
Roman Catholic Priest Tomáš Bavorovský († 1562) and the Reception of Erasmus in the Bohemian Lands

Jaroslav Havrlant (Louny)

It may seem surprising that an established Roman Catholic prelate, Tomáš Bavorovský, could still be an overt adherent of Erasmus of Rotterdam in the latter half of the sixteenth century. After all, Erasmus was viewed as a controversial personality, who allegedly had contributed to the rise of the Protestant Reformation. Although he died in 1536 without severing his ties with the Roman Church, his writings appeared very early on the Inquisitorial lists of prohibited literature. Even in recent times most of the studies concerning Erasmus's reception in Bohemia have been directed toward the reformational milieu of Utraquism and the Unity of Brethren. This article, therefore, aims at exploring the little noticed response among the Bohemian *sub una*, who maintained a union with the bishop of Rome and rejected reformational theological input. I do not aim at any new paradigm-altering discoveries, but rather at a summing up of the current state of research.¹

* This article owes its origin to the support of the Grant Agency [Grantová agentura] of Charles University of Prague for the project *Ekleziologie Tomáše Bavorovského († 1562)* [Ecclesiology of Tomáš Bavorovský († 1562)] č. 376/2006/A-TFP/KTF. An edited version has become one of the chapters of my thesis: Jaroslav Havrlant, "Prolegomena k hledání ekleziologických inspirací v životě a díle Tomáše Bavorovského († 1562)" [Prolegomena to the Search for Ecclesiological Inspirations in the Life and Work of Tomáš Bavorovský († 1562)] (Prague, 2010) (doctoral thesis, Catholic Theological Faculty of the Charles University in Prague) 44–57.

¹ A selection from copious literature: František M. Bartoš, "Erasmus a česká reformace" [Erasmus and the Bohemian Reformation] *Theologická příloha Křesťanské revue* 23 (1956) 7–12, 34–41; idem, "Erasmus und die böhmische Reformation," *CV* 1 (1958) 116–123, 246–257; Josef Vintř, "Erasmus Rotterdamský a český humanismus" [Erasmus of Rotterdam and Bohemian Humanism] *Dějiny a současnost* 10,1 (1968) 4–7; Rudolf Říčan, "Die tschechische Reformation und Erasmus," *CV* 16 (1973) 185–206; Jaroslav Kolár, "Erasmovská recepce v české literatuře předbělohorské doby" [Reception of Erasmus in Czech literature of the pre-White Mountain Period] *Miscellanea oddělení rukopisů a starých tisků SKČR* 4 (1984) 232–287 (new edition, idem, *Návraty bez konce. Studie k starší české literatuře* [Returns without End. Studies in Older Czech Literature] ed. Lenka Jiroušková (Brno, 1999) 174–180; idem, "Erasmianische Rezeption in der tschechischen Literatur der Zeit vor der Schlacht am Weissen Berge," in: *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern* II, [Ergänzungsband] (Cologne and Vienna, 1991) 57–66; Michal Svatoš and Martin Svatoš, *Živá tvář Erasma Rotterdamského* [The Living Face of Erasmus of Rotterdam] (Prague, 1985); Josef

First of all, I would like to introduce the nowadays virtually forgotten personage of Tomáš Bavorovský. The National Awakeners knew and admired him in the nineteenth century as an author of four books, written in attractive and florid Czech.² At that time, his texts appeared in readers for secondary schools.³ Subsequently, historians paid scant attention to Bavorovský. The only specific article about him is by Josef Hejnic, and recently Ota Halama edited Tomáš's last theological treatise in his own study of saints in the Bohemian Reformation.⁴

Bavorovský was born into the family of the mayor of Bavorov, a small town in southern Bohemia, as his mother's testament shows.⁵ An interesting person casting an unusual light on Bavorovský himself was his brother Jiřík, who in 1551 matriculated in the Lutheran University of Wittenberg

Hejnic, "Erasmus Rotterdamský a české země v druhém desetiletí 16. století" [Erasmus and the Bohemian Lands in the 1510s] LF 109 (1986) 214–221 (brief version: idem, "Doslov" in: Erasmus Rotterdamský, *Chvála bláznivosti. List Martinu Dorpiovi* (Prague, 1986) 124–136); Mirjam Bohatcová, "Erasmus Rotterdamský v českých tištěných překladech 16.–17. století" [Erasmus of Rotterdam in Czech Printed Translations of the XVI–XVII Centuries], ČNM, řada historická 155 (1986) 37–58; Amedeo Molnár, "Erasmus a husitství" [Erasmus and the Bohemian Reformation], *Miscellanea, oddělení rukopisů a vzácných tisků* 4,2 (1987) 207–232 (also in German, idem, "Erasmus und das Hussitentum," CV 20 (1987) 185–197); Olga Fejtová and Jiří Pešek, "Recepce díla Erasma Rotterdamského v měšťanském prostředí v Čechách na přelomu 16. a 17. století" [Reception of Erasmus of Rotterdam's Works in the Burghers' Milieu of Bohemia at the Turn of the Sixteenth Century] *Miscellanea* 17 (2001–2002) 13–28. On the relation to the Utraquist Church, see David, *Finding*, especially 294–299. I have mainly relied on the writings of Rudolf Říčan and Mirjam Bohatcová.

² Josef Dittrich edited a selection of Bavorovský's works in seven volumes in 1822: Tomáš Bavorovský, *Desatero kázání o svatém pokání* [Ten Sermons on the Sacrament of Penance]; idem, *Dvoje kázání při slavnosti nové mše* [Two Sermons for Celebrating a New Mass]; idem, *Kázání na Evangelium na den Božího Těla* [A Sermon on the Gospel for the Feast of Corpus Christi]; idem, *Kázání na Evangelium na den sv. Trojice* [A Sermon on the Gospel for the Feast of the Holy Trinity]; idem, *Kázání o svatém manželství na Evangelia* [A Sermon on the Gospels about Holy Matrimony] idem, *Zrcadlo věčného a blahoslaveného života* [The Mirror of Eternal and Beatific Life] ([all five] Prague, 1822); idem, *Výklad svatého čtení Na Veliký Pátek* [Explication of the Holy Readings for Good Friday] (Hradec Králové, 1822). Karel Vinařický, [review] "T. Bavorovský, Zrcadlo věčného a blahoslaveného života, ed. J. Dittrich, Praha 1822," *Časopis pro katolické duchovenstvo* 1 (1828) 146–153; Josef Jireček, "Kněz Tomáš Bavorovský a jeho věk" [Priest Tomáš Bavorovský and His Age], *Časopis katolického duchovenstva* 5 (1864) 401–412, 492–505; Jan V. Novák, "Postilla česká kn. Tomáše Bavorovského. Příspěvek ke kulturním dějinám XVI. věku" [The Czech Homiliary of Tomáš Bavorovský. Contribution to the Cultural History of the Sixteenth Century], SH 3 (1885) 138–144, 236–241.

³ Josef Jireček (ed.), *Anthologie z literatury české doby střední. Čítanka pro vyšší gymnasia* (Prague, 1858) 120–126 and several further editions.

⁴ Josef Hejnic, "Tomáš Bavorovský a Český Krumlov," JSH 40 (1971) 78–83; Ota Halama, *Otázka svatých v české reformaci* [The Problem of the Saints in the Bohemian Reformation] (Brno, 2002) 181–219.

⁵ Státní okresní archiv Strakonice, *Archiv města Bavorova*, III B 10, karton č. 42, testament ze dne 29.7. 1559.

(together with other students from Bohemian towns *sub una*).⁶ Only two years later he became an official at the castle of Helfenburk. Later, Jiřík married a wealthy butcher's daughter in Plzeň, moving into his father-in-law's house, and we often find him among the town councillors of Plzeň. In 1578, most likely his son was among the members of the town council who sought to expel the *sub utraque* from Plzeň and who were then "impudently" sued by local evangelicals in the Court of the Land (*zemský soud* i.e. the highest court in Bohemia).⁷

As for Tomáš Bavorovský, we encounter him for the first time also in Plzeň in 1550, but previously he probably served in Jindřichův Hradec.⁸ His earliest printed sermons are found in the revised Czech translation of the homiliary by the German Augustinian, J. Hoffmeister.⁹ The book appeared in 1551, when Bavorovský was a priest in Plzeň and delivered thirteen Lenten sermons on penance as well as sermons on Good Friday and Easter Sunday. These homilies were soon published, and Bavorovský's popularity was on the rise, even though he claimed (in the preface) not to be a learned man.¹⁰ It is attested by a *Poem about the Birth of Jesus Christ* (in Latin) which the Lutheran leaning Matouš Cervus dedicated to the parish priest of Plzeň, and now also an archdeacon, Bavorovský. It appeared in Wittenberg, perhaps still at the time when Tomáš's brother Jiřík was a student there.¹¹ At that time, the youthful Vilém of Rožmberk took over from his guardian's control over the family manor and began to seek able assistants who would be able to realize his intended reforms.

⁶ In the 1550s students from Olomouc, Plzeň, Třeboň and České Budějovice matriculated in the University. The largest number, of course, was from the Protestant Jáchymov. See Ferdinand Menčík, "Studenti z Čech a Moravy ve Witemberku od r. 1502 až do r. 1602" [Students from Bohemia and Moravi in Wittenberg in 1502–1602] ČMKČ 71 (1897) 256.

⁷ Josef Strnad (ed.), *M. Šimona Plachého z Třebnice Paměti Plzeňské* [Memoirs of M. Šimon Plachý of Třebnic] *Prameny a příspěvky k dějinám královského města Plzně* 1 (Plzeň, 1883) 82; Miloslav Bělohávek, Jaromír Kovář, Miloslav Šváb, and Adolf Zeman, *Dějiny Plzně I. Od počátků do roku 1788* [History of Plzeň I. From the Beginnings to 1788] (Plzeň, 1965) 138; Jaroslav Douša, "Městské rady v Plzni a na Starém Městě pražském v letech 1550–1650. Sociální složení rad v letech 1560–1590" [Town Councils in Plzeň and the Old Town of Prague, 1550–1650. Social Composition of the Councils, 1560–1590] *Sborník archivních prací* 32/2 (1982) 346–350.

⁸ Josef Hejnic and Jan Martínek, *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě od konce 15. do začátku 17. století* [A Manual of Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia from the Late Fifteenth to the Early Seventeenth Century] 5 vv. (Prague, 1966–1982) 1: 503, č. 13.ee).

⁹ Johannes Hoffmeister, *Postila česka* [A Bohemian Homiliary] (Prostějov, 1551) f. 376a.

¹⁰ Tomáš Bavorovský, *Kázání o svatém pokání z mnohých kněh učitelův svatých věrně sebraná a se vši pilností sepsaná* [A Sermon about Holy Penance, Faithfully Collected from Many Books of the Holy Teachers, and Composed with Great Diligence] (Prague, 1552); idem, *O umučení Pána a Spasitele našeho Ježíše Krista křesťanské a pobožné rozjímání* [A Christian and Pious Meditation on the Martyrdom of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ], ([Prostějov] 1552); *Knihopis*, II/1–9, *Tisky z let 1501–1800* [Imprints from 1501 to 1800] here II/2: 28–30, no. 1004 and 1006.

