COMMUNIO VIATORUM

A THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL • XLV 2003 • I

Jan Hus – a Heretic, a Saint, or a Reformer? •

The White Mountain, 1620: An Annihilation or Apotheosis of Utraquism? •

Close Encounters of the Pietistic Kind: The Moravian-Methodist Connection •

by

Vilém Herold, Zdeněk V. David, Ted A. Campbell

PUBLISHED BY CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE, PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL FACULTY

COMMUNIO

CONTENTS (XLV, 2003) Nr. 1

VIATORUM

a theological journal

Published by Charles University in Prague, Protestant Theological Faculty
Černá 9, 115 55 Praha 1, Czech Republic.

Editors: Peter C. A. Morée, Ivana Noble, Petr Sláma
Typography: Petr Kadlec
Printed by Arch, Brno
Administration: Barbara Kolafová (cv-adm@etf.cuni.cz)

Annual subscription (for three issues): **28 €** or the equivalent in **Europe**, **30 USD** for **overseas**. Single copy: **10 €** or **11 USD**.

Please make the payment to our account to:

Bank name: Česká spořitelna
Address: Vodičkova 9, 110 00, Praha 1, Czech Republic
Account no.: 1932258399/0800
Bank identification code (SWIFT, BLZ, SC, FW): GIBA CZPX

Orders, subscriptions and all business correspondence should be adressed to:

Communio viatorum
Černá 9
P. O. Box 529
CZ-115 55 Praha 1
Czech Republic
Phone: + + 420 221 988 205 Fax: + + 420 221 988 215
E- mail: cv@etf.cuni.cz URL: http://www.etf.cuni.cz/cv.html

(ISSN 0010-3713)

IČO vydavatele (ETF UK, Černá 9, 115 55 Praha 1) 00216208. Evidenční číslo MK ČR 6374.

COMMUNIO VIATORUM AND INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP ON THE BOHEMIAN REFORMATION

From its very inception, *Communio Viatorum* has played an invaluable role in promoting the study of the Bohemian reformation. During their lifetime, articles by Professors František Michálek Bartoš and Amedeo Molnár appeared in virtually every issue of this journal thereby opening up the study of the Bohemian reformation to foreign scholars whose facility with the Czech language was limited, taking them well beyond the generally received truths available in the older literature available in "western" languages. As a young scholar, I remember scanning the table of contents of each issue as it arrived to see what new and unheard of things it contained about the First Reformation. Given the restrictions placed on research and publishing in theological fields by the political regime of the time, it was this journal alone that was able to deal seriously with the profoundly religious nature of the reform movement. This stood in stark contrast with contemporary political correctness which saw religion as a veneer on a movement which was to be "properly" understood in terms of the struggle between social classes. A brief review of the annual indexes of this journal during the "Bartoš-Molnár years" will remind the reader of the rich contribution to our knowledge of the Bohemian reformation made in these pages.

Over the years, that contribution has born considerable fruit. While there is a long-standing academic interest among "western" scholars in the history of Lands of the Crown of St. Wenceslas, interest in the religious dimensions of that history was re-ignited by a generation of Czech émigrés (such as Otakar Odložilík, Matthew Spinka, René Wellek and Jarold K. Zeman), who begot a generation of "academic progeny" (notably Peter Brock, Frederick Heymann, Howard Kaminsky, and Jaroslav Pelikan) to carry on the study of the Bohemian reformation on foreign shores.

While that generation of emigrés is now dead and their "progeny" have either departed this life or are retired from teaching, their legacy

has continued to thrive and extend its roots deeper into the academic life of lands well to the west of the Bohemian frontier. This volume of CV testifies to that heritage.

The Czechoslovak Academy of Arts and Sciences (SVU) has played a valuable role in promoting the study of the Bohemian reformation; first, by providing a venue for scholars to present papers in this area on a panel devoted to "Religion" and, later, by making it possible for a group of scholars to organise a series of sessions at the biennial World Congresses of the SVU devoted exclusively to the study of the Bohemian reformation and its religious practice. By the year 1998, this section had grown to such a size that its needs could no longer be accommodated by the SVU and, since the year 2000, it has met at the Vila Lanna in Prague as a self-standing symposium under the generous patronage of the Philosophical Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. At its 2002 meeting, the symposium brought together over thirty scholars from ten lands for three and a half days. Since 1996, the collected papers from the previous symposium have been published by the Main Library of the Czech Academy of Sciences under the title *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*.

While the symposium has outgrown the possibility of meeting concurrently with the World Congresses of the SVU, links with this organisation are maintained as a smaller number of scholars organise a single panel at the Congress opening up the world of the Bohemian reformation to those who might not otherwise avail themselves of a conference devoted to this period of history and religious life alone.

The three papers in this present volume are drawn from among those presented at the 20th World Congress of the SVU which was held in Washington, D.C. from 9–13 August 2000. They represent a sample of the present scholarship in Bohemian reformation studies wherein readers will discover a more expansive vision of the field than may be expected as the articles span three centuries of Christian experience.

Jan Hus was, by no means, the initiator of the Bohemian reform movement. Well over half a century of reforming preachers, theologians and a laity nurtured in a renewed piety had prepared the ground for what Hus's death at the stake in Constance was to catalyze. It is

Hus, however (more because of his charismatic personality and the means of his death than the novelty of his teaching), that has become the best-known character in a movement that spanned almost three centuries. Just to utter Hus's name in this Republic is to evoke strong sentiment of one sort or another. Vilém Herold's article, presented to a plenary session of the SVU, is a temperate evaluation of the present state of research on Hus and will give the reader a good sense of how one man can be hailed as heretic, saint and reformer and how each of those epithets is being re-evaluated in the light of contemporary scientific research and ecumenical dialogue.

Even among those who did not treat the Bohemian reform movement as if Jan Hus were its initiator, there was a tacit acceptance that its zenith was during the years immediately following his death in 1415. Even those who allowed that the reform movement continued into the shadow years after the defeat at Bílá Hora (White Mountain) in 1620, usually argued that its vigour had dissipated before the middle of the fifteenth century. Over recent years, the work of Zdeněk David put the lie to this as he slowly built a magisterial case for the vibrancy and resilience of movement until its final extirpation from Bohemian lands after the Bílá Hora. His article in this collection provides a detailed examination of Utraquism as it faced increasing pressure from the counter-reformers who, finally, gained hegemony after the defeat of the Bohemian Estates.

One aspect of the Bohemian reformation that remains a living legacy is to be found in the *Unitas Fratrum* or the Moravian Church as it is generally known beyond the Czech lands. While it has evolved in both theology and polity well beyond its fifteenth century Bohemian origins, it continues to make a distinctive contribution to the life of the churches today. Its best-known (and, perhaps to many, most influential) moment its long history was the time of its contact with John and Charles Wesley – first on their way to and in Georgia and, later, in London at the time of Methodism's nascence. The context, content and extent of that contact, however, is little known and often dwells more in the realm of pious myth than fact. Ted Campbell unravels some of the popular misconceptions of early Moravian-Wesleyan relations, and sees the disintegration of the contact between two "religions of the heart" in terms the conflict of the person-

alities of their respective leaders as well as growing theological differences. Finally, he demonstrates how much the two traditions have in common today despite over two centuries of development on quite independent trajectories.

The organisers of the SVU panel on the Bohemian Reformation are grateful for the opportunity to make known some the work presented in Washington and to give readers of CV a glimpse into the present state of scholarship in this field of study. It is to be hoped that the publication of these articles may play a small part in continuing the tradition begun by Bartoš and Molnár in the pages of this review, encourage those whose scholarly interests include the Bohemian reform movement (in its widest sense) and kindle the interest of those for whom it is still the affair of "a far-off people of whom [they] know nothing".

