility from Utraquism would be symbolised by a statement of Václav Budovec of Budov in 1603 that he knew of no one who would be adherent of the Prague Consistory among the higher estates.[80] In sum, Utraquism possessed neither the pride of the Roman Church, nor the submissiveness of Lutheranism. Parenthetically, it may be added that the denominational division along 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.[81] Ireland represented the reverse (as *mutatis mutandis* did Bohemia).[82]

Negative Consequence: Claim of Numerical Insignificance

The downside of the plebeianism of the Utraquist Church was a tendency in historical literature to slight the Church's significance, even its very existence, since attention focused on the views and beliefs of the upper classes. Recent trends in the historiography of nationalism might bestow a spurious semblance of veracity on the assertions that there were virtually no Utraquists in Bohemia at the turn of the sixteenth century. This school, represented by Ernest Gellner, Eric Hobsbawm, and others, has denied the existence of authentic nations in Europe in the sixteenth century, and placed their origin into the nineteenth century.[83] If one took into account only the "feudal" nation thus excluding commoners, then indeed the number of Utraquists in Bohemia would appear meager: only three per cent of the Bohemian nobles could be classified as Utraquists in the opening decades of the seventeenth century.[84] A flagrant example of a bias toward the views of the upper classes

[79] He summed up the Utraquist position succinctly saying: "…there is nothing for us in either a German religion, or in what was published at Augsburg; ancient customs and diet decrees of the Bohemian Kingdom are good enough…." *Sněmy české*, 4:393.

[80] "…nevíme tu vo kom, kdo by se koncistoří Pražskou spravoval a jinde v zemi, zvláště z vyšších stavů, o nich nevíme." *Sněmy české*, 10:427.

[81] *The World of Rural Dissenters, 1520–1725*, ed. Margaret Spufford (New York, 1995).

[82] Also in Poland the nobility, but not the common people, was attracted to Lutheranism, Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský*, 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).

[83] See also Ernest Gellner, *Encounters with Nationalism* (New York, 1995), and *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1983); Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. 2d ed. (New York, 1992); Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition* (New York, 1983).

[84] Josef Pekař, *Dějiny československé* [History of Czechoslovakia] (Prague: Akropolis, 1991) 91.

and a skepticism about ordinary people's intellectual commitments of Czech historiography can be seen in the trivialisation of the popular enthusiasm for Utraquism in 1618.[85] A similar problem has been noted recently in English sixteenth– and seventeenth-century historiography 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."[86] It is ironic that Czech 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 mentality of the common man was not alien to the Leninist variant of Marxism.[87]

Actually, according to my calculations the proportion of Utraquists in the Czech-speaking population of Bohemia on the eve of the Battle of the White Mountain (totaling 1,200,000) can be estimated at between two thirds and three quarters. Refining further the figures for religious affiliation in Bohemia, 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.[88]

[85] David, *Finding*, 321–329.

[86] Alexandra Walsham, "The Parochial Roots of Laudianism Revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and 'Parish Anglicans' in Early Stuart England," JEH 49 (1998) 621.

[87] Reliable estimates indicate that in 1600 Bohemia's barons and knights comprised 1,400 families; Jan Kapras, *Právní dějiny zemí koruny české* [Legal History of the Bohemian Crown Lands] (Prague, 1913) 2:436. The classical statement of Lenin's contempt for the intelligence of the masses is enshrined in his seminal V. I. Lenina, *Chto delať? Nabolevshie voprosy nashego dvizheniia* [What is to Be Done? The Painful Questions of Our Movement] (Stuttgart, 1902); also in V. I. Lenin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [Complete Works], 5th ed. 55 vv. (Moscow, 1967–1970) 6: 1–192.

[88] See David, *Finding*, 328 n. 126. 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; see Václav Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské" [Studies About Prague After the Battle of the White Mountain], *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hl. města Prahy* [A Miscellany of Contributions to the History of Capital of Prague] 6 (1930) 413–415. Assuming that this ratio was representative of the country, the number of Czech Lutherans would comprise between 5 and 10 per cent of the population, based on the percentage of the Brethren, established in Pekař, *Dějiny československé,* 92. According to this formula, the Brethren and Lutherans within the Czech-speaking population would together constitute between 10 and 20 per cent. This would come close to the ratio of twenty-five Utraquist parishes to seven Protestant ones in the deanery (ecclesiastical district) of Kouřim in 1613, cited by Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 539 n. 2. If we further accept the proportion of 12 to 15 per cent of the *sub una*, cited by Pekař, *Dějiny československé*, 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 5 to 10 per cent being Lutherans, 5 to 10 per cent Brethren, and 12 to 15 per cent *sub una*. It is further assumed that Bohemia on the eve of the Bohemian uprising of 1618 had 1,700.000 inhabitants of whom 1,200.000 were Czechs (see František

For the sake of completeness, the size of religious groups within the German-speaking population of Bohemia, probably 500,000 strong, can be similarly estimated. According to an analogous calculation, the number of German *sub una* would be 60,000 to 75,000, and the number of German Brethren 25,000 to 50,000. This would leave 375,000 to 415,000 German Lutherans. The undoubtedly small number of German Utraquists, if once approximated, should be subtracted from the number of Lutherans.[89]