¹¹ Matthaeus Cervus, *Carmen de natali Domini nostri Iesu Christi*, (Witebergae [Veit Kreutzer], 1552).

Therefore, he spared no effort in trying to enlist the gifted Tomáš Bavorovský into his own service. The inhabitants of Plzeň, who had furnished the parish house according to Tomáš's wishes, wanted to retain him and went as far as to petition the administrators of the Archbishopric of Prague to that effect. Yet, Thomas wished to please Vilém and to return to his own native region.

His transfer became possible only in April 1553.¹² Bavorovský then was appointed parish priest in Český Krumlov, the seat of the Rožmberks, which meant that he simultaneously held the offices of the Dean of Doudleby and the Archdeacon of Bechyně. There, in less than four years, he composed his most famous work, *Postila česká* [A Bohemian Homiliary], which Vilém of Rožmberk had printed in an exquisite form by the publisher Jan Günther in Olomouc in 1557. The homiliary is considered as the best one of the party *sub una* in the sixteenth century.¹³ It is difficult to judge the attitude, which Bavorovský adopted at that time, towards Vilém's marriage to Katherine of Brunswick, when Rožmberk pledged to respect her Lutheran denomination. A year later, the famous preacher was appointed Dean of the Chapter at the Cathedral of St. Vitus in Prague and, at the request of Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol, he was released from his service on the Rožmberk manor. Because of grave illness, Bavorovský resigned from the Deanery and returned to the parish in Plzeň. There he wrote his last treatise, *Zrcadlo onoho věčného a blahoslaveného života* [The Mirror of the Eternal and Beatific Life] (Prague, 1561), in which he fittingly addressed the issues of the afterlife and the veneration of the saints.¹⁴ He died in Plzeň in September 1562, "leaving not a few debts behind."¹⁵ On the occasion of his death, a poetical eulogy was composed by a burgher of Plzeň Kašpar Cropacius of Kozinec, who was famous for his religious tolerance. Although he was expelled from Plzeň for his "Aatholic" views – and permission to bury him there was refused in 1580 – he still bequeathed a part of his estate to monasteries of his native town.¹⁶

¹² Hejnic, *Tomáš Bavorovský*, 78–83.

¹³ *Postila česká aneb kázání a vejklady na euangelia kteráž se v nedělské dny přes celý rok čtou* [Bohemian Homiliary, or Sermons and Explications of the Gospels, Read on Sundays During the Entire Year] (Olomouc, 1557) (*Knihopis* č. 1005); Hynek Hrubý, *České postilly* (Prague, 1901) 182.

¹⁴ *Zrcadlo onoho věčného a blahoslaveného života, v kterémž se vedlé jisté zprávy Písma svatého spatřiti a viděti muože, jakým životem, a v kterých místech svatí po smrti zuostávají, kterak a v jakém způsobu za nás se přimlouvají a jaký jest rozdíl mezi orodováním Kristovým a svatých jeho* (Prague, 1561) (*Knihopis* č. 1007). As noted earlier, the treatise was edited by Josef Dittrich and Ota Halama.

¹⁵ "...nemálo dluhů jest po sobě pozůstavil..." Klement Borový, ed., *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické i utrakvistické* [Protocols and Letters of the Catholic and the Utraquist Consistories] v. 2, *Akta konsistoře katolické* [Documents of the Catholic Consistory] (Prague, 1869) 354.

¹⁶ Kašpar Cropacius, *Cropacii Poemata* (Norimberg, 1581) 175–176; Josef Hejnic and Jan Martinek, *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě od konce 15. do začátku 17. století* [A Manual of Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia from the Late Fifteenth to the Early Seventeenth Century] 5 vv. (Prague, 1966–1982) 1:497–506.

Tomáš received substantial assistance in language editing and publication arrangements from his close friend Jan Straněnský, an experienced editor and translator. Straněnský was in the service of the Count Palatine [*purkrabí*] of Karlštejn, Jáchym of Hradec and it was to him and to his wife Anna of Rožmberk that Tomáš dedicated his first two books. Most likely, the noble pair underwrote the cost of their publication. Tomáš's friendship with Straněnský may seem surprising considering the fact that Straněnský is considered a Utraquist. Born in the South Bohemian town of Počátky, he spent practically his whole life (certainly the years 1545–1585) in the service of the *sub una* barons of Hradec. Of course, he did not have to conform to them in religion. Archivist Jan Muk was convinced that Straněnský adhered to Utraquism, and his payment for the reconstruction of the chaplaincy *sub una* in Jindřichův Hradec (1564) was an expression of gratitude for the permission of communion in both kinds. A more cogent indication of his religious conviction was the fact that in 1584 he published – without the Archbishop's permission – a calendar, which included the feast days of Hus and Jerome. He translated and published authors *sub una* as well as Lutheran ones.¹⁷

Even more interesting is Bavorovský's cooperation with the mentioned Matouš Cervus, a Protestant from Jáchymov, who in the time of Tomáš's stay in Český Krumlov was appointed a principal of the local school. There is a letter in which the Dean of Krumlov, that is Bavorovský, invited Vilém of Rožmberk to attend Plautus's comedy about a miser, which Cervus skillfully staged with his pupils. His origin from a Lutheran town and an anti-papal poem led Josef Hejnic to classify Cervus as a Lutheran. Nevertheless, from 1553 onwards he worked as a teacher and a physician in regions more or less *sub una* in Austria and southern Bohemia (Vienna, Linz, Český Krumlov, České Budějovice, and Prachatic).¹⁸ In my opinion, the adherence of Straněnský and Cervus to their respective denominations was rather vague.

¹⁷ See Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII. věku (v způsobě slovníka životopisného a knihoslovního)* [Manual of the History of Czech Literature till the End of the Eighteenth Century: A Biographic and Bibliographic Dictionary] (Prague, 1876) 2:246–248; Jan Muk, “Tomáš Rešl z Jindřichova Hradce a Jan Straněnský z Počátek, spisovatelé staročeští” [Tomáš Rešl of Jindřichův Hradec and Jan Straněnský of Počátky, Early Czech Writers] ČSPŠČ 26 (1928) 82–86, 123–133; Martin Bedřich, *Dílo Jana Straněnského. Alternativa křesťanského humanismu* [The Work of Jan Straněnský: An Alternative of Christian Humanism] (Prague, 2005) (diplomová práce, Katedra české literatury a literární vědy FF UK v Praze). The friendship of Bavorovský and Straněnský is cited as an admirable example of cooperation between the parties *sub una* and *sub utraque* by David, 140–141.

¹⁸ Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*, 1:356–358; Josef Hejnic, “Českokrumlovská latinská škola v době rožmberské” [The Latin School in Český Krumlov in the Rožmberk Period] *Rozpravy ČSAV, řada společenských věd* 82,2 (1972) 25–28, 38, 43; Aleš Stejskal, “Divadelní představení v Českém Krumlově v roce 1556 (Příspěvek ke kulturním dějinám rezidenčního města)” [Theatrical Plays in Český Krumlov in 1556. (Contribution to the Cultural History of a Manorial Seat)] *Výběr* 33,4 (1996) 254–267.

It is, however, certain that both had embraced the ideals of tolerance and biblical Humanism à la Erasmus and Melanchton.

The writings of Bavorovský are distinguished not only by his exquisite Czech language and style, but also by his emphasis on ethical values, derived almost exclusively from Scripture. Such a biblicism had been for a long time popular among the Christian Humanists. Arguing from a source shared by various denominations made possible a broader reception of the author, which was useful especially in the Bohemian Lands. Tomáš rarely refers to the ancient Church Fathers, and occasionally he notes events or experiences from contemporary life. This manner of Gospel exegesis corresponds to Erasmus's guide for dealing with a biblical text. In fact, Bavorovský already refers to Erasmus in the introduction to his *Homiliary*, where he cites from the preface of the latter's famous *Paraphrase on the Gospel According to Matthew*. Both authors support the right of the poor and uneducated to read Scripture in their own mother tongue.¹⁹ Similarly, it may seem surprising that as a preacher *sub una* Bavorovský would still in the 1550s closely collaborate with a presumed Utraquist Straněnský, or even with Lutheran Cervus. Nevertheless, this circumstance indicates that the influence of Erasmus – whose tolerance and stand above the confessional strife were famous – continued and developed further.

It is my wish to answer the question, why Bavorovský, a recognized prelate *sub una*, was not reluctant to adhere proudly to Erasmus even after the Jesuits' advent in Prague. It is well known that the Prince of the Humanists was then accepted by virtually all the Christian groups. It also meant, of course, that he was rejected by almost everyone after the commencement of confessionalisation, which is usually connected with the Jesuits and the Tridentine Council. As we shall see, the Erasmianism of Bavorovský was not an isolated phenomenon in Bohemia and continued for a considerable time before its suppression.

Among the sources of Bohemian provenience we find the name of the Dutch savant for the first time in connection with his now most famous work *Chvála bláznivosti* (in Greek *Mórias enkómion*) [In Praise of Folly]. Already at that point this satire appealed to both the Utraquists and the *sub una*. On the Utraquist side it was the Humanist Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení, who translated the *Mórias enkómion* into the vernacular for the councilors of the Old Town in 1513. He tried to make accessible to his co-believers the most recent ideas

¹⁹ In *Paraphrasis in evangelium Matthaei* (Basel, 1522) Erasmus develops his defense of the Bible in national languages, adumbrated in his earlier writings, namely, in the preface to the commentary on the first Psalm *Beatus vir* (1515) and, especially, in *Paraclesis – Povzbuzení*, that is, in a part of the introduction to his Greek-Latin edition of the New Testament (1516/1519). See also Heinz Holeczek, *Humanistische Bibelphilologie als Reformproblem bei Erasmus von Rotterdam, Thomas More und William Tyndale*, [Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 9] (Leiden, 1975) 188–202. For the introduction to Bavorovský's *Postila česká* see Jireček, *Kněz Tomáš Bavorovský*, 406–412.

of the Humanist ambiance, which could assist their opposition vis à vis Rome and to remain in step with the culture of western and southern Europe. The exploration of burghers' libraries regrettably indicated indirectly that the published text of the book probably did not enjoy a wide circulation either in translation or in the original.²⁰

On the side of the *sub una*, at the same time, the *Mórias enkómion* (and also *Rukověť Křesťanského rytíře* [The Manual of a Christian Knight] and other books by Erasmus) fell into the hands of the erudite members of the Olomouc Chapter, where Humanistic studies flourished thanks to the learned society *Sodalitas litteraria Marcomannica* (*Societas Maierhofiana*). This reception is indicated by the correspondence of the Provost Augustine of Olomouc with Bishop Stanislav Thurzů from the turn of 1512.²¹ This long-serving Bishop, after the death of his brother Jan Thurzo, Bishop of Wrocław, opened up a cordial correspondence with Erasmus and supported his labours not only through encouraging words of praise, but also financially. In return, Erasmus dedicated to the Bishop of Olomouc two of his books (his edition of *Naturalis historia* of Pliny the Elder [1525] and the *Explication of the Thirty-Eighth Psalm* [1535]).²² A useful intermediary between Erasmus and the two bishops, Jan and Stanislav, was the gifted Silesian poet Kašpar Ursinus Velius, a future tutor of King Ferdinand's offspring.²³

²⁰ Emil Pražák, *Řehoř Hrubý z Jelení. Studie s ukázkami z díla* [Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení: A Study with Samples of his Writings] (Prague, 1964) 45–47, and many others after him state that the translation was published by Mikuláš Konáč in 1512, but this fact can not be proven as indicated by Říčan, *Die tschechische Reformation*, 198 n. 4. The book *Chvála bláznovství* has been found rarely in the burghers' libraries of Prague and Louny. On the contrary, in Polish towns *Mória* belonged among the most popular works of Erasmus. See Fejtová and Pešek, *Recepte*, 13–28. See also Jaroslav Kolár, "Překlad Řehoře Hrubého z Erasmových Adagií" [Translation by Řehoř Hrubý from Erasmus's Adagia] LF 111 (1988) 103–109.