David R. Holeton

JAN HUS – A HERETIC, A SAINT, OR A REFORMER?

Vilém Herold, Praha

Jan Hus is without a doubt one of the most important personalities of Czech history, a personality which also left its mark on the history of Europe. A philosopher and theologian, a professor and rector of the Charles University of Prague, a Catholic priest and outstanding preacher, he was a lover of truth and endeavored to rescue the church from its contemporary moral decline. In consequence of his death he became the unwitting initiator of the Hussite Revolution and of the bloody wars which followed and which bear – rightly or wrongly – his name. He is far more than merely a historical personality belonging to the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.

The characterizations of Hus as a heretic, as a saint, or as a reformer of the church, which had arisen inconsequence of his death at the stake in Constance on July 6, 1415, have accompanied him practically throughout his entire "second life" from the fifteenth century to the present and reveal the ambiguities in the interpretation of the Hussite tradition. At the same time, historiography has devoted an unusually wide attention to Hus and Hussitism.[1] In the end, however, the diverging approaches to his legacy have painfully burdened and divided, rather than positively stimulated and united, the historical consciousness of the Czech nation and its cultural and spiritual heritage.

Let us now pause to examine these characterizations of Hus. Let us begin with the first one – the characterization of him as a heretic or even as an arch-heretic based on the verdict of the Council of Cons-

[1] František Šmahel presents a substantial and knowledgeable survey of the existing research on Hussitism in his *Husitská revoluce*, 1st ed., 4 vols. (Prague, 1993), 1:11–70. Volume Four of this comprehensive work contains an extraordinarily valuable selective bibliography of around 3,800 (!) titles concerning Hus and the early phases of the Bohemian Reformation.

tance. This ecumenical, broadly international gathering of the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church had met in order to remove many evident ecclesiastical shortcomings, in the first place the papal schism lasting since 1378, and then even the triple division of the papacy lasting since the Council of Pisa.[2]

Jan Hus found himself before the Council within the framework of a proceeding which was transferred from the domestic Prague setting to the Papal Curia. The proceedings were triggered by Hus's disagreement when the Archbishop of Prague ordered the confiscation of Wyclif's book on suspicion of heresy, and when he prohibited preaching on private premises, specifically in the Bethlehem Chapel. Master Jan Hus himself appealed to the Papal Curia against the Archbishop's decisions, at first with seven petitioners, then – on June 25, 1410 – on behalf of the entire university. Thereby he paradoxically initiated the process which, five years later, would bring him to the stake as a heretic.[3]

It is not our task to follow in detail the course of Hus's trial. That has been done by others who are more qualified.[4] Even so, it is necessary to emphasize from the start the distinct and fateful interconnection of Hus's cause with that of Wyclif. Several days after the submission of Hus's appeal, on July 16, 1410, the order of Archbishop Zbyněk Zajíc of Házmburk was carried out and Wyclif's books were burnt in his courtyard of Malá strana. In response, Hus organized – before the end of the month – a grand defense of Wyclif's several writings at the university. He himself defended Wyclif's treatise, *De Trinitate*.[5]

Hus's connection with Wyclif then continued to play its damaging role until the pronouncement of the final verdict. This was the case despite the initial favorable judgment of a gathering of Oxford, Paris-

[2] For recent coverage see Walter Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz, 1414–1418.* 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1997–1999).

[3] Jiří Kejř, *Husův proces* (Prague, 2000), 52 ff.

[4] Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz*, and Kejř, *Husův proces*; also W. Brandmüller, "Hus vor dem Konzil," in *Jan Hus zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Munich, 1997), 235–242.

[5] For detailed description of the events around the defense and the burning of Wyclif's writings in Prague see Václav Novotný, *Jan Hus: život a učení*. I. *Život a dílo*, 2 vols. (Prague, 1919–1921), 1:401–429.

ian and Italian theologians in Bologna, which on the orders from Pope John XIII dealt with Hus's appeal in August 1410 in the house of Cardinal Odo Colonna, the later Pope Martin V. The tribunal concluded that the burning of Wyclif's books in Prague was illegitimate and that the students should not have been deprived of books on logic, philosophy, and theology which had contained numerous truths. It added that the destruction of the books had been an insult to the universities of both Oxford and Prague.[6]

Of course, the ecclesiastical authorities' views of Wyclif subsequently underwent considerable changes. Again, the changes had earlier roots. They related to the papal censures pronounced as early as 1377, and to the decision of the London Synod in 1382, the time when Wyclif had already lost the favor of the English royal court. Twenty-one articles from his treatises were condemned as heretical or erroneous.[7] These censures were augmented by the professors of the University of Prague who represented the three foreign nations – Bavaria, Saxony, and Poland. A university gathering in May 1403 enlarged the number of suspected articles from twenty-one to forty-five and the foreign professors voted a prohibition of their teaching or dissemination.[8]

The German professors intensified their opposition to Wyclif after their departure in 1409, in consequence of the Decree of Kutná Hora, from Prague to Leipzig and other universities. Fatefully, the earlier Czech proponents of Wyclif at the Prague theological faculty, particularly Stanislav of Znojmo and Štěpán of Páleč, switched sides around 1412. This Prague group of Wyclif's enemies proved especially detrimental to Hus's cause both at the Curia and, after its transfer, at the Council of Constance.[9]

---

[6] See also Kejř, *Husův proces*, 57. The document of the public notary in this matter was published in František Palacký, *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam... illustrantia*, (Prague, 1869), 426–428.

[7] Herbert B. Workman, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, 2nd ed. 2 v. in 1 (Hamden, Conn., 1966), 2:266 ff, and Novotný, *Jan Hus: život a učení*, 1:107–111.

[8] Johann Hübner, a German from Silesia, suggested the addition of 21 articles to the earlier 24 articles of London; the university assembly was convoked by Rector Walter Harrasser, who represented the Bavarian Nation. Ibid., 108–109.

[9] Hus's former teacher, Stanislav of Znojmo, died on his way to Constance in Jindřichův Hradec toward the end of October 1414. See Stanislav Sousedík, "Sta-

In this regard it was ominous that, shortly before the final sentencing of Hus, on May 4, 1415, the Council of Constance condemned Wyclif posthumously (that is contrary to canon law) as a heretic, on the basis of forty-five articles extracted by a four-member commission from the English theologian's writings, but virtually identical with the incriminating material previously compiled in London and Prague.[10] This was an unfavorable development for Hus because henceforth the Council father could label him as a supporter, propagator, and defender of the errors of the arch-heretic John Wyclif [*sectator et fautor et eruditor ac defensor errorum Johanis Wiclef haeresiarchae*]. Hus's sentence even stated that he was not a disciple of Christ, but rather one of John Wyclif, the arch-heretic [*non Christi, sed potius Joannis Wicleff haeresiarchae discipulus*].[11]

On the basis of this sentence, Hus was also burnt as a heretic or an ach-heretic, and the tradition of the heretical Hus has survived with varying emphases in the consciousness and the cultural ambience of the Roman Catholic Church for centuries and virtually to the present. The image of the burning of Jan Hus appears frequently, for instance, in Richenthal's illustrated chronicle of the Council of Constance, which pays major attention to this event.[12]

At the same time, Hus's painful death at the stake elicited almost immediately an opposite reaction. As early as September 11, 1415, the University of Prague in a protest against Hus's conviction and execution, sent by to the Council of Constance, emphasized the high morals and holiness of its former professor and rector. The same was true of the protest by the Bohemian and Moravian nobility which was dispatched in the same month in eight original versions provided with altogether 452 seals. According to this document, the Council had inflicted a cruel and degrading death on a truly good, just, and Catholic man, who had adorned the kingdom by his life, character,

---

nislaus von Znaim: Eine Lebensskizze," *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 17 (1973) 37–56.