Negative Consequence: Charge of Cultural Inferiority

A major reason for neglecting the legacy of Utraquism and the sixteenth-century culture, engendered by it, was the opinion of modernist esthetes in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, who – disregarding the didactic political, legal, and social values – looked askance at the intellectual heritage for its alleged lack of literary sophistication, and rejected the reverence shown to it by the national awakeners. Arne Novák in his influential history of Czech literature trivialized the worth of the sixteenth-century writings thus: "The real Renaissance spirit rarely penetrates this literature; mere practical considerations prevail. There are very few works reflecting the creative poetic gifts of observation, imagination, or expression."[90] He preferred the esthetic qualities of the Baroque culture during the Counter Reformation.[91] René Wellek also entertained a dim view of the Humanist period in Czech literature considering it imitative of Latin models and thus unoriginal.[92]

From a somewhat different angle, the historian Josef Pekař joined the ranks of the critics when he saw the cultural thrust of the Bohemian Reformation

Kavka and Josef Válka, *Dějiny Československa, 1437–1781* [The History of Czechoslovakia, 1437–1781], 2nd ed. (Prague, [1970]) 201.

89 The size of religious groups within the German-speaking population of Bohemia, probably 500,000 strong, can be similarly estimated. According to an analogous calculation, the number of German *sub una* would be 60,000 to 75,000, and the number of German Brethren 25,000 to 50,000. This would leave 375,000 to 415,000 German Lutherans. The undoubtedly small number of German Utraquists, if once approximated, should be subtracted from the number of Lutherans.

90 Arne Novák, *Stručné dějiny literatury české* [A Concise History of Czech Literature], eds. R. Havel and A. Grund. (Olomouc, 1946) 61, cited by Eduard Petrů, *Vzdálené hlasy: studie o starší české literatuře* [Far-Away Voices: Studies About Early Czech Literature] (Olomouc, 1996) 227; see also for mild dissent Milan Kopecký, "Tradice a její žánrová modifikace [Tadition and Its Genre Modification]," in *Speculum medii aevi: Zrcadlo středověku* [*Speculum medii aevi:*A Mirror of the Middle Ages], ed. Lenka Jiroušková. (Prague, 1998) 80–81. Some of the embarrassment over the modest level of Czech culture is also reflected in Josef Hanzal, *Od baroka k romantismu: Ke zrození novodobé české kultury* [From Baroque to Romanticism: About the Birth of Modern Czech Literature] (Prague, 1987).

91 Zdeněk Rotrekl, *Barokní fenomén v současnosti* [The Baroque Phenomenon at Present] (Prague, 1995) 146–147.

92 René Wellek, *Essays on Czech Literature*, intro. Peter Demetz (The Hague, 1963) 23.

forsaking the high level of the Romance-Catholic culture for the much lower Germanic-Protestant one. This view saw much higher achievements in Bohemia of the fourteenth century than were those of the subsequent two centuries.[93] Curiously, the disdainful attitude toward the literature of the Utraquist era – perhaps, because of its "bourgeois" setting – found an echo also in Czech historical writing of the Marxist period.[94]

Yet, voices to the contrary – although apparently less influential – were not entirely silenced. Krofta, albeit Pekař's disciple, was convinced that the image of shallowness and poverty of sixteenth-century culture, which "has been taught and believed," was entirely mistaken, stating: "I have studied the fruits of this culture from various aspects…and I am convinced that it is the peak of our cultural development, that at that time we, as a nation, lived the fullest and richest life … and that this period is to us today intrinsically much closer than what preceded and what followed. ….and I am firmly convinced … that this will be generally recognised, once these matters become better known."[95] While the esthetes and some others decried the low level of Czech *belles lettres*, the defenders called attention to the socio-political literature which was inspired by a humanist and humanitarian spirit that represented a worthy Bohemian contribution to the intellectual development of civilisation. There were even those brave souls who took up the cudgels for a respectable esthetic status of *belles lettres* in the Utraquist age. Thus, Jaroslav Kolár has argued that the Bohemians had virtually come to terms with the most advanced currents of contemporary Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, citing as an example "the fruitful encounter of Czech literature with the work of Giovanni Boccacio."[96]

Negative Consequence: Charge of Provincialism

Another reason for deprecating the intellectual and cultural heritage of the Utraquist era was the a priori assumption of a cultural isolation and consequent mediocrity of Bohemia resulting from the wars of the Bohemian Reformation.[97] Actually, the sixteenth-century Utraquist culture, like the cul-

[93] Jaroslav Čechura and Jana Čechurová, *Korespondence Josefa Pekaře a Kamila Krofty* [The Correspondence of Josef Pekař and Kamil Krofta] (Prague, 1999) 86.

[94] For instance, Zdeňka Tichá, *Cesta starší české literatury* [The Pursuits of Early Czech Literature] (Prague, 1984) 203–205.

[95] Čechura and Čechurová, *Korespondence Josefa Pekaře a Kamila Krofty*, 87.

[96] Jaroslav Kolár, *Návraty bez konce: Studie k starší české literatuře* [Endless Returns: Studies about Early Czech Literature], ed. Lenka Jiroušková. (Brno, 1999) 119, 121. More recently Viktor Viktora has also testified to the richness of Czech sixteenth-century literature; see idem, *K pramenům národní literatury* [About the Sources of National Literature] (Plzeň, 2003) 74–116.