²¹ Martin Rothkegel, ed., *Der lateinische Briefwechsel des Olmützer Bischofs Stanislaus Thurzů. Eine ostmitteleuropäische Humanistenkorrespondenz der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts* [Hamburger Beiträge zur Neulateinischen Philologie: 5] (Hamburg, 2007) 45–46 and no. 14, 15; Hejnic, *Erasmus Rotterdamský*, 216. About *Societas Maierhofiana*, for instance, Ivo Hlobil and Eduard Petrů, *Humanismus a raná renesance na Moravě* (Prague, 1992) 30–35, 150–165; also English, trans., *Humanism and the Early Renaissance in Moravia* (Olomouc, 1999); Vojtěch Cekota, "Z názorů olomouckých humanistů v první polovině 16. století" [The Views of Early Olomouc Humanists in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century] *Studia Comeniana et Historica* 13 (1983) n. 26, sborník, 163–168.

²² Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdam*, eds. Percy S. Allen, Helen M. Allen and Heathcote W. Garrod, 12 vv. (Oxford, 1906–1958) 4: Epp 1242, 1243, 5: Epp 1267, 1272; 6: Ep 1544; 9: Ep 2608; 10: Ep 2699; Rothkegel, ed., *Der lateinische Briefwechsel*, 70–73 and Epp 29, 30, 32, 33, 37, 61, 62; Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*, 5:370–372; for Czech trans. of letters, see Svatoš and Svatoš, *Živá tvář*, 362–368. On Bishop Thurzů, see Peter G. Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus. A biographical register of the Renaissance and Reformation* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London, 2003) 3:324–325.

²³ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 2: Ep 548; 3: Epp 851, 944; 5: Ep 1514; 6: Ep 1557; 7: Epp 1917, 2008; 8: Ep 2313; 9: Ep 2517; 10: Ep 2664. Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*, 5:423–426; Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 3:356–357.

After Stanislav's death in 1540 the vacant see of Olomouc was contested by two of Erasmus's admirers, Jan Dubravius and Jan Horák Házmburský of Milešovka. Born in Plzeň, Dubravius showed his open adherence to Erasmus already in his first writings as a Canon of the Olomouc Chapter. It was partly in the commentaries in his edition of the late Roman author Martian Capella's *Nuptiae Mercurii cum Philologia* (Vienna, 1516), partly in his famous fable in verse *Theribolia* [The Council of Animals] (Nuremberg, 1520), where there are echoes of ideas adopted from various of Erasmus's writings, including *Mórias enkómion*. As Bishop of Olomouc, he showed greater tolerance than his predecessor Thurzů. For instance, he petitioned for the release from jail of Jan Augusta, Bishop of the Unity of Brethren.²⁴ Dubravius's opponent Jan Horák, Provost of the Litoměřice Chapter, renounced his candidacy. Later, the estates of Bohemia suggested him as a candidate for the archiepiscopal see of Prague, where he was to serve both the *sub una* and the Utraquists. He was even dispatched as a Legate to the Council of Trent. Horák earned fame at the University of Leipzig, where he collaborated with Johannes Cochläus in combating Luther's alleged errors. At that time, he established contact with Erasmus, when in 1530 he sent him for assessment an Anti-Lutheran tract of Konrad Wipina.²⁵ After the death of the earlier mentioned Ursinus Velius in 1539, Horák – perhaps on account of his Erasmianism – was entrusted with the education of King Ferdinand's children, whom he taught not only Latin and German, but also Czech. Therefore, he supplied the incentive for the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrasis in evangelium Matthaei* as *Parafráze na Matoušovo evangelium* (Litoměřice, 1542). The translation was done by the Prague burgher and a Hebrew scholar, Jan Vartovský of Varta, who had become famous as the author of the first translation – subsequently lost – of the Old Testament from the original languages into Czech.²⁶

Thus, we arrive at a time when Erasmus's pedagogical works and textbooks were used in Bohemia mainly in schools. Although gradually pupils of all denominations were to become familiar with them, their use began in the Latin schools of the party *sub una*. Specifically, it was Plzeň, always loyal to Rome, that maintained lively contacts with Germany, and where the teacher,

²⁴ Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť* II: 74–84. Also the next Bishop of Olomouc Vilém Prusinovský of Víckov was fond of Erasmus; see Miloš Kouřil, "Vztah olomouckých biskupů k Erasmusovi Rotterdamskému" [The Relationship of the Bishops of Olomouc to Erasmus of Rotterdam] *Studia Comeniana et historica*, 18 (1988) n. 35, supplement, 120–126.

²⁵ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 8: Ep 2247; Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*, 2:332–336; Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 2:202–203; 3:450–451.

²⁶ Regrettably, Vartovský did not include in the translation of the *Paraphrasis* Erasmus's preface, which Bavorovský cites; Bohatcová, *Erasmus Rotterdamský*, 44–46; *Knihopis* n. 2348. The translation (the printer of which is unknown) was dedicated to King Ferdinand and more especially to his sons, whom Horák tutored in Litoměřice. This gave rise to the assumption that the translated volume was to serve pedagogical purposes.

Ondřej Strojek, translated as early as 1526 the text, *Výsoce umělého Desideria Erasma Roterodama spis obšírný, plně a dokonale vykládaje Otčenáš, modlitbu nám od Krista předepsanú* [Treatise of the erudite Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam explaining fully and perfectly the Lord's Prayer, the prayer prescribed for us by Christ].²⁷ Another teacher, Bachelor Jan Petřík of Benešov, frequently used Erasmus's books in teaching the children of the manorial lord in Jindřichův Hradec, and eagerly sided with the *sub una*. He translated several conversations from the *Colloquia*, Erasmus's psalms and prayers. He also furnished in 1530 what was the first vernacular translation of the famous pedagogical manual of morals and etiquette, *De civilitate morum*.²⁸ Later, Petřík was appointed town scribe in České Budějovice which, thanks to his double-dealing, remained loyal to the King during the estates' uprising of 1547.²⁹

The initial mediation of Erasmus's works through the *sub una* should not be a matter of wonderment. Humanism, of which the Dutch sage was a prime representative – he was even called the Prince of the Humanists – habitually was favoured by the Roman loyalists. The representatives of Utraquism were rather suspicious of “foreign innovations”. For instance, Mikuláš Konáč of Hodiškov admonishes his readers to love Hus more than Erasmus or Luther.³⁰ Humanist studies flourished in the larger towns of the party *sub una*, while Charles University was mainly concerned with providing material support for its staff and colleges and with the maintenance of Utraquist orthodoxy. The

²⁷ *Knihopis*, n. 2366.

²⁸ Excerpts from *Colloquia* (*Poctivé a nábožné rozmlouvání dítek*, 1534, *Knihopis* n. 2363) and *De civilitate morum puerilium libellus* (*Knížka utěšená... o mravích dítek*, 1537, *Knihopis* n. 2364) were published in the Old Town of Prague, but no copies have survived; Bohatcová, *Erasmus Rotterdamský*, 43. See also the manuscript collection in the Strahov Library, call no. DG V 21. The author of another translation from *Colloquia*, preserved in a single copy *Rozmlouvání... kterak manželé spolu nakládati mají* (1538, *Knihopis* n. 2362), might have been, according to Kleinschnitzová, the Prague patrician and a Utraquist, Sixt of Ottersdorf; Flora Kleinschnitzová, “Erasma Roterodámského ‘Uxor mempsigamos’ v českém překladě” [*Uxor mempsigamos* of Erasmus of Rotterdam in Czech translation], *Bratislava. Časopis Učené společnosti Šafaříkovy* 5 (1931) 553–564. The lost *Rozmlouvání čtyř starců o rozličných přibězích lidských* (1534), which used to be in the Rožmberk Library, was probably also printed in Prague, but possibly in Náměšť nad Osavou; Lenka Veselá, *Knihy na dvoře Rožmberků* [Books at the Court of the Rožmberks] (Prague, 2005) 274, n. 109.

²⁹ Karel Pletzer, “Českobudějovický písař Jan Petřík z Benešova (příspěvek k dějinám české literatury XVI. století)” [The Scribe of Český Budějovice, Jan Petřík of Benešov (A Contribution to the History of Sixteenth-Century Czech Literature)], *JSH* 28 (1959) 17–24, 40–47. Petřík's son Václav was appointed chancellor of Archbishop Brus, and later served even as Bavarian Legate at the Papal Court; Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*. 4:156.

³⁰ In a preface to his selection from Hus's explications [*Mistra Jana Husy... výkladové* (Prague, 1520)] (*Knihopis* č. 3266) Konáč admonished the dedicant, “aby více miloval svého Čecha [rozuměj Mistra Jana], učitele skutečného, nežli německé mnichy Erasma Roterodámského, Martina Luthera i některé domácí nyníjší více než sluší výmluvné.” J. Hejnic, “Erasmus Rotterdamský,” 218.

faculty's efforts (for instance, by Řehoř Hrubý of Jelení and Václav Písecký) to raise the level of instructions in classical languages unfortunately were not successful. Wishing to work at the highest level of European Humanism, the son of Řehoř, Zikmund Gelenius, had to leave Prague and travel to Erasmus in Basel. At last in the 1540s, Matouš Collinus of Chotěřina, who had studied under Melancthon, was able to teach Greek at the University at an appropriate level and to read with the students not only the ancient classics, but also Erasmus's *De ratione conscribendi epistulas*.³¹

Yet, it would be improper to overlook the contribution of the Utraquists and the Unity of Brethren to the propagation of Erasmus's work in Bohemia and Moravia. It is apropos to recall that the most distinguished theologian of the Unity, Lukáš of Prague, already in 1517 included in his treatise *O šesti příčinách bludův obecných* [On the six causes of common errors] parts of *Rukověť křesťanského rytíře* which was, together with explications of the New Testament and the *Paraphrasis*, the most frequently read of Erasmus's writings.³² The entire *Rukověť* was translated in Bělá pod Bezdězem in 1519 by the anti-papal Humanist Oldřich Velenský who introduced the Bohemians in a printed form not only to Erasmus but also to Luther.³³ The journey of Mikuláš Klaudyán to Erasmus in Antwerp with the Unity's *Apologie* [Apology] is well known and much discussed in literature.³⁴ Neither he, nor Arkleb of Boskovice, the Supreme Captain of Moravia, received the anticipated positive assessment of the Unity's teaching from the pre-occupied savant.³⁵ Consequently, after Erasmus's break

³¹ Michal Svatoš, "Kališnická univerzita (1419–1556)" [The Utraquist University, 1419–1556] *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy*, I, 1347/48–1622, ed. Svatoš (Prague, 1995) 215–216; Jiří Pešek, "Výuka a humanismus na pražské univerzitě doby předbělohorské" [Teaching and Humanism at the Prague University in the Pre-White Mountain Period] *ibid.*, 227; Svatoš, "Pokusy o reformu a zánik karolinské akademie" [Attempts at Reform and the End of the Caroline Academy] *ibid.*, 269, 281.