[10] Kejř, *Husův proces*, 141.

[11] "Articuli testium Constantiensium," in Jan E. Sedlák, ed., *Mistr Jan Hus* (Prague, 1915), 339*. The drafts and the final version of the verdict are published ibid., 344*–353*, see 345*.

[12] Ulrich Richenthal, *Das Konzil zu Konstanz, 1414–1418: Faksimilienausgabe*, ed. and notes by Otto Feger (Starenberg, 1964).

and reputation, and had taught, preached and expounded the law of God in a Catholic manner in harmony with the explication of doctors approved by the Church.[13] Hus's courageous and admirable stance face to face with death, as depicted by an eye-witness Master Petr of Mladoňovice, attained at times hagiographic dimensions. The account dramatizes Hus's suffering and tribulations at Constance, and has been often, not unjustly, characterized as a quasi-liturgical Passion of Hus [*passio*].[14]

Also Hus's depiction at the stake soon began to assume a character antithetical to the charge of heresy. For instance, in the so-called Martinická Bible from about 1430, a miniature of Hus's immolation – which also constitutes one of his earliest portraits – adorns the letter "I" in the sentence *In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram*. Thus it stands at the start of the first chapter of the first book of Genesis and, indeed, at the very beginning of the Scripture.[15]

All these were pointers toward the veneration of Hus as a saint. We can already see the beginnings in 1416 when Hus was compared with Saint Lawrence and other Christian martyrs. The Bohemian Utraquist Church established July 6th as the holiday of Saint John Hus with its own mass propers and with corresponding adjustments in the text and notations of the gradual, alleluia, offertory and communion.[16] Therefore, it is not surprising that in the hymnal of Kutná Hora from the late fifteenth century Hus, although with the heretic's cap, stands surrounded by aureole and bracketed by the proto-martyrs Saints Lawrence and Stephen. Still wearing the heretic's cap Hus is shown, on an early-sixteenth century image, as concelebrating mass with Saint Adalbert [Vojtěch], Bohemia's national patron. In the hymnal

[13] František M. Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce*, 2 vols. (Prague, 1965–1966), 1:16.

[14] Such was especially the role of the concluding part of Mladoňovice's report (*Zpráva o Mistru Janu Husovi v Kostnici*), which in a somewhat modified Czech version became a part of Utraquist liturgy, and in several versions and translations spread throughout Protestant Europe. See Ivan Hlaváček's introduction to the anthology, *Ze zpráv a kronik doby husitské* (Prague, 1981), 10.

[15] J. Květ, "Nejstarší české vyobrazení upálení M. Jana Husa v bibli Martinické," in: *Českou minulostí: Práce věnované V. Novotnému* (Prague, 1929), 175–193. As a hypothesis, he ascribes to Mladoňovice the original ownership of this bible.

[16] David R. Holeton, "'O felix Bohemia – O felix Constantia': The Liturgical Commemoration of Saint John Hus," in: *Jan Hus – Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen*, 385–403.

of Litoměřice from the same period, Hus not only stands at the pulpit surrounded by the aureole, but the scene of his immolation at Constance is directly linked with his heavenly assumption.[17] Further, although much later, Hus was recognized as a saint by the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church of Canada, and has been honored as God's witness by Reformed churches and, since its inception, by the Czechoslovak Hussite Church.[18]

Still later, not until the latter part of the twentieth century, the Roman Catholic Church chimed in at last and revealed tendencies toward a "rehabilitation" of Jan Hus and a cassation of his trial. If consistently pursued, these tendencies might further open the way to Hus's canonization, by analogy to the fate of his younger French contemporary, Joan of Arc. These anticipations were initially linked with the efforts of the distinguished Belgian scholar and Benedictine monk, Paul De Vooght, and of Professor Stefan Swieżawski, a Polish consultant for the Second Vatican Council.[19]

Let us deal briefly with the third characteristic of Hus, that of a Reformer of the Church. Properly speaking, its relevance must be linked with the emergence of the German Protestant Reformation. When, one hundred and four years after the burning of Hus, Martin Luther received a copy of Hus's book, *De ecclesia* [On the Church], from the university professors of Prague, the German Reformer noted with surprise the coincidence of his ideas with Hus's views.[20] Hus's writings played a significant role in the German Reformation particularly after Matthias Flacius Illyricus had published them (along with Jerome of Prague's selected writings) in two volumes in Nuremberg in 1558. A new edition appeared in Francfort on the Main in 1715. Because of the regrettable unavailability of Hus's writings in a complete modern scholarly edition, the Francfort ver-

[17] Karel Stejskal and Petr Voit, *Iluminované rukopisy doby husitské* (Prague, 1991).

[18] I owe to Zdeněk David the reference to Hus's veneration by the Anglican Church of Canada.

[19] Paul De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Huss* , 2nd ed. 2 vols. (Louvain, 1975), and idem, *Hussiana* (Louvain, 1960), 2nd ed. in 1 vol. (Louvain, 1975); S. Swieżawski, "Jan Hus: heretyk czy prekursor Vaticanum Secundum," *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 40/6 (1986), 1911, and idem, "Jan Hus: heretyk czy święty?" *Więź*, 36/2 (1993), 92–100.

[20] On the relationship between Hus and Luther see, among others, Amedeo Molnár, *Na rozhraní věků: Cesty reformace* (Prague, 1985), 141–243.

sion offers, to this day, the best available text of some of Hus's Latin pieces.[21]

The linkage between Hus and Luther also appeared in iconography. For instance, a well-known woodcut by a Saxon artist of the third quarter of the sixteenth century depicted the two Reformers, jointly administering the Lord's Supper in both kinds to John and Frederick of Saxony. Within the Bohemian milieu, the gradual of Malá Strana from the early sixteenth century graphically depicted the reformatory progression from Wyclif striking a spark to Hus holding a lit candle to Luther raising a flaming torch.[22]

Before deciding which of Hus's three characterizations – heretic, saint, or reformer – was closest to historical truth, we must briefly pose the questions why and on what basis Hus was sentenced in Constance.

The accepted conclusion, confirmed by existing scholarship, is that the reason was, above all, his teaching about the Church and its allegedly close connection with the ideas of Wyclif.[23] Hus's Latin treatise, *De ecclesia*,[24] indeed coincides in many places with John Wyclif's treatise of the same name. Not an impartial judge in this matter, Johann Loserth, who edited Wyclif's treatise, felt that in assessing Hus's *De ecclesia* the Council of Constance saw only a "meager abridgement"and a "feeble imitation" of Wyclif's work, and that the illustrious fathers would have been utterly astonished, had they seen the original. Yet, Loserth was not entirely correct.[25]

---

[21] Anežka Vidmanová, *Základní vydání spisů M. Jana Husa* (Prague, 1999).

[22] The well known woodcut by a Saxon artist from the third quarter of the sixteenth century is reproduced on the dust-jacket of the collection, *Jan Hus – Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen*; the depiction from the manuscript of the National Library in Prague (XVII A 3) is reproduced on the dust-jacket of Ann Hudson's *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988).

[23] Jan Hus, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, ed. S. Harrison Thomson (Prague, 1958) [henceforth cited as Hus, *De eccl.*], see the editor's intro. on p. xxiii. See also further explication.