[97] See, for instance, *Dějiny zemí koruny české* [History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown]. 2 vv. (Prague, 1992) 1:289. Earlier also Palacký deplored the cultural decline of Bohemia in

ture of the national awakening (although couched in the vernacular idiom) was open to outside influences, tolerant of intellectual diversity, and pursued universal, not provincial, ideals. Bohemian Utraquism did not adopt a position of religious exclusivity, a retreat into a ghetto. On the contrary, it embraced a universalist view of its mission envisioning a reform of the entire Western Christendom, causing Rome to abandon its errant ways and adopt the correct paths in liturgy and ecclesiology.[98] Bohemian scholars and intellectuals in the Utraquist age maintained lively contacts at the peaks of European culture. The intellectual leaders of the Bohemian Enlightenment, like František F. Procházka, felt that no country in sixteenth-century Europe was superior to Bohemia in its writers and scholars.[99] A competent contemporary witness, such as Erasmus, listed Bohemia among the few countries of Europe where the humanities were valued and flourished in the sixteenth century.[100] He maintained a broad interest in the Bohemian Reformation, including correspondence with distinguished Bohemians. An impressive number of his works was translated into Czech and published in the sixteenth century.[101] Moreover, Utraquist theologians were concerned with European-wide proposals to liberalize Roman ecclesiology by reformers, such as Erasmus, Georg Witzel, Thomas More, and John Fisher, before and after the Council of Trent.[102]

On an individual level, the breadth of cultural horizons was exemplified by the Utraquist author Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení, who translated into Czech works of Erasmus, as well as those of Petrarch[103] and the Greek Fathers. His son, Zikmund Hrubý of Jelení, was a friend of Erasmus, whom he assisted in preparing editions of ancient authors in Basel, while he worked in the publishing house of Johannes Froben under the name of Gelenius.[104] Two erudite Utraquist ecclesiastics, Jan Hortensius Zahrádka and Jindřich Dvorský z Helfenberka, each of whom held the top office in the Utraquist Church as

the wake of the religious wars. See Josef Kalousek, "O vůdčích myšlénkách v historickém díle Palackého [About the Leading Ideas in the Historical Work of Palacký]," *Památník na oslavu stých narozenin Františka Palackého* [A Memorial Volume for the Centenary of František Palacký's Birth] (Prague, 1898) 2003.

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

99 František Faustin Procházka, *De saecularibus liberalium artium in Bohemia et Moravia satis commentarius* (Prague, 1784) 334, cited by Hugh L. Agnew, *Origins of the Czech National Renascence* (Pittsburgh, 1993) 111.

100 Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence*, 11 vv. (Toronto, 1974–1992) 6: 174.

101 David, "The Universalist Aspirations," 205.

102 Ibid., 211.

103 Francesco Petrarca, *Knihy dvoje o lékařství proti štěstí a neštěstí* [Two Books of Medicine Against Fortune and Misfortune] (Prague, 1501), see *Knihopis*, no. 7049.

104 *Lexikon české literatury: Osobnosti, díla, instituce* [Dictionary of Czech Literature: Personalities, Writings, Institutions], ed. Vladmír Forst and others (Prague, 1985–2008) 2: pt 2: 339.

administrator (respectively in 1541 and in 1572–1581), enjoyed high international reputation. Having studied in Padua and Venice in the early 1530s, Hortensius was not only a distinguished theologian (particularly as a specialist on St. Paul's epistles), but also the outstanding Czech mathematician of his time.[105] In the early 1540s, Dvorský had entered into scholarly communication concerning the classics of antiquity with no lesser figure than the "praeceptor Germaniae," Philipp Melanchton himself.[106] Bohemian editions of the Bible inspired international respect for their attention to Greek texts in the mid-sixteenth century. Some, like Sixt of Ottersdorf, traveled abroad to learn Greek.[107] During the opening years of the seventeenth century, Martin Bacháček, professor of astronomy and rector of the University of Prague, was a respected colleague of such luminaries as Johannes Kepler and Tycho Brahe.[108] Both Brahe and Kepler utilised in their work astronomical observations, made earlier in Prague by Šimon Proxen of Sudety, Cyprian Lvovský, and Tadeáš of Hájek.[109] The legal and constitutional system of Bohemia, benefiting from the skills of the erudite legislators, stood high in comparison with general European standards and excelled over the jurisprudence of neighboring countries. The Confederation of 1619, adopted during the Bohemian uprising against the Habsburgs, was in a way the first modern constitution of Europe.[110]

This breadth of vision was not limited to a few top intellectuals, but it applied also at lower clerical levels. The plebeian character of Utraquism, or its status as a religion of the commoners, did not involve a decline in its intellectual standards to the primitive level of an unsophisticated folkish religion, usually associated with the Waldensian or Lollard ministers. Utraquist priesthood remained loyal to the traditional roots of the Bohemian Reformation which were firmly planted in the academy. Their publications show the Utraquist ecclesiastics to have been learned, theologically sophisticated, and academically minded scholars who continued to infuse Utraquism with a spirit of reasonableness and with informed discussion. Their engagement with the patristic and scholastic writers was not based on mere citations from compendia of excerpts (florilegia), but on creative intellectual engagement with their texts. Thus an examination of the Second Book of Bílejovský's *Ecclesiastical*

[105] *Ottův slovník naučný*, 11:642–43.

[106] Ibid., 8:275.

[107] Josef Dobrovský, *Dějiny české řeči a literatury v redakcích z roku 1791, 1792 a 1818* [A History of Czech Language and Literature in the Editions of 1791, 1792, and 1818], ed. Benjamin Jedlička (Prague, 1936) 153.