³² J. Hejnic, "Erasmus Rotterdamský," 218; Fejtová and Pešek, "Receptce," 18.

³³ *Knihopis* č. 2351. In the next two months Velenský managed to publish in Czech, according to Erasmus's Latin text, Lucian's *Kratochvilní... žaloby chudých a bohatých před Saturnem* [Entertaining... Complaints by the Poor and the Rich to Saturn], sharp-witted moralistic discourses, as well *Spolurozmlouvání svatého Petra, apoštola, a nejsvatějšího Julia Druhého, papeže* [Conversation of St. Peter, the Apostle, with the Most Holy Julius II, the Pope], another sharp satire then – and mostly also nowadays – ascribed to Erasmus. The author denounces the frequently warring Pope. *Knihopis* č. 4992, 15625; Bohatcová, "Erasmus Rotterdamský," 39–42, 52–53; Antonie Jan Lamping, *Ulrich Velenus (Oldřich Velenský) and his Treatise against the Papacy* (Leiden, 1975).

³⁴ Klaudyán's journey – in the company of Bachelor Vavřinec Votík – is described, for instance by Josef Šusta, "P. Allen, The Age of Erasmus. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1914. Str. 313," [a review], *ČČH* 22 (1916) 188–192; Bartoš, "Erasmus a česká reformace," 34; Paul De Vooght, "Un épisode peu connu de la vie d'Érasme: sa rencontre avec les hussites bohèmes en 1519–1521," *Irénikon* 47,1 (1974) 27–47; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 2:261–263.

³⁵ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 4: Ep 1154, 1183; Bartoš, "Erasmus a česká reformace," 36–37. Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1:174–175.

with Luther, the radical wing of the Bohemian Reformation leaned more toward the famous theologian of Wittenberg. The Prague chronicler, Bartoš Písař called Erasmus “a Christian teacher according to the law of God,” who was elevated “above the usual character of the German nation”; Luther, of course, is for him the elect of God, who would lead the nations from blindness into the divine light.³⁶

Disrespectful treatment of Erasmus was more of an exception than a rule among the *sub una* in Bohemia. For instance, Jan Šlechta of Všehrdy, who was apparently the first of the Bohemian Humanists to correspond with the Dutch savant, tells us about a Prague canon, who allegedly claimed that Erasmus had been burned together with his books in Cologne.³⁷ In the same period, on the contrary, another canon of St. Vitus's Cathedral was teaching Erasmus to the pupils of the school in Plzeň.³⁸ Such a positive approach was proper not only to tolerant Humanists. Ten years later in 1529, an Augustinian Jan Vodňanský, originally a Calixtine, who then avidly attacked both the Unity and the Utraquists, nevertheless recognised in his treatise *Satanášova věž* [Satan's Tower] the difference between Erasmus and Luther in their approach to ecclesiastical reforms. Although initially Erasmus, driven by the devil, almost became the author of Lutheran heresy, later he did not wish to sail in the church's vessel without a helmsman. Subsequently, he never ceased to bombard this Antichrist (i.e., Luther) with fiery arrows and sharp missiles from Holy Scripture.³⁹

Although in Erasmus's extensive correspondence we encounter Bohemians and Moravians, who wished to avoid subordination to Rome's authority, such as the noted Arkleb of Boskovice, nevertheless those *sub una* predominated.

³⁶ FRB 6: XIV, 30–32; Říčan, “Die tschechische Reformation,” 190; Molnár, “Erasmus a husitství,” 207–208; Josef Macek, *Víra a zbožnost jagellonského věku* (Prague, 2001) 347.

³⁷ Properly speaking we learn this directly from Erasmus who in this sense responded to a lost letter from Šlechta; Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 3: Ep 950; see also trans. in Svatoš and Svatoš, *Živá tvář*, 346; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 3:259–260.

³⁸ Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*, 5:490–500; Josef Hejnic, *Latinská škola v Plzni a její postavení v Čechách (13.–18. století)*, *Rozpravy ČSAV, řada společenských věd* 89, no. 2 (1979) 17, 20.

³⁹ [26r] “... Ale Erazim Rotorodan už byl téměř všeho toho počátek, však vytrhl se z nich a zdaleka se jim díval, až teď ku posledku jsa jako přinucen [26v] bodlavým a jedovatým Luterovým psaním, jakož i od počátku, když mu čert připaloval, jinak psáti neuměl. Teprv jistě a pravě odpovědi dává, že přitom roztrženým shromáždění nikdáž nechtěl státi, ani bez zprávce plavčího chtěl se na lodí plaviti, hledaje jistého i vopustil nejisté. Znáje, že lodička Petrova nikdáž nebude bez zprávce. A ač vlnobitím důmyslův a bludův kaceřských bude zmítána, však nikdáž nepotune, ale vždy vyplyne a k svému upokojení prvněmu přide. ...” [33r] “... Po těch najposlěz prve vychvalovaný doktor Erazimus od toho Lutera, ale již jeho ježkovým a bodlavým písmem přiboden a přimúzen, s mocnými diely přitáhl k dobývání té věže, v ničemž sebe při té práci nelituje, vohnivými [33v] šípy a vostrými střelami Pisma svatého nepřestává střeleti na toho antikrista. ...” (MS NK Prague, XVII G 13, f. 26r–26v, 33r–33v). Říčan, “Die tschechische Reformation,” 191.

I have already mentioned most of them.⁴⁰ A native of Cheb, Johann Wildenauer, known also as Sylvius Egranus, visited Erasmus in Louvain in 1520. He had initially avidly embraced Luther's innovations in Jáchymov, but soon – perhaps thanks to his friendship with Erasmus – he repudiated Lutheranism and eventually died as a *sub una*.⁴¹ Other Humanists, who entered into contact with Erasmus, hailed from the opulent and populous Jáchymov, where ultimately Lutheranism prevailed due to the powerful influence of the neighboring Saxony. The local school master, Petrus Plateanus,⁴² and the sons of the mine manager, Heinrich von Könneritz, adhered to Luther.⁴³ On the contrary, the famous physician, Georgius Agricola, whose treatise on mining *Bermannus* appeared in Basel in 1530 with Erasmus's preface, remained loyal to Rome.⁴⁴ The secular Provost of Vyšehrad, the Knight Petr Bechyně of Lažany, was perhaps the last of the Czechs who hastily wrote to the Prince of Humanists and who adhered to his ideas. He posted his letter in 1535 during a stay in northern Italy in the town of Bassano del Grappa, the proprietors of which were the wealthy Šliks of Jáchymov.⁴⁵

If a letter was sent to Erasmus from Prague, its author was always a foreign Humanist from the royal suite, inevitably a *sub una*. These correspondents included the Magyar savant, Jakab Piso, the secretary of King Louis Jagellon;⁴⁶ Johann Fabri, King Ferdinand I's confessor;⁴⁷ and the Bishop of Trent,

⁴⁰ Stanislav Thurzó, Ursinus Velius, Jan Horák, and Jan Šlechta. The last-named adhered to the *sub una*, although he was an alumnus of the University of Prague and hired a Utraquist, Václav Písecký, to teach one of his sons; another son studied under Melancthon.

⁴¹ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 4, 409, note 12; 5: Ep 1377. For instance, he visited Erasmus in 1520, 1523, 1531, but he had been in personal contact with him also at an earlier time; Molnár, "Erasmus a husitství," 211; Alfred Eckert, "Leben und Lehre des Johann Wildenauer (Sylvius Egranus)," *Erbe und Auftrag der Reformation in den böhmischen Ländern* 12/14 (1974–1975) 19–36; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1:425–426.

⁴² Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 8: Ep 2216. Plateanus, Erasmus's compatriot, was then helping Agricola with the publication of his treatise on mining, *Bermannus*. He visited Erasmus in Freiburg in 1533, but he might have known Erasmus since his studies at the Collegium Trilingue in Louvain. Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 3:99–100.

⁴³ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 8: Ep 2274; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 2:270–272. Brothers Andreas and Christoph, – and perhaps also Erasmus – studied around 1530 in Freiburg, where they resided in Erasmus's house. Erasmus dedicated to the brothers a letter as an introduction to Agricola's *Bermann*. Georgius Agricola, *Bermannus aneb Rozmluva o hornictví*, Radim Kettner ed., Jan Reiniš trans. (Prague, 1957) 17, 44–46; idem, *Bermannus (Le Mineur): Un dialogue sur les mines*, Robert Halleux and Albert Yans edd. (Paris, 1990).

⁴⁴ Still in 1531, Agricola wrote to Erasmus from Jáchymov, but only the answer is extant; Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 9: Ep 2529; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1:13–14.

⁴⁵ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 9: Ep 3027; Petr Bechyně († 1561) studied in Bologna, Ferrara and perhaps also Padua since 1530. Later, as Captain of the Old Town, he served as one of the *defensores* of the Consistory *sub una*; Tomek, *Dějepis* 9:117; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1:114.

⁴⁶ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 5: Ep 1297; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 3:94–95.

⁴⁷ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 7: Ep 2000; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 2:5–8.

Bernardo Clesio, Ferdinand's long-time counselor, who wrote to Erasmus three times.⁴⁸ It is known that Ferdinand I himself and his sister Maria, the spouse of King Louis, were in frequent contact with Erasmus and the members of his entourage.⁴⁹ As noted, Utraquist Prague maintained a rather reserved attitude toward the Humanist innovations. Somewhat belatedly, Charles University offered to appoint as teacher of Greek Zikmund, the son of Řehoř Hrubý, who – as noted earlier – worked directly with Erasmus in the Basel printing house since 1524. Zikmund, however was not interested in a teaching position, and declined a similar invitation to Nuremberg. Matouš Collinus, who accepted the position in Prague, supported an orientation of the University and of many *sub utraque* toward Wittenberg University and Luther's teaching. One may ask hypothetically, whether Zikmund Gelenius would have supported in Bohemia a trend toward the teaching of Erasmus, had he taught Greek in Prague.⁵⁰

The translation of Erasmus's apologetic treatise *O ustanovení v církvi (De interdicto esu carniūm)*, 1522) appeared in 1542 in Prague, but its dedication aimed at the Utraquists: "To the Lord Mayor and the Council of the City of Hradec nad Labem." Its appearance then was very apropos, inasmuch as at that time the ecclesiastical councils of the *sub utraque* dealt with the issues of celebrating the feast days, preserving the "ancient ceremonies," and believing in the intercession of saints. It was then rumoured that the neglect of feast days and fasts had led to the calamity in the form of the Turkish threat. The orthodox Utraquists were on the defensive against the Lutheran tendencies and unwilling to abandon the veneration of saints.⁵¹ The translator Jiřík Anděl Králohradecký praises Erasmus, as follows: "...his approach is neat and moderate, and he nowhere entirely disparages ceremonies – because they are aids to true religion – but he notes what might be the utility of fasts, and when and how one should fast. He touches also on clerical marriages, and he observes in this matter their justification by the law of the Lord. Also [he points out] what is the improper and proper celebration of feast days, and the reasons for celebrating some of them. Only about these three matters it is written in this

⁴⁸ Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, 6: Ep 1793; 10: Ep 2921; 11: Ep 2941; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 1:313–315.