[24] See the preceding note. – A Czech translation, Jan Hus, *O církvi*, trans. F. M. Dobiáš and Amedeo Molnár, intro. J. Hrabák (Prague, 1965) [henceforth cited as Hus, *O církvi*] in its notes contains numerous corrections and revisions of errors in Thomson's Latin version [Hus, *De eccl.*], which is not a critical edition.

[25] John Wyclif, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, ed. Johann Loserth (London, 1886) [henceforth cited as Wyclif, *De eccl.*], see the editor's intro. p. iii. See also Johann Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif: Zur Genesis der Husitischen Lehre*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1925), where

Loserth was not right, not only because he exaggerated Hus's dependence on Wyclif in words and in substance, but also because the Council in fact had been familiar, as we noted earlier, with Wyclif's teaching through the forty-five articles which it had condemned on May 4, 1415. Hus was interrogated at Constance concerning his adherence to these articles. In many instances he denied holding either currently or previously the particular opinions ascribed to Wyclif [*non tenui nec teneo*]. It is important for our purposes that a majority of Wyclif's incriminating articles also concerned the realm of ecclesiology.[26]

The final verdict of guilt, pronounced on Hus at the Council's fifteenth general session on June 16, 1415, was based on thirty articles, which were derived mainly from his *De ecclesia* and supplemented from his polemics, *Contra Stanislaum de Znoyma* and *Contra Stephanum de Palecz*, which were likewise concerned with teaching about the Church. Hus also commented on these articles in a brief response, completed on June 20, 1415.[27]

Next, we will next examine at least some of Hus's responses to Wyclif's forty-five articles and to the additional thirty articles of his own indictment in order to determine his stance in ecclesiology and the degree of its coincidence with Wyclif's views.

Before exploring the particular examples, it is necessary to prefix two basic considerations. First, there is no doubt that Hus in fact intro-

---

the author sought to demonstrate Hus's complete dependence on Wyclif by a mechanical comparison of the texts of the two thinkers' ecclesiological treatises, as well as their other works. He charged Hus with intellectual derivativeness and imitativeness, and extended the claim of unoriginality to the program and the aims of the Bohemian Reformation as a whole.

[26] The text of Wyclif's forty-five articles, together with Hus's responses, is published under the title "Responsiones Mgri Johannis Hus ad articulos Johannis Wiclef," in Sedlák, *Mistr Jan Hus*, 305*–310*.

[27] The text of these thirty articles with Hus's notes was published as "Responsum M. Johannis Hus ultimum, ad articulos excerptos e libro de Ecclesia," together with further articles *de processu causae* as well as Hus's responses, in Palacký, *Documenta*, 225–234. In Palacký's edition the number of articles is reduced to twenty-nine, inasmuch as he combines into one articles twenty and twenty-one, which had appeared in the authoritative ed. of G. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 27 (Venice, 1784). – Hus's cited polemics against Stanislav of Znojmo and Štěpán Páleč were edited by J. Eršil in Jan Hus, *Magistri Iohannis Hus Polemica* (Prague, 1966), 233–367.

duced into his *De ecclesia* a substantial amount of text and thought from Wyclif's treatise of the same name. The comparative examinations of the two texts has so far shown that Hus lifted 1602 lines of his *De ecclesia* almost verbatim from Wyclif. The borrowing constitutes twenty-three per cent of his text, inasmuch as the total extent of his *De ecclesia* includes 6964 lines (according to Thomson's Latin edition of the text).[28] Further coincidences are still coming to light and, as Alexander Patschovsky has recently noted, many more such correspondences are likely to emerge, once truly critical editions of both treatises make possible a computer-assisted comparison.[29]

It is possible to show much agreement between Hus and Wyclif in the chain of arguments, which lead to the definition of the Church as a community of those predestined for salvation, the head of which is not the pope but Christ, and as the mystical body of Christ which exists from the Creation to the Last Judgment.[30] It is a conception that denies the existence and functioning of the Church as an institution. Gordon Leff has noted that with Wyclif this conception deprived the Church of its normal identity, and presented its existence as an unchanging and eternal archetype outside time and space.[31]

Finally, it is beyond dispute that Wyclif's and Hus's conception of the Church had identical philosophical and theological sources par-

---

[28] See the introduction to the Czech trans., Hus, *O církvi*, 15.

[29] Alexander Patschovsky, "Ekklesiologie by Johannes Hus," *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 179 (1989), 370–399.

[30] Hus, *De eccl*., cap. 1, 3: "ex cuius sententia 'sc. beati Augustini' patet, quod unica est sancta universalis ecclesia, que est predestinatorum universitas a primo iusto inclusive usque ad ultimum futurum salvandum inclusive, et claudit omnes salvandos;" *ibid*., 7: "sancta universalis ecclesia est numerus omnium predestinatorum et corpus Christi misticum, cuius ipse est caput, et sponsa Christi;" *ibid*., 2: "eadem ecclesia predestinatorum currebat a mundi exordio usque ad apostolos, et ab hinc usque ad diem iudicii. – Wyclif, *De eccl*., cap. 1, 3: "Quamvis autem ecclesia dicatur multipliciter, suppono quod sumatur… pro… congregacione omnium predestinatorum. Illa est autem sponsa Christi;" *ibid*., 5: "nullus vicarius Christi debet presumere asserere se esse caput ecclesie sancte catholice… quod soli Christo potest competere;" *ibid*., cap. 17–18, 390–393: "Et patet quod non sequitur: si ante incarnacionem non vocabatur christiana religio, quin pocius quod a mundi inicio fuit ecclesia… sancta ecclesia que ab Abel iusto usque ad novissimum electum sic fructificavit."

[31] Gordon Leff, "The Place of Metaphysics in Wyclif's Theology," in *From Ockham to Wyclif*, eds. Ann Hudson and Michael Wilks (Oxford, 1987), 225–226.

ticularly in Saint Augustine, the Latin Church Father, whom both of our authors esteemed most highly and frequently cited as a foremost authority.

Nevertheless, the second basic consideration to keep in mind is that the agreement between Wyclif and Hus is far from being absolute or total. This applies already to the reasons for writing their treatises. Wyclif wrote his *De ecclesia* more or less for the use of the English royal court, which resented the exaction of high payments by the Avignon Curia which, at the time of the Hundred Years War, functioned under the aegis of the French monarchy, and thus in a camp inimical to England.[32] Wyclif, therefore, crafted theological arguments against the privileges and the wealth of the Church, as well as against the misuse of ecclesiastical authority and its interference in secular affairs.

Hus's work grew to a high degree from the local intellectual tradition of Bohemia, although even this tradition was firmly anchored in the broader intellectual milieu of Europe. As early as the reign of Charles IV, there was a strong resentment in Prague against the moral degradation in the contemporary Church and an equally strong desire to see corrective measures applied. This was witnessed by the activities of such preachers as Konrád Waldhauser and Milíč of Kroměříž. This "reform" camp included also Archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice and Jan of Jenštejn.[33] Working under the protection of Vojtěch Raňků of Ježov in Prague, a graduate of the University of Paris, Matěj of Janov, outlined a program of distinguishing the true from the false Christianity. This basis for the moral rebirth of the Church

[32] Workman, *John Wyclif*, the basic monograph on the subject, describes this period of Wyclif's life and work in Book Two under the title, "The Politician." Wyclif wrote certain portions of his *De ecclesia* at the direct behest of the royal court. This was the case, for instance, with Chapter Seven, titled "De captivo Hispanensi," which attempted to justify the king's action against the Spanish prisoners, who had sought refuge on the grounds of Westminster Abbey. At the behest of the court, Wyclif presented this chapter and selected arguments from following chapters in the Parliament.