[108] Josef Hanzal, "Martin Bacháček z Nauměřic a městské školy ve středních Čechách před Bílou Horou" [Martin Bacháček Nauměřice and the Town Schools in Central Bohemia Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain], *Středočeský sborník historický* [The Historical Journal of Central Bohemia], 10 (1975) 141–42.

[109] František Palacký, *Dílo* [The Writings], ed. Jaroslav Charvát, 4 vv. (Prague, 1941) 4:13.

[110] Karel Malý in his essay in *Vladislavské zřízení zemské a počátky ústavního zřízení v Českých zemích, 1500–1619*, [See review in ČČH 101 (2003) 405]

chronicle, for instance, indicates a theological erudition documented by sixty--eight references to the opinions of at least twenty-four fathers and doctors of the Church, and other distinguished theologians.[111]

Similarly, one can cite the example of Bílejovský's colleague, Pavel Bydžovský, who directed the resistance against the Lutheran takeover of the Utraquist Consistory in 1543. His knowledge was exhibited by a substantial command of patristic literature (both Greek and Latin), in which he showed familiarity with recent editions.[112] His theological erudition further covered the medieval doctors of the church, decisions of both ancient and medieval church councils, provisions of canon law (specifically the *Decretum* of Gratian),[113] the classics of Utraquism, as well as Luther's and Melanchton's doctrines. This whole gamut of learning was displayed in the discussion of every major theological proposition.[114] Even a rank and file Utraquist priest, Vavřinec Leander Rvačovský of Rvačov, is praised for his "unusual linguistic, historical, and theological knowledge."[115] The tradition of learned clergy continued into the early decades of the seventeenth century. Pačuda in his *Spis v němž se obsahuje* [Treatise… on Events Preceding the Advent of Christ] (1616) not only cited profusely from the fathers and doctors of the Church, but also displayed a working knowledge of Latin and Greek classical authors, such as Homer, Herodotus, Euripides, Plutarch, and Plautus. What was even more important, his citations were not merely perfunctory, mechanical or ornamental, but used creatively and effectively for purposes of illustration or amplification.[116]

[111] Namely (in alphabetical order and with the number of references in parentheses): Albert the Great (2), Ambrose (2), Augustine (7), Bede (1), Bernard of Clairvaux (2), Eusebius (1), Gregory the Great (4), Hilary of Poitiers (1), Hugh of St Victor (1), Jan Hus (2), Innocent III (1), Jerome (5), John Damascene (1), Nicholas of Lyra (6), Origen (6), Pascasius (1), Peter Payne (6), Jan of Příbram (1), Pseudo-Dionysius (1), Remigius of Auxerre (1), John Rokycana (1), Theodore of Tarsus (1), Thomas Aquinas (3), and John Wyclif (11). Bílejovský, *Kronyka Cýrkevní*, 88–104.

[112] Pseudo-Dionysius, *Theologia vivificans. Cibus solidus. Dionysii coelestis hierarchia. Ecclesiastica hierarchia. Divina nomina. Mystica theologia. Undecim epistolae. Ignatii undecim epistolae. Polycarpi epistola una*, edited by Jacques Le Fèvre d'Étaples. In alma Parisiorum academia, Per Henricum Stephanum, 1515, see Pavel Bydžovský, *Děťátka a neviňátka hned po přijetí křtu sv. Tělo a Krev Boží, že přijímati mají* [Innocent Infants Should Receive the Holy Divine Body and Blood Immediately after Baptism] (Prague, 1541) f. B2r.

[113] Bydžovský, *Děťátka a neviňátka*, f. B4r.

[114] For instance, his *Knížky o přijímání Těla a Krve Pána našeho Ježíše Krista…* [Books about the Reception of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ…] ([Prague], 1539), 52–55; *Tato knížka toto try ukazuge…* [This Booklet Shows Three Things…], (n.p., after 1541), 14–16; *Tento spis ukazuje že Biskupové Biskupa a Biskup Kněží a kněží od řádných biskupů svěceni těla a krve boží posvěcovati mají* [This Treatise Shows that Bishops Should Ordain a Bishop, a Bishop [Ordain] Priests, and Priests Ordained by Legitimate Bishops [Should] Consecrate the Divine Body and Blood] (n.p., 1543), 12–15; Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české* [Handbook of the History of Czech Literature] (Prague, 1875) 1: 114–15.

[115] Antonín Rybička, "Rvačovský Vavřinec Leander," ČČM 45 (1871) 326.

[116] Pačuda cites from Cyprian (C1v, D6v, K5v), Lactantius (B6v), Eusebius (E2v), Basil the Great (B8v), Ambrose (K5r, K6r), Chrysostom (E1r), Augustine (A7v, C4r, G4v, G5r, K4v), Gregory