⁴⁹ On personalities at the court of the Jagellonian kings, including Queen Maria, see Lajos Nyikos, "Erasmus und der böhmisch-ungarische Königshof," *Zwingliana* 7 (1937) 346–374. On Maria's confessor and preacher (born in the Slovak Levoča) see Adalbert Hudak, "Der Hofprediger Johannes Henckel und seine Beziehungen zu Erasmus von Rotterdam," *Kirche im Osten* 2 (1959) 106–113; Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 2:17–20, 399–401, 175–176.

⁵⁰ On Gelenius: Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus* 2:84–85. On Collinus: Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť*, 1:416–451; Josef Hejnic, "Filip Melanchthon, Matouš Collinus a počátky měšťanského humanismu v Čechách" [Philip Melanchthon, Matouš Collinus, and the Beginnings of Burghers' Humanism in Bohemia] *LF* 87 (1964) 361–379. On the situation at the University of Prague, see n. 31 above.

⁵¹ Halama, *Otázka svatých v české reformaci*, 78–80.

booklet, and thus these [observances] could be justified, if they are conducted according to God's will...."⁵²

Another theological treatise, *Kázání osvíceného muže Erasma Roterodamského: O nesmírném milosrdenství Božském* (*De immensa Dei misericordia* 1524) appeared in Moravia in 1558. It was printed by Kašpar Aorg in Prostějov, who collaborated with the Olomouc publisher, Jan Günther. Except for the fact that Aorg was probably a sympathizer with the Unity of Brethren, nothing else is known about the translator or the circumstances of the publication. The treatise was subsequently published for the second time by Jiřík Melantrich in Prague in 1573.⁵³

If initially conditions in Prague did not favour Humanistic studies, this was not true of the entire Czech-speaking territory. A kind of Erasmian centre could be found in Moravia in Náměšť nad Oslavou. In a way, one might say that here appeared in the 1530s the first Czech "ecumenical" translation of the New Testament, and it was done according to the Latin text of Erasmus. The authors Beneš Optát and Petr Gzel were Utraquists, a priest *sub una* Václv Philomates provided linguistic advice, and the publication was assisted by Kašpar Aorg, then a printer of the Habrovany sect.⁵⁴

⁵² "... k tomu pěkně a právě prostředkem přistoupá a nikdež ceremonií zcela (nebo nemají se všechny tupiti, protože jsou nápomcné k náboženství pravému) netupí, nýbrž oznamuje, jací by byli užitékové postu i kdy neb jak se mají postiti. Dotýká se i ženění kněží, a podlé vyměření zákona Páně při tom se jest zachoval. Též jaké jest nepořádné i pořádné svěcení svátkuov a příčiny některých k svěcení. A o tom třem toliko v této knížce se píše, a mohlo by proto ... to vyměření státi, kdyby toliko se zachovali v tom podlé vůle Boží..." The citation is in Bohatcová, "Erasmus Rotterdamský," 46–47. On the history and theology of Erasmus's treatise, see Cornelis Augustijn, *Erasmus. Der Humanist als Theologe und Kirchenreformer* (Leiden – New York – Cologne, 1996) 220–232.

⁵³ Bohatcová, "Erasmus Rotterdamský," 48, 51.

⁵⁴ On Aorg, see Petr Voit, *Encyklopedie knihy. Starší knihtisk a příbuzné obory mezi polovinou 15. a počátkem 19. století* [Encyclopedia of the Book: Older Printing and Related Fields from the Mid-Fifteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries] (Prague, 2006) 61–62. I guess at Philimates's confession from his birth in Jindřichův Hradec and studies in Vienna; see Hejnic and Martínek, *Rukověť* 4:165–166; Václav Philomates, *Musicorum libri quattuor. Čtyři knihy o hudbě*, ed. Martin Horyna (Prague, 2003). According to Hrejsa, Optát inclined toward Lutheranism in his anti-Roman standpoint, and was close to the sect of Habrovany and to the Unity, but "he in principle opposed any fragmentation of the church, and separation from it into smaller units." Ferdinand Hrejsa, "K českým dějinám náboženským za prvních let Ferdinanda I., II. Beneše Optáta Výklad epistol ap. Pavla z r. 1528. a Postilla z r. 1527" [On Czech Religious History During the Early Years of Ferdinand I., II. Beneš Optát's Explication of St. Paul's Epistles from 1528, and Homiliary from 1527] ČČH 21 (1915) 179–216; Martin Rothkegel, *Mährische Sakramentier des zweiten Viertels des 16. Jahrhunderts: Matěj Poustevník, Beneš Optát, Johann Zeising (Jan Čížek), Jan Dubčanský ze Zdenína und die Habrovaner (Lulčer) Brüder* [Bibliotheca bibliographica Aureliana; 208; Bibliotheca dissidentium; 24] (Baden-Baden and Bouxwiller, 2005) 41–100. For a perceptive characterisation of the Erasmian spirit, which is endemic in the *Grammar* of Náměšť, see Oldřich Králík, "Humanismus a počátky českého mluvnictví" [Humanism and the Beginnings of Czech Linguistics] in: *Pocita Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi*, edd. Antonín Grund, Adolf Kellner, and Josef Kurz (Brno, 1948) 253–275.

The financial support for the translation of the New Testament in 1533 was provided by Johanka of Boskovice, the abbess of the Cistercian monastery Králové in Staré Brno. Johanka, however, aroused much hostility among the nuns, perhaps because of her carefree expenditure of the monastic funds, or perhaps because of her exceptional tolerance toward the Anabaptists, whom she permitted to reside in villages that belonged to the monastery. In any case, she had to resign her office a year before the publication of the New Testament, although she could remain at the monastery.⁵⁵ It is not without interest that Johanka had, on one side, brother Arkleb of Boskovice (+1528), the earlier mentioned Captain of the Land, and, on the other side a sister Apolonia, who survived the Protestant wave as abbess of the Monastery of Tišnov until her death in 1540. Another interesting fact is that Beneš Optát, who according to Hrejša was influenced by the teaching of Luther and Zwingli, translated the New Testament at the request of the head of a convent. Similarly the first Bible in the Czech language originated almost two centuries earlier to meet the needs of nuns.⁵⁶ These

⁵⁵ Johanka served as an abbess from 1598 to 1532. She permitted the Anabaptists to settle in Hustopeč in 1530. The new abbess, Barbora of Sovinec, evicted them only after the King's request in 1535. (As an interesting aside, some of the Anabaptists wished then to gain papal indulgences and reported for confession and communion to the parish priest *sub una*.) Soon thereafter disputes broke out, revolving around precious jewels belonging to the monastery, which Johanka had deposited with the Brno Chapter. This case may have a bearing on her casual financial management, and on her consequent loss of office. Alois Vojtěch Šembera, *Páni z Boskovic a potomní držitelé hradu boskovického na Moravě* [The Barons of Boskovice and Subsequent Owner of the Boskovice Castle], 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1870) 124–126; Jaroslav Bránský, *Čtyři z Boskovic* [The Four from Boskovice] (Boskovice, 2008) 60–71; František Kameníček, *Zemské sněmy a sjezdy moravské. Jejich složení, obor působnosti a význam od nastoupení na trůn krále Ferdinanda I. až po vydání obnoveného zřízení zemského (1526–1628)* [The Moravian Diets. Their Composition, Competence, and Significance from the Accession of Ferdinand I until the Promulgation of the Renewed Land Ordinance, 1526–1628], 3 vv. (Brno, 1905) 3:470–471, 474; František Mareš, “Novokřtenci” [The Anabaptists], ČČH 13 (1907) 24–36, especially, 29; Jaroslav Pánek, “Moravští novokřtenci. (Společenské a politické postavení předbělohorských heretiků, sociálních reformátorů a pacifistů)” [The Moravian Anabaptists (The Social and Political Situation of the Pre-White Mountain Heretics, Social Reformers, and Pacifists)], ČČH 92 (1994) 242–256, especially, 249–251.

⁵⁶ The editors, allegedly inclining toward Protestantism, expressed their feelings toward the monastic orders in the preface to the New Testament (f. Ilv-IIIr): “Tomu pak všemu, když ještě nedostatek nákladu překážku činil, tvů milost sám Pán Bůh, panno v Pánu Kristu milá, k tomu zbudil, aby ty ke cti a k chvále Pánu a Ženichu svému, jemuž oddána si a pravdě svatého evangelium, v níž máš spasena býti, to míle učinila a nákladem svým (ani na zisk, ani na žádnou ztrátu nic se neohledajíc) vytisknutí pomohla. Z čehož my spravedlivě povinnost svú sme uznali, abychom po Pánu Bohu předkem tvé milosti svú práci a českého Erazma obětovali. A tak přijmiž již, urozená panno, v Pánu Spasiteli milá, přijmiž českého Erazma, po němž dávno toužila... Tu nejdeš největší svému stavu i věku nepotřebnější bohatství; tu nejdeš, kterak by v poznání sebe od přirození (jakož každého člověka) bídné a hříšné; také věčného sebe velmi milujícího Ženicha svého a nejlepšího nejvěrnějšího přítele i věrně poznala i tak srdečně zamilovala, aby se jemu samému líbila, v něm samém všecku svú

circumstances, together with the inclusion of Leo X's letter to Erasmus into the preface of the book (the same as in the original edition in Basel), indicate that the group in Náměšť consisted of tolerant Erasmian *sub una* and *sub utraque* rather than of Protestants. Unfortunately, the text of the *New Testament* – contrary to the simultaneously published *Gramatika česká* – did not catch on, and remained only in one edition. It is likely that readers were repelled by its language which, although vernacular, was awkward, being full of untraditional and for biblical text unsuitable phrases.⁵⁷

As it is generally known, Erasmus was initially recognised as an authority by virtually all the religious denominations. He tried to be impartial in disputes, and address and unite all Christians with his emphasis on Scripture and on the ethical side of religious life. Therefore, it should not be surprising that among those who appealed to him were also the extreme radicals of the Bohemian Reformation whose theology was, in fact, quite alien to Erasmus. For instance, the *Apologia* of the Habrovany sect, published by Aorg in 1536 (in Luleč in Moravia), sought support in Erasmus in addition to the Unity, Luther and above all Zwingli. The leader of the so-called Little Party, Jan Kalenec, a Prague cutler, sought support for the denial of the Holy Trinity in Erasmus's *Annotationes* to the New Testament. On the contrary, those Jesuits, who in their College in Prague labeled Erasmus the author of every heresy in 1559, were most likely not natives, but arrivals from the Spanish Netherlands and the Mediterranean region.⁵⁸

The ascension to the office of Archbishop of Prague by Antonín Brus of Mohelnice counter-intuitively gave added support to Erasmianism in Bohemia. In particular, the censorship of books was simplified. Up to then a printer needed the permission of the administrators of both Consistories, as well as from the Captain of the Prague Castle. Since 1562, censorship fell into the hands of a single person, the Archbishop of Prague, who made no secret of his pro-Erasmian standpoint, even after the Council of Trent.⁵⁹

radost, všecku svú naději měla a nikdá se ho nespouštěla. K tomu žádáš-li, jakž věrné nevěstě přísluší, církve jeho (jízto také oud si a máš býti) řádné, ctnostné a věrné zachování poznati... A tvú milost, velebná panno, Bůh rač v poznání i v činění své vůle rozhojnit i zachovati. Amen."