[33] See, for instance, the intro. to Milíč of Kroměříž [Iohannis Milicii de Cremsir], *Tres sermones synodales*, eds. V. Herold and M. Mráz (Prague, 1974), or Peter C. A. Morée, *Preaching in Fourteenth-Century Bohemia: The Life and Ideas of Milicius de Chremsir († 1374) and His Significance in the Historiography of Bohemia* (Heršpice, 1999).

was presented in his magnum opus, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*.[34]

The University of Prague also sheltered important Polish preachers and scholars, Matthew of Cracow, Stanislav of Skarbimierz, and Petr Wysz of Radolin, who likewise critically deplored the current depressing state of the Church, particularly in their treatises *De praxi Romanae curiae*, *Sermones saoientales*, and *Speculum aureum*.[35]

Hus advocated a moral reform of the Church from the grass roots, not from above by the power of the king. When at times he adopted certain extreme propositions, very close to Wyclif's, it usually happened in the heat of polemical ardor. We must not forget that Hus wrote *De ecclesia* in 1413 in a time of stress when an interdict barred him from residence in Prague. At the same time he faced the challenge of responding to extreme theocratic and papalist formulations of the Church's character, such as were contained in the *Rada osmi doktorů* [Counsel of the Eight Doctors] of the Prague Law Faculty, or in the treatises of his erstwhile friends, now his opponents, especially Stanislav of Znojmo and Štěpán Páleč.[36] These formulations appeared to him unacceptable in an atmosphere "poisoned by the thirty years of the Great Schism," to use the apt characterization of Paul De Vooght,[37] and he therefore, at times, chose formulations which he had found in Wyclif. Hus, however, by no means identified with all of Wyclif's philosophical and theological starting points and conclusions. This can be demonstrated on the promised examples to which we now turn.

---

[34] Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova: jeho život, spisy a učení* (Prague, 1905, reprint 2000), and Vilém Herold, "The University of Paris and the Foundations of the Bohemian Reformation," in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*. Vol. 3: Papers from the XIXth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bratislava 1998, eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague, 2000), 15–24.

[35] W. Seńko, *Mateusza z Krakowa De praxi Romanae curiae*, (Wrocław 1969); S. Swieżawski, *Eklesjologia póznośredniowieczna na rozdrożu*, (Cracow, 1990); W. Seńko, *Piotr Wysz z Radolyna i jego dzieło* '*Speculum aureum*', (Warsaw, 1996).

[36] Stanislav of Znojmo, *Stanislai de Znoyma Tractatus de Romana ecclesia* in: Jan Sedlák, *Miscellanea husitica Ioannis Sedlák*, eds. J. V. Polc a S. Přibyl (Prague, 1996), 312–334; Štěpán Páleč, *Stephani de Palec De aequivocatione nominis ecclesia*, *ibid*., 355–363. – See also Swieżawski, *Eklesjologia*. 112, and Z. Włodek, "Eklesjologia krakowska w pierwszej połowie XV wieku," in: *Jubileusz sześćetlecia Wydziału teologicznego w Krakowie* (Cracow, 1998), 260 ff.

[37] De Vooght, *Hussiana*, 95.

The twenty-seventh of Wyclif's forty-five condemned articles stated that whatever happened did so with absolute necessity – *Omnia de necessitate absoluta eveniunt*. Hus responded that he neither then, nor earlier, hold this article.[38] For Wyclif this radically deterministic approach had at least two major consequences. One was his concept of the Church as limited to the number of those predestined. The other was his eucharistic theory of remanence, according to which the material substance of bread and wine persisted even after consecration, because according to Wyclif not only did everything happen by absolute necessity, but also anything created could not be annihilated, not even by the will of God [*nihil anihilari potest*].[39]

However, in response to the first of Wyclif's condemned articles, which concerned the theory of remanence, Hus denied that he had ever believed in the persistence of bread and wine in the eucharist after consecration, and explicitly emphasized that, in this particular regard, he followed the eucharistic teaching of the saints and of the Church.[40] In fact, there is no evidence available showing that Hus ever upheld the remanence position.[41] Paradoxically, Hus was tainted in Constance by the lingering memories of the well-publicized trials of Stanislav of Znojmo and Matěj of Knín prior to 1408. The two had actually embraced the remanence theory, but recanted after being tried before the Archbishop of Prague.[42]

---

[38] "Responsiones Mgri Johannis Hus ad articulos Johannis Wiclef," in: Sedlák, *Mistr Jan Hus*, 308*.

[39] See Anthony Kenny, *Wyclif* (Oxford, 1985), 31 ff. (Chapter "Freedom and Necessity").

[40] "Responsiones Mgri Johannis Hus ad articulos Johannis Wiclef," in: Sedlák, *Mistr Jan Hus*, 305*: "Ad 1. vid. A Substancia panis materialis et similiter substantia vini manent in sacramento altaris, H u s: Nunquam tenui nec teneo, quia sanctorum sentenciam et ecclesie sequor."

[41] Stanislav Sousedík, *Učení o eucharistii v díle M. Jana Husa* (Prague, 1998).

[42] As shown already by Sedlák, "Eucharistické traktáty Stanislava ze Znojma," in: *Miscellanea husitica Ioannis Sedlák*, 105 (first published in the journal *Hlídka* in 1906), it would be possible to designate Stanislav's first treatise as *De remanentia panis*. (Subsequently, however, it was supplemented with an orthodox addition in the final version of the treatise *De Corpore Christi*.) Sedlák published it under the title, "Stanislai de Znoyma Tractatus primus de Eucharistia," *ibid*., 288–297. A Cistercian, Jan Štěkna, had preached against Wyclif's and Stanislav's remanence teaching in Prague as early as 1405. (His sermon is published *ibid*., 300–301). A German professor at the University of Prague, Ludolf Meisterman, later made this matter the subject of a suit at the Roman Curia. In 1408, the Archbishop dealt with

As for the thirty articles which formed the basis for Hus's conviction, he was questioned about a proposition in the treatise *Contra Stephanum de Palecz* [Against Štěpán Páleč] stating that a bad pope, or one foreknown for damnation, was not a true pastor, but a thief and a robber. The apparently negative consequence of this proposition for the institutional status of the Church and for the recognition of papal authority seemed to flow out of the concept of the Church as a community of the predestined, headed by Christ, in which even the pope lacked – without a special revelation – the knowledge of his own salvation.[43]

Hus responded that such a bad pope (prelate or pastor) was unworthy of his status [*digne*] only before God. As to his office and to the people's estimation [*quoad officium et hominum reputationem*], he was still a pope, a pastor, or a priest.[44] Hus, in fact, defined the Church in a triple way in his *Sermo de ecclesia* of 1410 in which he focused on ecclesiology more systematically for the first time.[45] First, the Church was viewed broadly [*large*] including all those who professed the same faith in word and deed, and according to Hus, also both the predestined and the foreknown, the latter particularly if they were

the charge of heresy for upholding remanence against Stanislav's pupil, Matěj of Knín, who had to repudiate the tenet under oath. Thus, Hus had the right to point out later that his former mentor, Stanislav, had probably erred more in the eucharistic teaching than anybody else (*ibid*., 102). Incidentally, Hus's statement provided further evidence against his ever upholding the theory of remanence.