The critics who have voiced their opinions about the low standards and provincialism of Bohemia's intellectual scene, frequently failed to take into account the situation in other countries, especially in their disparagement of the Utraquist University of Prague.[117] To the extent that this institution suffered a decline in scholarly productivity, and perhaps standards, by the sixteenth century, this was an affliction common to universities, particularly in central Europe of that period. During the fifteenth century, German universities had shrunk virtually to the faculties of arts, and acted largely as "finishing schools" for local audiences.[118] On the brighter side, the University of Prague scored a notable achievement in maintaining an effective network of secondary schools in the towns of Bohemia, culminating during the rectorate of Martin Bacháček. Zikmund Winter concludes his exhaustive study of the Utraquist university with the following words: "…many men were educated there, who excelled in the sciences, although they did not excel in self-promotion [*chlubením*]."[119] Indeed, no less a figure than Kepler expressed his admiration for the university.[120] Moreover, as a result of the happy symbiosis between the university and the urban milieu, the scope of educated townsmen's intellectual interest reached beyond practical knowledge of law, medicine, and technology to the sphere of pure science and scholarship in philosophy, classics, theology, linguistics, and history.[121]

the Great (C7v), and Bernard of Clairvaux (D5r, E4v, F3v, F8v, J6r). Pačuda also displayed familiarity with Greek classics, such as Homer (J4r), Herodotus (J3v), Euripides (J4r), Aristotle (C2v), Diodorus Siculus (B6r), Strabo (B4r), Philo (B1v), Plutarch (C4v, J5r), and Claudian (G1v), as well as Roman classics, such as Plautus (J6r), Cicero (E5v, H7r), Ovid (C2v, G1v), Lucanus (G8r), and Lucius Apuleius (C5v). Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje*.

117 *Dějiny Prahy* [History of Prague]. Vol. 1: *Od nejstarší doby do sloučení pražských měst, 1784* [From the Beginning to the Union of the Towns of Prague, 1784] (Prague, 1997) 223–224; Viktora, *K pramenům národní literatury*, 13.

118 See, for instance, Henry Kamen, *The Iron Century: Social Change in Europe, 1550–1660* (New York, 1971) 284–89. On the loss of international membership, and decline to an undergraduate or "finishing school" level see Rainer C. Schwinges, *Deutsche Universitätsbesucher im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des Alten Reiches* (Stuttgart, 1986) especially, 470–72, 495–96, and the review by John M. Fletcher, *English Historical Review* 104 (1989) 121–22. The situation would persist until the nineteenth century; see Olaf Pedersen, "Tradition and Innovation," in *A History of the University in Europe*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, 4 vv. (Cambridge, New York, 1996) 2: 486–87.

119 Zikmund Winter, *O životě na vysokých školách pražských: kulturní obraz XV. a XVI. století* [Life at the University of Prague: A Cultural Portrait from the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Centuries] (Prague, 1899) 564; idem, *Děje vysokých škol pražských*, 60–62.

120 Josef Hanzal, "Martin Bacháček z Nauměřic a městské školy ve středních Čechách před Bílou Horou." Středočeský slovník historický 10 (1975).

121 Jiří Pešek, *Měšťanská vzdělanost a kultura v předbělohorských Čechách, 154620* [The Burghers' Education and Culture in Bohemia Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain, 1547–1620] (Prague, 1993) 26–28.

The Vindication of Plebeianism: Towns' Ascendancy in Culture

In the long run, the shift in religious orientations, made evident by the events of 1575, may be viewed as symptomatic of a more fundamental watershed in Czech history, namely the passing of intellectual leadership from the nobility to the middle classes.[122] The controversies of 1575 revealed that the nobility, by rejecting Utraquism and seceding to Lutheranism, had separated itself from the nation's majority.[123] The nobility was becoming increasingly parasitical seeking to evade civic responsibility by shifting the tax obligation to the townspeople, especially in 1567.[124] The nobility was also becoming increasingly dysfunctional, unable to play well even the roles in foreign and military affairs, which supposedly legitimised its privileged status. For instance, Vilém of Rožmberk's and Vratislav of Pernštejn's negotiations on behalf of the Habsburgs for the Polish throne in 157573 appeared as an epitome of diplomatic failure.[125] A military treatise of 1593 illustrated the defective training of aristocratic and gentry youth in physical prowess and political wisdom.[126] Czech society was turning more plebeian in its rejection of militarism, which of course was considered an aristocratic virtue.[127]

[122] Janáček, "Královská města česká na zemském sněmu r. 1609–1610," 251.

[123] Contrary to the view of the prominent Czech historian of the Reformation, Kamil Krofta that by 1575 the Utraquist Church had separated itself from the vast majority of the nation (unless one thinks of the quaint Hungarian-style notion of a political nation of nobles); "Boj o konsistoř," 417.

[124] Kneidl, *Městský stav v Čechách v době předbělohorské*, 119–122; Pánek, "Spor o Voka z Rožmberka," 173. On the Bohemian nobility see also Petr Maťa, *Svět české aristokracie, 1500–1700* [The World of Bohemian Aristocracy] (Prague, 2004) 440–477.

[125] Almut Bues, *Die habsburgische Kandidatur für den polnischen Thron während des Ersten Interregnums in Polen 1572–73* (Vienna, 1984) 67–68; Kamil Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ: Od Bílé Hory k Palackému* [Immortal Nation: From the White Mountain to Palacký] (Prague, 1940) 416–17; Waclaw Sobieski, "Vilém z Rožmberka a Jan Zamojski," in Miloš Weingart, and others, eds., *Z dějin východní Evropy a Slovanstva: Sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi k šedesátým narozeninám* [From the History of Eastern Europe and the Slavs: A Festschrift for Jaroslav Bidlo's Sixtieth Birthday] (Prague, 1928) 288–91.