⁵⁷ Vladimír Kyas, *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví* [The Czech Bible in the History of National Literature] (Prague, 1997) 143, 149.

⁵⁸ *Apologia. Totiž zjevné dostiučinění...*, (Luleč, 1536) (Knihopis č. 233); Řičan, *Die tschechische Reformation*, 192. The Jesuits in that year (apparently after the promulgation of the *Index librorum prohibitorum*) removed from their library Erasmus's treatise *De copia verborum*, see Zikmund Winter, *O životě na vysokých školách pražských knihy dvoje* [Two Books About Life in the University Schools in Prague] (Prague, 1899) 388.

⁵⁹ František Tischer, "Příspěvek k dějinám cenzury za arcibiskupa Antonína Brusa" [Contribution to the History of Censorship under Archbishop Antonín Brus], *Listy filologické*, 32 (1905) 258–271 and 376–379; Petr Voit, "K dějinám cenzury v předbělohorské době (Některé problémy období 1547–1567)" [To the History of Censorship prior to the Counter Reformation; Some Problems from the Period, 1547–1567] FHB 11 (1987) 305–320; idem,

Thus there appeared in Czech Erasmus's books: *O přípravě k smrti* [On Preparation for Death], which was translated in 1563 by the *sub una* Jan Popel z Lobkovic, a supporter of the Jesuits; *Výklady na evangelia a epistoly roční* [Explications of the Gospels and the Epistles During the Year] (1571) and *Vdova křesťanská* [The Christian Widow] (1595). Earlier translations were also reprinted.⁶⁰ The work of the "Erasmians of Náměšť" was continued by the Unity theologian Jan Blahoslav, who decided to translate the New Testament directly from the original language (1st ed., Ivančice, 1564). Above all, he made use of Erasmus's Greek and Latin texts, his *Annotations* and *Paraphrases*. Naturally, the holdings of the Unity's library in Kralice included the works of Erasmus.⁶¹

Inasmuch as the reception of Erasmus in the Czech Lands was explored primarily in relation to the Bohemian Reformation, it has often been forgotten that the new Prague Archbishop Brus was also of service to Erasmus at the Council of Trent, where he was appointed the chairman of a commission charged with the revision of the *Index librorum prohibitorum*.⁶² The *Index* of

Encyklopedie knihy, 154–156; Jaromír Hořec, *Počátky české knihy* [Beginnings of the Czech Book] (Prague, 2003) 72–78.

⁶⁰ M. Bohatcová, "Erasmus Rotterdamský," 48–52, 55–56. *Kniha... člověku... jak by se k smrti hotoviti měl* (*Knihopis* č. 2356, 2357), *Výklady na evangelia a epistoly roční* [Explanation of the gospels and the epistles of the (liturgical) year] (*Knihopis* č. 2369) translated from Erasmus's *Paraphrases* and by Kryštof Slánský, Lutheran pastor in Hranice in Moravia, and the book *Vdova křesťanská* [A Christian widow] (*Knihopis* č. 2368) freely translated by Master Jan Kherner of Plzeň, a lawyer and former dean of the University of Prague. Reprints of earlier editions: *Knihopis* č. 2350, 1882n., 1479n. The following were published, based on Erasmus work of translation and editing: *P. Terentii Comoediae sex* (three times: Prague, 1568, 1581, 1582), *Elegantiarum e Plauto et Terentio libri duo* (Pragae, 1589) (*Knihopis* č. 2406) and *Isokrates ad Nikoklem regem*. The last one is no longer extant. Erasmus used it as an appendix to *Institutio principis christiani*, which in 1568 could be sold in Olomouc only by Jan and Václav Pilát. See Petr Voit (ed.), *Moravské prameny z let 1567–1568 k dějinám bibliografie, cenzury, knihtisku a literární historie* [Moravian Sources from 1567–1568 for the History of Bibliography, Censorship, Book Printing, and Literary History] (Příspěvky ke knihopisu: 5) (Prague, 1987) 124 and 203, no. 106.

⁶¹ Already the Unity's Bishop Jan Augusta quoted from the preface to Erasmus's *Parafráze na Matoušovo evangelium* [Paraphrase of Matthew's Gospel] in his polemical treatise *Pře Jana Augusty a kněžstva kališného* [The Dispute between Jan Augusta and the Utraquist Clergy] ([Litomyšl], 1543) (*Knihopis* č. 850) f. Z2a-b. Jiří Just has recently shown that Blahoslav based his translation of the New Testament mainly on Erasmus's editorial work and biblical commentaries, not merely on the *Barbiriana* of Beza, as it has been often asserted. Numerous quotations from Erasmus are also found Blahoslav's *Grammar*. See *Gramatika česká Jana Blahoslava*, edd. Mirek Čejka, Dušan Šlosar, and Jana Nechutová (Brno, 1991); Jiří Just, *Biblický humanismus Jana Blahoslava* [The Biblical Humanism of Jan Blahoslav], disertační práce, Evangelická teologická fakulta UK Praha (Prague, 2007) 103–111; Řičan, "Die tschechische Reformation," 194–195.

⁶² Franz Heinrich Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Literaturgeschichte* (Bonn, 1883), 1:314–321; Josef Šusta, "Macchiavelli a Boccaccio na koncilu tridentském" [Macchiavelli and Boccaccio at the Council of Trent] ČČH 6, 1900, 42–47; Anna Skýbová, "Knihovna arcibiskupa Antonína Brusa z Mohelnice" [The Library of Archbishop

Pope Paul IV, issued three years previously (1559) was considered even by the inquisitors excessively severe and almost nowhere had received full recognition. It placed Erasmus into a worse position than, for instance, Luther or Calvin; not only was he included, like they, in the first category of prohibited authors (whose writings were forbidden), but also his entry enjoyed a singular clause, lacking in the case of other heretics, namely that his writings were prohibited "with all the commentaries, notes, dialogues, letters, translations, books, and writings, even if they did not concern religion."⁶³ For many Spanish and Italian prelates such a designation sufficed for the condemnation of Erasmus's entire work. Brus was unable to agree with their standpoint and therefore sought as far as possible to clear Erasmus (and many others) from the accusation of heresy. In the end, Erasmus was successfully upgraded to the second category in the Tridentine *Index*, which prohibited only his *Colloquia*, *Moria*, *Lingua*, *Christiani matrimonii institutio*, *De interdicto esu cranium*, and the Italian translation of the *Paraphrase of Matthew's Gospel*. His other writings, which concerned religion, were prohibited, until the Theological Faculty of Paris or Lovain had cleared them. His *Adagia*, published by Paolo Manuzius (who also printed the Tridentine *Index*) were permitted, just as his other works that had been cleared by a Theological Faculty or by the Inquisition.⁶⁴ Curiously, however, under letter "E" the name of Erasmus is placed in the first category of prohibited authors with a cross-reference to letter "D," where Desiderius is located correctly in the second category. A virtually identical text was then repeated in the *Indexes* of the seventeenth and

Antonín Brus of Mohelnice] in: *Knihtisk a kniha v českých zemích od husitství do Bílé hory. Sborník prací k 500. výročí českého knihtisku* [Printing and the Book in the Czech Lands from the Bohemian Reformation to the White Mountain. A Miscellany for the Quinquecentennial of Bohemian Printing], edd. Josef Polišenský and František Šmahel (Prague, 1970) 239–256, esp. 244–245; Miroslav Hroch and Anna Skýbová, *Králové, kacíři, inkvizitoři* [Kings, Heretics, Inquisitors] (Prague, 1987) 123, 143–147; Jésus Martinez de Bujanda (ed.), *Index de Rome, 1557, 1559, 1564. Les premiers index romains et l'index du Concile de Trente* [Index des livres interdits: 8] (Sherbrooke, PQ and Geneva, 1990) 74–79, 88–89.

⁶³ "Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus cum universis commentariis, annotationibus, scholiis, dialogis, epistolis, censuris, versionibus, libris et scriptis suis, etiam si nil penitus contra religionem, vel de religione contineant"; Martinez de Bujanda (ed.), *Index de Rome*, 429–433, 760, 761. This first universally applicable *Index* of Paul IV (Romae, 1559) is also accessible on the internet (<http://www.aloha.net/~mikesch/ILP-1559.htm>).

⁶⁴ "Certorum auctorum libri prohibiti: Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami *Colloquiorum liber*, *Moria*, *Lingua*, *Christiani matrimonii institutio*, *De interdicto esu carniū*. Eiusdem *Paraphrasis in Matthaeum*, quae a Bernardino Tomitano in italicam linguam conversa est. Cetera vero opera ipsius, in quibus de religione tractat, tamdiu prohibita sint, quamdiu a facultate theologica Parisiensi vel Lovaniensi expurgata non fuerint. *Adagia* vero ex editione, quam molitur Paulus Manutius, permittentur. Interim vero, quae iam edita sunt, expunctis locis suspectis iudicio alicuius facultatis theologicae universitatis catholicae vel inquisitionis alicuius generalis, permittantur"; Martinez de Bujanda (ed.), *Index*, 429–433, 445, 833–834, 836. (435–436, 834: Under the title *Auctorum incerti nominis libri prohibiti* we moreover find *Dialogus de morte Iulii II. Papae, sive Iulius*, the author of which is probably also Erasmus); *ibid.*, 435–436, 834. See also Reusch, *Der Index*, 347.

eighteenth century, except for a brief interlude of the *Index* of Sixtus V from 1590 (as well as the succeeding edition of 1593), which located Erasmus in both the first and the second category. Afterwards in 1596, the *Index* of Clement VIII returned to the Tridentine version with a minor supplement.⁶⁵ Much later, this indecision and ambiguity of the Indexes most likely confused the notorious missionary and censor, Antonín Koniáš, who once more – to be on the safe side – listed “the archheretic Erasmus of Rotterdam” [*hlavního kacíře Erazma Roterdámského*] in both the first and the second category in the first edition of his *Klíč* [The Key] (1729).⁶⁶ Only the second edition marks “the heretic Erasmus” merely by a star, which signifies the second category. It also enumerates two of his prohibited works, which were to be corrected according to the attached instructions, namely, the Latin *Institutio principis christiani* and the Czech *Vdova křesťanská*.⁶⁷ Erasmus dedicated the two treatises to siblings from the Habsburg dynasty – Ferdinand allegedly learned *Institutio principis christiani* by heart and, perhaps for that reason, the Inquisition paid special attention to those publications. It did not matter whether the translator was a *sub una* or a Utraquist.