[43] Palacký, *Documenta*, 228 ("Accusationes M. Johannis Hus ejusque responsa"): "Papa vel praelatus malus et praescitus aequivoce (est) pastor et vere fur et latro." Hus commented on this article: "quia non secundum officium et vitae meritum, sed solum secundum officium." The relevant passage in Hus's treatise, *Contra Stephanum Palecz*, in which he responded to the charges of his former friend and partner Páleč ("olim amicus meus et socius precipuus"), that he had held, "quod si papa, episcopus vel prelatus est in peccato mortali, quod tunc non est papa, episcopus vel prelatus," Hus explained, "quod tales non vere protunc secundum presentem iusticiam, sed equivoce sunt pape, episcopi vel prelati" and referred to the Gospel of St. John (10,6) "sunt fures et latrones." Hus, *Polemica*, 238. This was in full agreement with Hus's view of Wyclif's condemned Article Fifteen: "Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est prelatus, nullus episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali," where Hus, with reference to Sts Augustin, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, and John Chrysostom, explained that this sentence had a true meaning, namely, "quod nullus talis est digne, quamvis secundum officium sit talis;" see "Responsiones Mgri Johannis Hus ad articulos Johannis Wiclef," in: Sedlák, *Mistr Jan Hus*, 306*–307*.

[44] See also n. 43. Petr of Mladoňovice recorded Hus's quoted response at the hearing before the Council fathers on June 8, 1415; see Palacký, *Documenta*, 301.

[45] Jan Hus, "Joannis Hus Sermo de Ecclesia," in: Sedlák, *Mistr Jan Hus*, 116*–126*.

currently in the state of grace.[46] Second, Hus posited the Church strictly [*stricte*] as covering only the predestined and appealed to Saint Augustine's judgment that in this sense the Church could not include any of the foreknown. According to the third definition, Hus defined the Church as the pope and the body of cardinals, who are supposed to be special members and officials [*officiales*] of the Lord Jesus Christ in accordance with the first and the second definitions.[47] It cannot, therefore, be doubted that Hus also respected the Church as an institutional entity, although for him the community of the predestined constituted – in harmony with Saint August – the Church in the strict or most proper sense of the word [*ecclesia propriissime dicta secundum Augustinum*].[48]

In his *De ecclesia* Hus defined the Church in a similar way, and there is, therefore, no reason to doubt his veracity when, in answering the articles of his indictment on June 18, 1415, he stated that in his treatise he recognized the Holy Roman Church which included – according to the saints – all believing Christians, who owed obedience to the Roman pope according to the law of Christ. "Nam pono in libro De ecclesia," Hus wrote verbatim, "esse sanctam Romanam ecclesiam, quae est, secundum sanctos, omnes fideles Christian[?] ad oboedientiam Romani pontificis juxta legem Christi pertinentes."[49]

The available evidence cannot convince us that, as has been at times suggested, Hus wished to "embellish" his position in Constance and denied certain "dangerous" points of his teaching, thus contradicting what he had actually proclaimed. We need not entertain any doubts about Hus's sincerity when he emphasized on June 18, 1415

[46] "Ecclesia ergo sancta catholica uno modo sumitrur large pro omnibus confitentibus eandem fidem verbo vel in facto, et sic accipitur pro predestinatis mixtim et pro prescitis, presertim dum, sunt in gracia secundum presentem iusticiam." *Ibid*., 116*–117*.

[47] "Alio modo sumitur ecclesia sancta catholica stricte pro congregacione predestinatorum. …Tercio modo accipitur ecclesia pro papa et cetu cardinalium qui debent precipua esse membra et officiales domini Jessu Christi et in sancta ecclesia primo et esecundo modo dictis." *Ibid*., 117*.

[48] The first of the thirty Articles, extracted from his treatise *De ecclesia*, was as follows: "Unica est universalis ecclesia, quae est praedestinatorum universitas," and Hus responded: "propriissime dicta secundum Augustinum;" see "Responsum M. Johannis Hus ultimum, ad articulos excerptos e libro de Ecclesia," in Palacký, *Documenta*, 225.

[49] See "Articulus 21 de processu causae," *ibid*., 231.

that he answered the articles of the indictment according to his conscience and in the knowledge of having to render an account before the Almighty.[50]

When he returned his answers on June 20, 1415, he already knew that his choice was limited to either renunciation or death.[51] Even then his conscience would not permit him to state sweepingly about the entirety of Wyclif's teaching that he did not hold or had not held [*non tenui nec teneo*] any part of it. Neither was he prepared to say this about his own teaching where he considered it correct and supported by the authority of the Scripture and the Church Fathers.

Therefore he concludes his last notes with the following prayer: "The Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the one God, in whom I believe and trust, will give me with the assistance of all the saints and righteous people the spirit of counsel and courage so that I may escape the snares of the devil, and finally come to rest in the divine mercy."[52]

How then to answer the question whether Hus was a heretic, a saint, or a reformer? The response, of course, depends on the angle of vision. The Council of Constance seized upon the first designation. One of the most eminent fathers of the Council, and Chancellor of the University of Paris, Jean Gerson, viewed the teachings of Wyclif and Hus as virtually identical. His mind was not free of prejudgments. As early as May 1414 he had exhorted the Archbishop of Prague, Konrád of Vechta, to eradicate in Bohemia "the most pernicious tare originating from the writings of a John Wyclif," and, if arguments of disputations did not succeed, to secure the help of the secular arm "to dispatch this heresy and its authors into the fire."[53]

Subsequently, at the Council of Constance, Gerson enunciated in

[50] "Et ego Joannes Hus, semper in spe servus Jesu Christi, scripsi responsiones ad articulos … juxta meam conscienctiam, de qua omnipotenti domino debeo redder rationem." *Ibid*., 233.

[51] "Jam restat vel revocare et abjurare et poenitentiam mirabilem suscipere, vel comburi." *Ibid*., 234.

[52] "Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, unus Deus, in quem credo et confido, dabit, intercedentibus omnibus sanctis et hominibus justis, spiritum consilii et fortitudinis, ut possim lapsum Satanae effugere, et in ipsius gratia finaliter permanere. Amen." *Ibid*., 234.

[53] Gerson's letter was published in Palacký, *Documenta*, 523–526: "…oniam a multis jam annis., sicut accepi, seminata sunt in abundantia nequam per vestram diocesim Pragensem peniciosissima zizania diversorum errorum, corruptam originem habentia a scriptis cujusdam dicti Joannis Wiclef … . Tandem accessit, velut in

his sermon *Prosperum iter* the policy that the Council was authorized not only to try cases of heresy, but also to condemn such opinions which could not be refuted by recourse to either the Scripture or the doctors and the customs of the Church. According to the Chancellor, such was the case with many of Wyclif's and Hus's tenets.[54] His view prevailed at Constance and, after the sentencing of Wyclif as a heretic in May 1415, Hus had, properly speaking, lost the chance to demonstrate his disagreements with the arch-heretic of Oxford.

And where do matters stand at present on the issue of Hus's heresy within the Roman Catholic Church? The story of a fresh approach to the problem may be traced back to the speech of Cardinal Josef Beran at the Second Vatican Council and to the statement of the present Pope John Paul II during his first visit in Prague in 1990. The year 1993 was an outstanding milestone when a scholarly ecumenical symposium on Hus, meeting in Bayreuth, was followed by a similarly oriented Commission for the Study of the Problems Related to the Personality, Life and Work of Jan Hus. The Commission was sponsored by the Czech Bishops' Conference with the Archbishop of Prague, Miloslav Cardinal Vlk as chairman, Bishop František Radkovský as deputy chairman, and Father František Holeček, O. M. as secretary. Cardinal Vlk has assessed the Commission's work in the following way: "… mutual openness and willingness to revise former historical preconceptions made it possible to see Hus within the actual historical setting of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries and the contemporary situation of the Church. …With the recognition of the era's dark background, the positive traits of Hus's personality could emerge more clearly."[55]

---

desperata peste, securis brachii secularis, excidens haereses cum auctoribus suis et in igne mittens."