[126] Sigmund Chotek of Chockov, "Instrukcí vojanská," in *Sněmy české* 8:419–421. Vilém's brother, Petr Vok of Rožmberk's physical weakness due to overindulgence in food, drink and sex (allegedly with twelve concubines) made him unfit for a command post in Hungary during the Turkish war in 1594. On the decline of military virtues, see Marie Koldínská, *Každodennost renesančního aristokrata* [see note 63 above] 13; and Jaroslav Pánek, "Křesťanský rytíř Jan Zajíc z Házmburka a jeho *Sarmácie*" [Christian Knight Jan Zajíc of Házmburk and his *Sarmácia*] in Jan Zajíc of Házmburk, *Sarmacia anebo zpověď českého aristokrata* [*Sarmacia* or the Confession of a Bohemian Aristocrat] (Prague, 2007) 155. For contemporary criticism, see Tomáš Bavorovský, *Postila česká* [Bohemian Homiliary] (Olomouc, 1557); see also Krofta, *Nesmrtelný národ*, 393; Hynek Hrubý, *České postilly: Studie literárně a kulturně historická* [Bohemian Homiliaries: Historical Study, Literary and Cultural] (Prague, 1901) 182–89; Jan Jakubec, *Dějiny literatury české* [History of Czech Literature], 2nd ed., 2 vv (Prague, 1924) 1: 713, 721.

[127] David, "Utraquism's Liberal Ecclesiology," BRRP (2007) 170–72. See also Pánek, "Křesťanský rytíř Jan Zajíc z Házmburka a jeho *Sarmácie*," 36.

During the sixteenth century, it would be difficult to find much of intellectual or inspirational value in the legacy of the various noble Lichtenštejns, Pernštejns, or Rožmberks with their contempt for the common man and their capricious narcissism.[128] It would be hard to find inspiration from the anemic *Weltschmerz* of even a more attractive figure like Karel the Elder of Žerotín.[129] Aside from a few exceptions, which seem to confirm the rule,[130] literary or artistic creativity was relatively rare even among the members of the lower nobility.[131] In addition to the scarcity of intellectual production, Zikmund Winter and Zdeněk Kalista have argued that the Bohemian nobles, like those of neighbouring German lands, and in contrast to the Bohemian townspeople, displayed markedly low levels of personal cultural or scholarly interest in the sixteenth century.[132] Most young nobles registered at universities abroad not in order to engage in scholarship, but to acquire social contacts.[133]

[128] Zdeněk of Lobkovice's treatment of Administrator Dačický in 1604, for instance, does not reflect the moral sensitivity of a respectable man, but rather the coarse instincts of a despot of the ilk of Ivan the Terrible. For a possible exception see Pánek, "Křesťanský rytíř Jan Zajíc z Házmburka," 16.

[129] See, for instance, Noemi Rejchrtová, "Listy osamělého politika" [Letters of a Lonesome Politician] in: Jan Skutil ed., *Karel starší ze Žerotína, Z korespondence* [Karel , the Elder, of Žerotín: From His Correspondence] (Prague, 1982) 8. More recently Kalivoda has assigned to Žerotín's political "genius" the prime responsibility for the failure of the Bohemian uprising against the Habsburgs in 1618; Kalivoda, *Husitská epocha a J. A. Komenský*, 42–43, 59–60. Žerotín's Moravian colleagues, Albrecht of Valdštejn and Ladislav Velen of Žerotín displayed their lack of political responsibility by embezzling, respectively in 1619 and in 1620, the entire public treasury of the Margraviate; see Josef Válka, *Dějiny Moravy* [History of Moravia] v. 2: *Morava reformace, renesance a baroka* [Moravia during the Reformation, Renaissance, and Baroque], Vlastivěda moravská, n.s. v. 6 (Brno, 1996) 93, 98.

[130] The exceptions include Václav Budovec of Budov or Kryštof Harant of Polžice and Bezdružice. Concerning the former, see Noemi Rejchrtová, ed., in Václav Budovec of Budov, *Antialkorán*, (Prague, 1989) 10.

[131] Václav Bůžek, "Literární mecenát nižší šlechty v předbělohorských Čechách, [Literary Patronage_of Lower Nobility in Bohemia in the Era Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain]" *Husitství, Reformace, Renesance: Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek and others. 3 vv. (Prague, 1994) 3:837, 839.

[132] Winter, *Život a učení na partikulárních školách*, 765–68; Zdeněk Kalista, "Tři staré šlechtické libráře" [Three Old Nobles' Libraries] ČSPSČ 36 (1928) 153–156, although František Hrubý in "Zpráva," ČČH 35 (1929) 207, maintains that Kalista's strictures are exaggerated. Regarding the nobles' trivial interests and limited cultural horizons, see Adam the Younger of Valdštejn, *Deník rudolfínského dvořana, 1602–1633* [The Diary of a Rudolphine Courtier], ed. Marie Koldinská and Petr Maťa (Prague, 1997) 12–13. Kalista challenged his mentor Josef Pekař who wished to see in the nobles the paragons of Bohemia's national virtues; see Zdeněk Kalista, *Po proudu života* [Along the Stream of Life], vv. 2. (Prague, 1996–1997) 2:155–56.The growing divergence between the lifestyles of the townspeople and the nobles in the sixteenth century is well summarised in Josef Petráň et al., *Dějiny Československa* [History of Czechoslovakia], 2 vv. (Prague, 1990) 1:497–501.

[133] Koldínská, *Každodennost renesančního aristokrata*, 10. Jiří Pešek stresses that the sixteenth-century Bohemian nobility had customarily remained at the level of bare literacy without any ambition for juridical or classical learning; see Pešek, *Měšťanská vzdělanost a kultura*, 129.