Let us, however, return into the sixteenth century. Neither the archbishops of Prague, nor the bishops of Olomouc, paid much attention to the Index of Prohibited Books in their exercise of censorship. Beside Erasmus, they permitted the sale or printing of Philipp Melancthon's works.⁶⁸ The censors enjoyed a freer hand because the decrees of the Council of Trent were not officially promulgated at the diocesan synods of Olomouc until 1591, and at those of Prague even fourteen years later.⁶⁹ Only in 1596, thanks to Nuncio Cesare

⁶⁵ Bujaňa (ed.), *Index de Rome*, 810, 812, 871, 873, 941, 942, 518.

⁶⁶ Antonín Koniáš, *Clavis haeresim claudens et aperiens. Klíč kacířské bludy k rozeznání otevírající, k vykořenění zamykající aneb Registřík některých bludných, pohoršlivých podezřelých neb zapověděných kněh* (Hradec Králové, 1729), especially, 37–38, where the signs “*” and “1. cl.” appear as symbols for the first and the second category.

⁶⁷ Koniáš, *Clavis haeresim claudens et aperiens*, 232–233 (corrections to “*Institutio Principis Christiani* saluberrimis Basile 1513”), 364–365 (corrections to *Vdova křesťanská*); other enumerated books are prohibited: 11–12, 155–156 (Optát's *Nový testament* 1533); 24 (“*Vejklad na Evangelium Matouše*”); 25 (“*Paraphases in omnes Epistolas Pauli*. Basileae 1521. 1. Cor. 11. Item: *Colloquia familiaria* Basil. 1526. f. 331. etc. Item: *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*. Item: *Novum Testamentum cum glossis*. Item: *Novum Testamentum Graeco-latinitum*. Item: *Ratio verae Theologiae*. 1523. H.”); 26 (“*Vejklad na Evangelia a epístoly nedělní*, Prague 1571. Item *Kázání o milosrdenství Božím*. Item *Knížka o přípravě k smrti*”). See also Bedříška Wižďálková, *Konkordance Koniášových Klíčů, Indexu, Jungmannova a Knihopisu* [Concordance of Koniáš's Keys, Indexes, Jungmann's Bibliography, and *Knihopisu*], *Príspevky ke Knihopisu*; 6–10 (Prague, 1987–1988).

⁶⁸ Voit, ed., *Moravské prameny*, 75; Petr Voit, “O vztahu moravské cenzury z let 1567 a 1568 k domácím literárním tendencím” [The Relationship of Moravian Censorship to Domestic Literary Trends, 1567–1568], *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 2 (1987) 216. It was, however, a matter merely of Melancthon's *Gramatika* and the results of his other linguistic and editorial labours.

⁶⁹ Jaroslav Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin* [An Outline of Bohemian Ecclesiastical History], 2 vv. (Rome, 1987) 2:43, 45.

Speciano, the *Tridentine Index* was published in Prague in the version of Clement VIII.⁷⁰ At that point the interest in Erasmus's writings was generally receding, yet still in the preceding year the translator of *Vdova křesťanská* – if it was well received by the public – wished to render into Czech also “the booklet about that impudent and untamed tongue” [knížku o tom bezectném a neskročeném jazyku], namely, Erasmus's prohibited treatise *Lingua*.⁷¹

Let us then sum up by saying that – no matter how much Erasmus might have been preparing the way to the Protestant Reformation – in Bohemia and Moravia the *sub una* could have received the ideas of the Dutch Humanist with a greater alacrity than elsewhere in Europe. It was because they had to solve early the issue of tolerance and to adopt moderate standpoint toward other religious denominations. While the Utraquists and the Brethren may initially have been attracted by the ridicule of conservative scholastic theology and the Renaissance papacy, for the Bohemian *sub una*, Erasmus's *Philosophia Christi* might have become a way of genuine ecclesiastical reform and of a restoration of long-lost unity. After Erasmus's neutral and rather pro-Roman standpoint had become evident, the radicals shifted under the influence of Luther and other Protestant reformers, while the Humanists *sub una* and the Utraquists remained loyal to the Dutch savant. Yet, no Christian denomination could get along without the input of Erasmus's biblical and editorial work. Also in the Czech Lands, Erasmus remained in vogue virtually to the end of the sixteenth century. While the Council of Trent and the arrival of the Jesuits did signify the Counter Reformation's acceleration, the reemergence of the Prague Archbishop, on the contrary, slowed down the coming of confessionalisation. Standing in an awkward position between the pope and the emperor, Brus of Mohelnice, in the spirit of Erasmus's standpoint, indignantly rejected the nuncio's complaints, asserting that he knew best what was good for the church, and what was not. According to St. Paul, obedience, even toward the Holy See, had to be reasonable. He could not be asked for what was unreasonable and what contradicted his best judgment.⁷²

⁷⁰ *Index librorum prohibitorum* (Pragae: Typis Venceslai Marini a Genczio, 1596) contains many misprints (one of them in Hus's name, listed on p. 93 as “Ioannes Hnss,” may have been intentional). It was true that the nuncio encountered considerable disgruntlement from the Prague printers, when the publication of strictly *sub una* documents was involved. See Enzo Rangognini, “Pražské latinské a italské tisky vydané z iniciativy a nákladem papežského nuncia Cesare Speciana” [Latin and Italian Imprints Published in Prague on the Initiative and at the Expense of Nuncio Cesare Speciano] *Knihy a dějiny* 4,1 (1997) 1–20.

⁷¹ “A poněvadž Erasmus Roterodamus o tom bezectném a neskročeném jazyku velmi rozkošnou a užitečnou knížku vydal, kdybych poznal tuto mou práci nyní, jak předně vdovám křesťanským, tak jiným Boha milujícím lidem, vděčnou býti, nemeškal bych ji z latinského jazyku na český přeložiti a na světlo vydati.” Desiderius Erasmus, *Vdova křesťanská*, Jan Kherner Plzeňský trans. (Prague, 1595) f. O1a.

⁷² Klement Borový, *Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, arcibiskup pražský. Historicko-kritický životopis* [Antonín Brus of Mohelnice. A Historical and Critical Biography] (Prague, 1873) 87, 265–266; about his stand on the *Index*, *ibid.*, 259; Kadlec, *Přehled*, 2:41.

The fact that still in the latter part of the sixteenth century established prelates *sub una*, such as Bavorovský, could closely collaborate with Utraquists and even with moderate Lutherans, begs many a question. The 1550s witnessed in Europe not only confessional disputes, but also the Augsburg Interim and the Peace of Augsburg. Christians, not just Roman Catholics, anticipated with hopes the outcome of the Council of Trent. Melancthon with other Lutherans arrived to Trent to discuss ecclesiastical reforms while at the other side of the ledger, the University of Wittenberg was attended by students from the towns, which maintained a traditional loyalty to the pope. Although such a free-wheeling condition had not lasted long in the rest of Europe, it seems that in the Bohemian milieu the optimism concerning the future of Christianity persisted longer. This mood may have been sustained by the ending of the vacancy of the Prague archiepiscopal see, and by the papal permission – albeit highly circumscribed – of lay communion in both kinds. It is possible that, thanks to this persisting optimism, there was also a continuation of the influence of Erasmus, whose writings could further strengthen the hope for a settlement of religious disagreements.

As has been done in this article, it is certainly suitable to describe the reception of Erasmus from the viewpoint of the more or less tolerant adherents of the various denominations – in our case the party *sub una*. Another, even more interesting approach might be to explore how Erasmus together with other biblicist Humanists brought together his admirers into a coalition above the denominational strife. I dare to say that some Christians could rise above the formal distinctions of their particular confession or liturgy, while they had not abandoned the firm attachment to their own faith, or the preaching of their "own distinct truth". In some cases, there were no theological differences. Thus, Roman Catholics who followed Erasmus, did not differ from the Spanish Jesuits in theology, but in matters of ecclesiastical discipline. These followers of Erasmus avoided controversial issues, and instead emphasized the common Biblical and ethical foundation of Christianity.⁷³

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

⁷³ Confessionalisation, religious pluralism, and tolerance in the sixteenth century are covered, for instance, in the voluminous festschrift, *Konfessionelle Pluralität als Herausforderung. Koexistenz und Konflikt in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit. Winfried Eberhard zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Joachim Bahlcke, Karen Lambrecht, and Hans-Christian Maner (Leipzig, 2006). Moderate religious standpoints of the Utraquists, who were influenced by Erasmus, are discussed by Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquism's Liberal Ecclesiology," *BRRP* 6 (2007) 173–174. On toleration and super-confessional Christianity in Moravia, see, especially, Josef Válka, "K otázkám úlohy Moravy v české reformaci" [The Role of Moravia in the Bohemian Reformation], *Studia Comeniana et historica* 15 (1985) no. 30, 67–80; idem, *Husitsví na Moravě. Náboženská snášlivost. Jan Amos Komenský* [Bohemian Reformation in Moravia. Religious Tolerance. John Amos Comenius] (Brno, 2005); Jaroslav Mezník, "Tolerance na Moravě v 16. století" [Toleration in Sixteenth-Century Moravia] in: *Problém tolerance v dějinách a perspektivě* [The Problem of Tolerance in History and in Perspective], ed. Milan Machovec (Prague, 1995) 76–85.

Erasmus's Works Translated into Czech Prior to 1800

<i>Year</i>	<i>Brief Title: Latin/Czech</i>	<i>Imprint</i>
1513	Moria / Bláznovství chvála (in: "Velký sborník")	Prague, MS NK, XVII.D.38, f. 130r–186v
1513	Adagia [partim] / Příslovie (in: "Velký sborník")	Prague, MS NK, XVII.D.38, f. 22v–29r
1517	Enchiridion [partim] / (in: O šesti příčinách bludův obecných)	Mladá Boleslav (?), MS KNM, V E 5, f. 88–102 KNM, V E 9, f. 204r–316v
1519, 1520	Enchiridion / O rytíři křesťanském	Bělá p. B., Oldřich Velenský
1520	Lucianus, Žaloby chudých a bohatých před Saturnem	Bělá p. B., Oldřich Velenský
1520	{Julius exclusus / Spolurozmlouvání sv. Petra a Julia II., papeže}	Bělá p. B., Oldřich Velenský
1526	Precatio dominica / Výklad na Otčenáš	Plzeň, Jan Pekk
1530	De civilitate / Knížky o mravích dětí	Jindřichův Hradec?, MS Strahov, DG V 21, f. 85v, 103v
1533	De civilitate / Knížky o mravích dětí	Jindřichův Hradec?, MS Strahov, DG V 21, f. 103v
1533	NT / Nový testament	Náměst, Matěj Pytlík z Dvořiště (Kašpar Aorg)
1534	Annotationes, Paraphrasis [partim] / Písničky čtyři evangelické	Náměst, Jan Pytlík z Dvořiště
1534	Colloquia [partim] / Rozmlouvání čtyř starcův	?
1534	Precatio pro pace ecclesiae / Modlitba za pokoj církve	Jindřichův Hradec, MS Strahov, DG V 21, 103v–106v
1534?	Precatio – Psalmus 24 [?] / Modlitba na žalm 24	Jindřichův Hradec, MS Strahov, DG V 21, 106v–108v
1534?	Institutio principis christiani [partim ?] / O navedení křesťanského knížete	Jindřichův Hradec?, MS Strahov, DG V 21, 110v–111v
1534	Galenus, Napomínání k poctivému učení	Jindřichův Hradec, MS Strahov, DG V 21, 127v–142r
1534	Colloquia [partim] / Poctivé a nábožné rozmlouvání dětí	Prague, [Pavel Severin?]
1537	De civilitate / Knížka o mravích dětí	Prague, ?
1538	Colloquia [partim] / Rozmlouvání, kterak manželé spolu nakládají	Prague, ?
1542	De interdicto esu carniū / O ustanovení v církvi	Prague, ?
1542	Paraphrasis in Matthaeum / Evangelium Ježíše Krista podle sv. Matouše	Litoměřice, Ondřej Dušík
1543	Paraphrasis in Matthaeum – Pio lectori [partim] / (in: Pře Jana Augusty, f. Z2a-b)	[Litomyšl, Alexandr Oujezdecký]
1554–1559?	De civilitate / Knížky o mravích dětí; Precatio pro pace ecclesiae / Modlitba za pokoj církve; Institutio principis christiani / O navedení křesťanského knížete; Precatio – Psalmus 24 [?] / Modlitba na žalm 24; Galenus, Napomínání k poctivému učení	České Budějovice, MS Strahov, DG V 21