[54] Kejř, *Husův proces*, 144–145 and 181–182: "Concilium generale potest et debet damnare propositiones multas vel assertiones huiusmodi, quamvis non possent ex solo et nudo textu sacre scripture patenter reprobari, seclusis expositionibus Doctorum vel celebri Ecclesiae. Hoc practicatum est in hoc concilio de multis assertionibus Iohannis Wicleff et Iohannis Hus."

[55] Jaroslav Pánek and Miloslav Polívka, eds., *Jan Hus ve Vatikánu. Mezinárodní rozprava o českém reformátoru 15. století a o jeho recepci na prahu třetího tisíciletí* (Jan Hus in Vatican: The International Discourse on a Czech Reformer of the 15th Century and His Reception on the Eve of the Third Millennium) (Prague, 2000). The quote is on p. 125.

These labors and endeavors culminated in the International Symposium on Master Jan Hus [*Convegno internazionale su Johannes Hus*], which was held at the Papal Lateran University in Rome and in the Vatican in December 1999. It was arranged jointly by the Central Committee for the Great Jubilee Year of 2000 and the Czech Bishops' Conference with the cooperation of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Charles University. The participants included foremost scholars and spokesmen for churches of several European countries, as well as representatives of the Holy See, in addition to researchers from the Czech Republic, Canada, Germany, Italy, Liechtenstein, and Poland.

During his audience with the participants of the Roman symposium, Pope John Paul II spoke highly about the work of the ecumenical Hus commission and about the symposium itself. He characterized Hus as "the well known Czech preacher, one of the most famous among other outstanding masters, produced by the University of Prague." He said further: "Hus is a noteworthy figure for many reasons. It is however most particularly his moral courage face to face with enmity and death which make him a person of special significance for the Czech nation, also heavily tested in the course of the centuries." "I feel the duty," the Pope said further, "to express a deep sorrow over the cruel death, to which Jan Hus had to submit, and over the resulting wound, which opened in the minds and hearts of the Czech people. And became the source of conflicts and divisions."[56]

Now let us turn to the second characteristic of Hus as a saint. The historical background was already provided in the introduction. In his speech at the Roman international symposium in December 1999, the President of the Czech Republic, Václav Havel, could rightfully state that this meeting was "in a certain sense also a culmination of centuries-long endeavors of many personalities to have the highest ecclesiastical authority solemnly and publically recognize the moral and intellectual contribution of the Czech reformer, a fervent Christian and a Catholic priest into the treasury of Czech and European history, and further to elicit an expression of sorrow over the way in

[56] *Ibid*., 111–113.

which the religious and state authorities responded, at that time, to his call for reform and for life according to the truth."[57]

Václav Havel reminded us further of "Hus's heart-felt and intrinsic attachment to the Truth, to its unswerving pursuit in harmony with the innermost convictions and deeds of everyday life," and also that "Hus stressed the role of human conscience more than most of the wise men and women who had preceded him."[58] As noted earlier, this moral authenticity of Hus has been also affirmed by the Pope. I believe it is possible to say without any exaggeration that the saintly character of Hus's life has been adequately documented.

At last, let us turn to the characterization of Hus as a reformer. Also in this case we have already furnished a brief historical introduction. At present, this issue is probably the most apropos. Cardinal Vlk and Pavel Smetana, the synodal senior of the Evangelical Church of Bohemian Brethren – who like the patriarch of the Czechoslovak Hussite Church, Josef Špak, participated in the symposium – issued a joint declaration stating that "our era has been filled with efforts for rapprochements among the Christian churches. This year has brought an important joint declaration, concerning the teaching on the justification by faith, from the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and the Lutheran World Federation. In this atmosphere, it is especially significant and relevant to reflect on personalities such as Hus, whose status on the borderline between the two traditions was expressed already by the title of the first Bayreuth symposium in 1993 – *Jan Hus Between Nations, Centuries, and Confessions*." The joint declaration continued: "No church and no confession can "appropriate" Hus in his entirety. Hus, however, can become the bridge of a new trust from heart to heart… In his ecclesiology Hus undoubtedly transcended the self-understanding of the Church of his time. In some respects, he anticipated the ideas of the Reformation of the next century; in other respects, he anticipated the attitudes which the Roman Church would subsequently endorse at the Second Vatican Council."[59]

---

[57] *Ibid*., 114–117.
[58] *Ibid*.
[59] *Ibid*., 120–122.

John Paul II emphasized that one of the principal goals of the ecumenical Hus Commission would be reached by its endeavors "to define more precisely the place, which … Hus occupies among the reformers of the Church."[60] We may wonder whether the Pontiff thought of an area delimited by the thesis *ecclesia semper [est] reformanda*, or rather of Hus's share in the process of the European Reformation, or even of a broader frame of reform in church and society which would extend to cover the present European and global community. It is my view that the last variant is the most likely inasmuch as the International Hus Symposium was held in the Vatican under the aegis of the Papal Central Committee for the Great Jubilee, and in a way it ushered in the Jubilee Year of 2000.

Václav Havel said in Rome that Hus had anticipated not only "… the future evolution of European religious thought, but also the values which lay at the foundation of present-day ideals of human rights, democracy, and civil society,"[61] and John Paul II emphasized that "a figure of the stature of Jan Hus, which in the past had been a major point of discord, can now become an object of dialog, exchanges of opinions, and thus of a reciprocal refinement of views." The work of the international symposium provided, according to the Pontiff, "an important service not only to the historical figure of Jan Hus, but also more broadly to all Christians and to the entire European society because, in the final analysis, it was a service to the truth of genuine humanity, a truth which the family of men needed to discover anew, more than any other truth at the dawn of the third millennium of the Christian era."[62]

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

[60] *Ibid*., 111.
[61] *Ibid*., 117.
[62] *Ibid*., 112.

THE WHITE MOUNTAIN, 1620: AN ANNIHILATION OR APOTHEOSIS OF UTRAQUISM?

Zdeněk V. David, Washington

Following the Battle of the White Mountain on November 8, 1620, which by and large ended the insurrection of the Bohemian estates against the Habsburg rule, the country was subject to what amounted to a revolution in religious, as well as political, matters. During the restored reign of King Ferdinand II, Bohemia witnessed an abrupt and drastic imposition of the Counter Reformation, which could proceed in an unrestrained way due to the simultaneous introduction of royal absolutism by the victorious Habsburg. Gone was the remarkable state of relative tolerance, respect for human rights, unfettered learning, and economic prosperity, which hitherto had characterized the Kingdom of Bohemia. The era of Camelot was over.