In comparison, the cultural legacy of the unpretentious public-spirited men and mild-mannered scholars of the towns was much more impressive, as well as conspicuously subject to emulation during the Czech National Awakening. The urban creators of lasting intellectual values included the champions of Utraquism at the Diet of 1575, Sixt of Ottersdorf and Pavel Kristián of Koldín, and other personages from the town milieu, such as: Daniel Adam of Veleslavín, Martin Bacháček, Brikcí of Licko, Marek Bydžovský of Florentin, Mikuláš Dvorský, Jan Kocín of Kocinét, Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov, Martin Kuthen of Šprinsberk, Prokop Lupáč of Hlaváčov, Jakub Srnec of Varvažov, Jan Straněnský, Adam Zalužanský of Zalužany, or Václav Zelotín of Krásná Hora. Starting in the late fifteenth century and extending throughout the rest of the Utraquist period, the urban middle classes established their leadership in the intellectual and literary life of the country.[134] The towns, especially Prague, had at their disposal in their chancelleries, schools, and churches impressive arrays of intellectuals, professionals, experts in law and the several academic disciplines.[135] The latter's sheer numbers outweighed whatever intellectual establishments even the wealthiest of nobles could assemble on their manors. The University of Prague was entirely in the service of the urban intellectual establishment.[136] Moreover, the critical mass of the urban intellectual potential was increasing as the seigneurial towns during the sixteenth century were approximating the royal towns not only in economic, but also in cultural spheres. Not only Prague, but other Bohemian towns as well, supported scholarship and historical writing, such as Hradec Králové, Kouřim, Louny, Písek, Rakovník, and Žatec.[137] Accordingly, in Rudolf II's reign "it was

[134] Kolár, *Návraty bez konce,* 25, 139–40.

[135] See, for instance, Jiří Pešek, "Kultura českých předbělohorských měst, 1547–1620 [The Culture of Bohemian Towns Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain, 1547–1620]," *Česká města v 16.–18. století: Sborník příspěvků z konference v Pardubicích 14. a 15. listopadu 1990* [Bohemian Towns from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Miscellany from the Conference in Pardubice 15. November 1990], ed. Jaroslav Pánek (Prague, 1991), 208–209; Petr Čornej, *Rozhled, názory a postoje husitské inteligence v zrcadle dějepisectví 15. století* [The Horizons, Opinions, and Standpoints of the Hussite Intelligentsia in the Mirror of Fifteenth-Century Historiography] (Prague, 1986). Concerning Veleslavín's particularly significant contribution see Josef Hejnic, "Daniel Adam of Veleslavín: Zu den gegenseitigen Beziehungen zwischen der tschechischen und lateinischen Literatur im letzten Viertel des 16. Jahrhunderts," in: Hans-Bernd Harder and Hans Rothe, eds., *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern.* [Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublic Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 11] (Cologne, 1988) 270–72.

[136] Michal Svatoš, "Humanismus an der Universität Prag im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert," in: *Studien zum Humanismus …,*" 203–205; Jiří Pešek, "Měšťanská kultura a vzdělanost v rudolfínské Praze [Burghers' Culture and Education in the Rudolphine Prague]," FHB 5 (1983) 174–176.

[137] Václav Ledvinka, "Feudální velkostatek a poddanská města v předbělohorských Čechách" [The Feudal Manor and the Subject Towns Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain], Jiří Pešek, "Kultura českých předbělohorských měst, 1547–1620" [The Culture of Bohemian Towns Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain, 1547–1620], and Petr Vorel, "Města jako

easy to find in Czech towns burghers who could read Virgil, Ovid, Horace, even Homer, Anakreon, etc., and were themselves able to compose poems in Latin and Greek."[138] Their concern with political theory and political science is reflected, for instance, in their translations and editions of Jean Bodin, Georg Lauterbeck, and Hieronymus Weller.[139] Much of the urban intellectual life found nourishment and expression in the publication programme of Adam of Veleslavín. [140]

It was also Adam of Veleslavín who identified the virtues of the middle-class scholars/statesmen in assessing the life accomplishments of three paragons of civil society (Ottersdorf, Jiří Melantrich of Aventin, and Bydžovský of Aventin):

> The three men were not only learned, but also reverent. Having gathered great knowledge, they still had clear consciences. Through long testing they attained wisdom without lacking discipline or honourable manners. They feared the Lord, respected their superiors, loved their country. They cared about the common good, not as some do just to see their city prosper during their lifetime, but they desired to leave to posterity their country in a better state than they had received it from their ancestors.[141] Though Veleslavín's statement might give the impression of a set panegyric, the praise rings true in these cases.

sídla feudálních vrchností" [Towns As Residences of Feudal Seigneurs], all in *Česká města v 16.–18. století: Sborník příspěvků z konference v Pardubicích 14. a 15. listopadu 1990*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek (Prague, 1991) 101, 123–24, and 204. See dedications to mayors and town councils in Brykcí z Licska, *Regule, To jest řeholy obecné z latinských učitelův práv vybrané…* [*Regulae*, That Is General Rules Selected from Latin Teachers of Law] (Prague, 1541) f. A1v; Josephus Flavius, *Historia židovská. Na knihy čtyry rozdělená*, trans. Václav Plácel of Elbing (Prague, 1592) f. (*) 2r; and Flavius Magnus Cassiodorus, *Historie cýrkevní*, trans. Jan Kocín of Kocinét (Prague, 1594) 261, 417.