<i>Translator</i>	<i>Translator's Confession</i>	<i>Index/Clavis</i>	<i>Extant.</i>	<i>č. kn.</i>
Řehoř Hrubý	Utraquist	#	1	
Řehoř Hrubý	Utraquist		1	
Lukáš Pražský	Unity	(*)	2	
Oldřich Velenský	Utraquist/ Unity	(*)	6 1	K02351 K02351a
Oldřich Velenský	Utraquist/ Unity		2	K04992
Oldřich Velenský	Utraquist/ Unity	3. cl.	1	K15625
Ondřej Strojek	<i>Sub una</i>		2	K02366
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		0	
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		0	
Beneš Optát, Petr Gzel	Utraquists for <i>Sub una</i>	*	11	K17099
[Beneš Optát ?, Petr Gzel ?]	Utraquists		1	K02361
?	?	# (*)	0	
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		0	
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		0	
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>	(cor.)	0	
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		0	
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>	# (*)	0	K02363
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		0	K02364
?	?	# (*)	1	K02362
Jiřík Anděl Králohradecký	For Utraquists	# *	1	K02367
Jan Vartovský z Varty	? for <i>Sub una</i>	*	7	K02348
Jan Augusta	Unity	*	11	K00850
Jan Petřík z Benešova	<i>Sub una</i>		1	

<i>Year</i>	<i>Brief Title: Latin/Czech</i>	<i>Imprint</i>
1555–1597	Cato, Disticha moralia (22 editions)	1. edition: Olomouc, Jan Günther
1556	De civilitate / Mrávnost obyčejův	Olomouc, Jan Günther
1558–1599	Dicta Graeciae sapientum (Apophtegmata) (23 editions)	1. edition: Olomouc, Jan Günther
1558	De immensa Dei misericordia / O nesmírném milosrdenství Božském	Prostějov, Kašpar Aorg
1563	De praeparatione / O hotovení k smrti	Prague, Jiří Melantrich
1564	De praeparatione / O hotovení k smrti	Prague, Jiří Melantrich
1564	NT / Nový Zákon	Ivančice, Unity Press
before 1568	Isokrates ad Nikoklem regem	Morava ?
1568	NT / Nový Zákon	Ivančice, Unity Press
1569	De civilitate [partim] / Civilitas morum (in: Matouš Collinus, Libellus Elementarius)	Prague, Jan Jičínský st.
1571	NT [partim] / Pašije	Ivančice, Unity Press
1571	Paraphrasis in NT [partim] / Vejkład na evangelia a epištoly roční	Prague, ?
1573	De immensa Dei misericordia / O nesmírném Božském milosrdenství	Prague, Jiří Melantrich z Aventýna starší
1579	De praeparatione / O připravování k smrti	?
1589	Publius Syrus, Sententiae – expositiones (in: Elegantiarum e Plauto et Terentio)	Prague, Daniel Adam z Veleslavína
1594	NT / Bible kralická šestidílná (VI. Díl NZ)	Kralice, Unity Press
1595	Vidua christiana / Vdova křesťanská	Prague, Jiří Jakubův Dačický
1596	NT / Bible kralická jednodílná.	Kralice, Unity Press
1596	NT / Nový Zákon	Kralice, Unity Press
1601	NT / Bible kralická šestidílná, VI. díl NZ	Kralice, Unity Press
1613	NT / Bible kralická jednodílná	Kralice, Unity Press
1765?	Colloquia [partim] / Rozmlouvání dvouch žen, Háty a Barbory	Olomouc, Josefa Terezie Hirnleová ?
1780	Colloquia [partim], De civilitate, Adagia [partim] / Uvedení k latinské řeči k užívání studijní mládeže (2. díl.)	Videň, Johann Thomas Trattner
1780	Basilius Magnus, Kázání o chválách postu	Prague, Jan Norbert Fický
1786	De praeparatione / O hotovení k smrti	Prague, Jan Josef Diesbach
1786	De praeparatione / O hotovení k smrti	Prague, Kašpar Widtmann
1787	Enchiridion / O rytíři křesťanském	Prague, Jan Josef Diesbach
1787	Enchiridion / O rytíři křesťanském	Prague, Kašpar Widtmann

<i>Translator</i>	<i>Translator's Confession</i>	<i>Index/ Clavis</i>	<i>Extant.</i>	<i>č. kn.</i>
Pavel Aquilinas Vorličný	Utraquist		47	K01477–1495
Pavel Aquilinas Vorličný ?	Utraquist		2	K02365
Pavel Aquilinas Vorličný	Utraquist		45	K01880–1898
?	?	*	3	K02349
Jan III. Popel z Lobkovic	<i>Sub una</i>	*	9	K02356
Jan III. Popel z Lobkovic	<i>Sub una</i>	*	5	K02357
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	18	K17110
?	?		0	
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	10	K17112
Tomáš Mitis z Limuz	Utraquist		2	K01574
Jan Blahoslav	Unity		6	K02264
Kryštof Slánský	Lutheran	*	1	K02369
?	?	*	1	K02350
Kryštof Slánský ?	Lutheran	*	0	K02358
?	?		1	K02406
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	52 ?	K01107
Jan Kherner Plzenský	Utraquist	cor.	4	K02368
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	72	K01109
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	18	K17116
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	44	K01108
Jan Blahoslav	Unity	*	60	K01110
Erasmus Albert ?	For <i>Sub una</i>	# (*)	3	K14994
?	?	# (*)	3	K16403
“A parson“	<i>Sub una</i>		2	K00999
Jan III. Popel z Lobkovic	<i>Sub una</i>	*	23	K02359
Jan III. Popel z Lobkovic	<i>Sub una</i>	*	32	K02360
Oldřich Velenský	Utraquist/ Unity	(*)	19	K02354
Oldřich Velenský	Utraquist/ Unity	(*)	22	K02355

Latin Works of Erasmus, Published in Bohemia and Moravia Prior to 1800

Year	Brief Title	Imprint
1555–1597	Cato, Disticha moralia (22 editions)	1. edition: Olomouc, Jan Günther
1556	De civilitate / Civilitas morum	Olomouc, Jan Günther
1558–1599	Dicta Graeciae sapientum (Apophtegmata) (23 editions)	1. edition: Olomouc, Jan Günther
1568	Terentius, Comoediae sex	Prague, Jiří Melantrich
1569	De civilitate [partim] / Civilitas morum (in: Matouš Collinus, Libellus Elementarius)	Prague, Jan Jičínský st.
1581	Terentius, Comoediae sex	Prague, Jiří Melantrich
1582	Terentius, Comoediae sex	Prague, Jiří Jakubův Dačický
1589	Publilius Syrus, Sententiae – expositiones (in: Elegantiarum e Plauto et Terentio)	Prague, Daniel Adam z Veleslavína
1611	NT [partim] / Evangelia et epistolae	Prague, Jiří Hanuš z Kronenfeldu
1785	Ratio seu Methodus	Prague, ?
1786	Ratio seu Methodus	Prague, Jan Mangoldt

Extant	according to <i>Knihopis</i> and its <i>Dodatky</i>
č. kn.	Entry no. in <i>Knihopis</i> – in the form used by the digital database http://www.knihopis.org/
<i>Index</i>	“Tridentine“ <i>Index librorum prohibitorum</i> , 1564
<i>Clavis</i>	Antonín Koniáš, <i>Clavis haeresim claudens et aperiens. Klíč kacířské bludy k rozeznání otevírající</i> , Hradec Králové 1749
cor.	with corrections permitted (<i>Klíč</i> 1749); according to <i>Tridentine index</i> (1564) all of Erasmus's books, which were not prohibited outright
*	Second Class of prohibited books, i.e., prohibited books of an author, whose other books were permitted (Koniáš: <i>Klíč</i> 1749 – Czech titles)
(*)	Same (Koniáš: <i>Klíč</i> 1749 – Latin titles)
#	Same (<i>Index librorum prohibitorum</i> 1564)
3. cl.	Third Class of prohibited books, i.e., prohibited anonymous books (<i>Index librorum prohibitorum</i> 1564)
}	anonymous titles, the probable author of which was Erasmus
NT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>

Virtually the same list of Erasmus's prohibited books, as in *Klíč* 1749, is also contained in *Index Bohemicorum librorum prohibitorum* (Prague 1770). The confessional identification of translators and editors is at times difficult and ambiguous. On the identification of Czech books in *Klíč*, see Bedřiška Wižďálková, *Konkordance Koniášových Klíčů, Indexu, Jungmanna a Knihopisu*, Příspěvky ke Knihopisu, 6–10 (Prague 1987–88). Brief Latin titles are cited mainly according to Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 3:494–496.

Although the tables offer an overview, they are only suggestive as to the reception of Erasmus in the confessional milieu of the Bohemian Lands. While the savants *sub una* employed Latin as a routine instrument of communication, the Utraquists and members of the Unity were more in need of Czech translations.

<i>Editor</i>	<i>Editor's Confession</i>	<i>Index/ Clavis</i>	<i>Ex-tant.</i>	<i>č. kn.</i>
Pavel Aquilinas Vorličný	Utraquist		47	K01477–1495
Pavel Aquilinas Vorličný	Utraquist		2	K02365
Pavel Aquilinas Vorličný	Utraquist		45	K01880–1898
Philipp Melanchthon,	Lutheran			
Tomáš Mitis z Limuz	Utraquist			
Tomáš Mitis z Limuz	Utraquist		2	K01574
Philipp Melanchthon,	Lutheran			
Tomáš Mitis z Limuz	Utraquist			
Philipp Melanchthon,	Lutheran			
Tomáš Mitis z Limuz	Utraquist			
Georg Fabricius	Lutheran Utraquist		1	K02406
Daniel Adam z Velešl.				
Jiří Hanuš z Kronenfeldu	Czech Lutheran		1	K02275