138 Josef J. Jungmann,, *Historie literatury české*, 2d ed. (Prague, 1849) 120, cited by Antonín Rejzek, *Blahoslavený Edmund Kampián, kněz Tovaryšstva Ježíšova, pro sv. víru mučeník ve vlast své* [Blessed Edmund Campion, Priest of the Society of Jesus, for His Faith a Martyr in His own Land] (Brno, 1889) 123.

139 Mikuláš Dvorský, *Jeronýma Wellera kniha o povinnostech všech úřadův duchovních i světských*. [Jerome Weller's Book About the Duties of Ecclesiastical and Secular Offices] 1591; Jan Kocín of Kocinét, *Ioannis Bodini Nova distributio iuris universi … explicata a Ioanne Cocino*. (Prague, 1581); see *Rukověť humanistického básnictví*, 3:53; Georg Lauterbeck, *Politica historica: O vrchnostech a správcích světských knihy patery* [Politica historica: Five Books about Secular Authorities and Administrators], tr. Daniel Adam of Veleslavín. Prague, 1584; 2nd ed. Prague: Dědici Daniele Adama z Veleslavína, 1606.

140 Mirjam Bohatcová and Josef Hejnic, "O vydavatelské činnosti Veleslavínské tiskárny," [The Publication Activity of Veleslavín's Printing House] FHB 9 (1985) 291–388.

141 Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, *Kalendář Historický. Krátké a sumovní poznamenání vsechnech dnuv jednohokazdého Mesyce pres cely Rok* [A Historical Calendar. A Brief and Summary Annotation of all the Days of Each Month During the Entire Year] (Prague, 1590). Also cited by Riss, "Život a literné působení Sixta z Ottersdorfu," 159.

The Plebeian Legacy of Utraquism

In longer historical perspective, the cultural achievements of Bohemia's commoners helped to compensate for the political and military shortcomings of the Bohemian nobility. The mismanagement of the Bohemian uprising (161620) demonstrated further the weakness of the Bohemian nobility by revealing its incompetence in the direction of both diplomatic and military affairs.[142] On the diplomatic front the Calvinist alliance yielded only assistance from the Dutch, while alienating the Lutheran countries, particularly Saxony.[143] On the domestic front, the nobles' lack of civic-mindedness, even during the insurrection, was manifest in the endeavour to shift the burden of taxation from themselves on to the towns.[144] Upon the election of Frederick of Palatinate as King on 26 August 1619,the townspeople were politically marginalised when the dissolution of the body of the thirty Directors deprived them of a share of power in central government.[145] Moreover, a disregard for the feelings of the Utraquist townspeople can be seen in the interference with their religious *via media* by the Calvinist zeal of Frederick's chaplains.[146]

The incompetence of the nobility, which led to a disappearance of the Bohemian sovereign state and to the suppression of its political culture in the aftermath of the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620, could not destroy the intellectual and cultural legacy of the Utraquist sixteenth century. After the hiatus of the Counter Reformation, this heritage revived in harmony with the ensuing era of the Enlightenment of the late eighteenth century. Its endorsement of unshackled learning, humanitarianism, and attachment to the

[142] Josef Janáček, "České stavovské povstání, 1618–1620: Otázky a problémy" [The Bohemian Estates' Uprising, 1618–1620: Questions and Problems] FHB 8 (1985) 26, 32. Concerning military leadership, see František Hrubý, "Nové příspěvky k historii bitvy na Bílé hoře" [New Contributions to the History of the Battle of the White Mountain] ČČM 27 (1922) 277–288.

[143] The Dutch provided a subsidy of 50,000 guilders per month, helped to raise loans for Bohemia in Amsterdam, and sent troops. About one-eighth of the army facing the Emperor at the battle of the White Mountain was Dutch or paid by the United Provinces; see Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 147806* (Oxford, 1995) 469.

[144] For instance, František. J. Kroiher, "Nevlastenectví českých stavů nekatolických v době předbělohorské [The Lack of Patriotism of the Acatholic Bohemian Estates in the Era Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain]," *Sborník historického kroužku* 3 (1894), especially 69; Jaroslav Pánek, "Stavovství v předbělohorské době" [The System of Estates in the Era Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain] FHB 6 (1984) 172.

[145] The new high royal officials were appointed entirely from the noble estates. Soon the towns likewise lost their representation in the county governments; *Přehled dějin Československa* [A Survey of the History of Czechoslovakia], Jaroslav Purš and Miroslav Kropilák, 2 vv. (Prague, 1982) 2:104, 106; Jaroslav Pánek, "Republikánské tendence ve stavovských programech doby předbělohorské [Republican Tendencies in the Programs of the Estates in the Era Prior to the Battle of the White Mountain]," FHB 8 (1985) 49.

[146] Particularly by their iconoclastic cleansing of Prague cathedral in cooperation with the Brethren, see Vincenc Kramář, *Zpustošení chrámu svatého Víta v roce 1619* [The Devastation of the Cathedral of St. Vitus in 1619], ed. Michal Šroněk (Prague, 1998) 41.

civil society – in contrast to the Baroque statism, militancy, and militarism – provided essential ingredients, in a happy symbiosis with the Enlightenment, for the formation of the nineteenth-century political culture in Bohemia. Hence, the wisdom embodied in the literary legacy of the urban statesmen and searchers after truth had not perished, but in a reborn state provided the basis and the guidelines for further political and cultural development.