On the religious front, the clergy of the Bohemian Brethren and the Calvinists were expatriated as early as 1621. The banishment of German Lutheran ministers was delayed until 1622–1624 to pacify Ferdinand II's ally, the elector of Saxony, Johann Georg. In 1622, the Jesuits were authorized to supervise education and censor books. In the same year measures were introduced to suppress Utraquism, a process with which we shall be concerned in this article. A campaign to convert dissidents in towns and in the countryside was launched in 1623–1624, and continued for several years. The task was entrusted to special missions, supported by military detachments and directed by "Reformation" Commissions. Aside from imprisonment and physical punishment, the threats of quartering of troops proved particularly effective in eliciting submission.[1] Many urban dissenters emigrated, mainly from areas bordering Saxony and Silesia. The

[1] R. Po-Chia Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal, 1540–1770* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 76; Jaroslav Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*. 2 vols. (Prague: Zvon, 1991), 2:78–79.

suppression of dissent was formally enacted in 1627, when the Letter of Majesty of 1609 was explicitly abrogated and the Renewed Land Ordinance declared the Roman Catholic religion the only permissible one. The main thrust of the Counter Reformation then turned against the nobles, who so far had been spared. Those who did not wish to conform had to leave the country. Protestant hopes engendered during the rest of the Thirty Years' War by periodic military successes of the Saxons or the Swedes were completely extinguished in October 1648 by the Treaty of Westphalia, which gave the Habsburgs a carte blanche to settle religious affairs in both Bohemia and Moravia. The subsequent dissenters continued to face serious penalties, since religious heterodoxy became equated with political treason.[2]

The repression following the Battle of the White Mountain on November 8, 1620, has been covered in both older and recent literature.[3] The aim of this article is to explore the consequences for Bohemian Utraquism under the following rubrics: (1) the fate of Utraquist clergy, institutions, and believers; (2) the mystery of the apparently rapid and complete vanishing of Utraquism; and (3) the long-range impact and significance of Utraquism.

After the Battle of White Mountain, the Utraquists would still constitute the most substantial part of Bohemia's population.[4] Their treat-

---

[2] Václav Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hl. města Prahy*, 6 (1930), 359–362; Robert A. Kann and Zdeněk V. David, *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands, 1526–1918*, History of East Central Europe, 6 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984), 103–107; Charles Ingrao, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618–1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 34–38; Josef Petráň and Lydia Petráňová. "The White Mountain as a Symbol in Modern Czech History," in Mikuláš Teich, ed., *Bohemia in History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 143–148.

[3] Anton Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*. 4 vols. (Prague: Tempský, 1880); Antonín Rezek, *Děje Čech a Moravy za Ferdinanda III až do konce třicetileté války, 1637–1648.* Prague: Kober, 1890; Tomáš Bílek, *Dějiny konfiskací v Čechách po roku 1618*, 2 vols. (Prague: Řivnáč, 1882–1883); Ernest Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie Leroux, 1903), 1: 1–241;Václav Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," *Sborník příspěvků k dějinám hl. města Prahy*, 6 (1930), 357–415; 7 (1933), 1–120; 9 (1935), 1–439; Ivana Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo: Jezuité v Čechách* (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1995); Jiří Bílý, *Jezuita Antonín Koniáš: Osobnost a doba* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 1996); Jan Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace* (Heršpice: Eman, 1997).

[4] On the prevalence of Utraquists under kings Rudolf II and Matthias in the population of Bohemia see Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquists, Lutherans, and the Bohe-

ment thus represented the most formidable challenge that the Counter Reformation had to face. The problem of the Protestant groups by and large solved itself through emigration. The Lutheran nobles and townspeople (mainly from the German areas) left largely for Saxony. The Unity of Brethren, and others suspected of Calvinism, had to go further afield to Prussia, Poland, Holland, England, and eventually to Dutch and British North America. As for the Utraquist majority, the Czech-speaking townspeople and rural folk, they had no place to go, even if they were permitted to, which in most cases they were not. There was no ecclesial rationale, milieu, or market abroad to which they could turn with their distinctive Bohemian brand of liberal Roman[5] Catholicism. They could not run or hide, but had to stay and face the Counter Reformatory music.

In the unhappy and even perverse outcome, the Bohemian religious organism was not destroyed on the surface, but its spirit was altered, while the body remained. One is reminded of the phenomenon of outer-space body-snatching "aliens" in contemporary American cinematography. There was relatively little change in the external appearance of the ecclesiastical framework, in the modes of faith and worship. It was, however, as if an alien character had entered the familiar body, as if a nurturing, some would say overindulgent, mother was replaced by a suspicious stepmother, committed to chastising and castigating her flock. Moreover, it was as if the spirit of reasonableness and discussion, based on the Judge of Cheb [*soudce chebský*] of 1432, the *Compactata* of 1436, and the Peace of Kutná

---

mian Confession of 1575," *Church History*, 68 (1999), 310–331; Zdeněk V. David, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609–1620," *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*. Vol. 3: Papers from the XIXth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bratislava 1998, eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Main Library, 2000), 188–196.

[5] The Utraquists regarded themselves, and were viewed under the *Compactata*, as an integral part of the historical Western Patriarchate of Rome, and thus as entitled to the appellation of not just the Catholic Church, but an outright Roman Catholic Church, see Zdeněk V David, "Central Europe's Gentle Voice of Reason: Bílejovský and the Ecclesiology of Utraquism," *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997), pp. 51–53, 58; and idem, "The Utraquists and the Roman Curia, 1575–1609: Institutional Aspects," *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, Vol. 4, 225–260.

Hora of 1485,[6] was replaced by that of authoritarianism and intolerance, based on the anathemas of the councils of Constance and of Trent, and on the militancy of the traditionally feared monastic orders. Seen from the grass roots, although virtually identical vestments and books were used, the character of the clergyman as a kindly pastor and neighbor was transmuted into that of a detached religious inspector acting as a counterpart to the manorial bailiff who was correspondingly charged with the work of secular policing.

In conclusion, in a speculative vein and as issues for future research several suggestions will be put forth. (1) The Bohemian Counter Reformation produced a national religious amnesia by which the conscious awareness of Utraquism was suppressed, but not replaced, by an attachment to either the Roman Curia, or one of the Reformed churches. (2) Nevertheless, the liberal substrate, divorced from the original theological context, would reemerge in the Bohemian national awakening, roused by the republication of sixteenth-century literature, the liberal spirit of which the Utraquist ambiance had originally nurtured. (3) Utraquism would continue to stand as a prototype for the subsequent epiphanies of "liberal Catholicism," particularly the Josephin ecclesiastical reforms of the late eighteenth century.

What Happened to the Utraquists?

1. Question of Toleration

The fate of the Utraquist Church was decided in 1621. It was true that King Ferdinand II, as late as June 1620, had prudently entertained the idea of preserving the institution sanctioned by his grandfather, uncle, and cousins. After all, it was not the Utraquists, but the Lutherans and the Bohemian/Moravian Brethren who initiated and spearheaded the revolt against Habsburg rule, while the Utraquist towns initially hesitated. The victorious avenger's temporary indulgence toward the

[6] On the liberal features of Utraquism see, for instance, Thomas A. Fudge, "The Problem of Religious Liberty in Early Modern Bohemia," *Communio Viatorum*, 38 (1996), 64–87; Ernest Denis, *Fin de l'indépendance bohême*. 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie Leroux, 1930), 2:208–209.

Utraquists may have also been inspired by a misplaced wish to please his Lutheran ally, Johann Georg, the elector of Saxony.[7] Even the Jesuits advocated a more tactful and humane approach, but only prior to the White Mountain.[8]

An advisory commission that assembled in the freshly conquered Prague in late November 1620 still recommended what in political science has become known as "the salami tactic" of initially proceeding only against the Brethren and the Calvinists, tolerating the Lutherans and the Utraquists.[9] In early 1621, the royal governor of Bohemia, Karl Lichtenstein, also favored the maintenance of Utraquism, at least on a temporary basis, including a separate Consistory. Mainly to relieve the shortage of acceptable clergy, he proposed that those Utraquist priests, who were willing to obey the Archbishop, be allowed to distribute communion in both kinds, a practice conditionally permitted by Rome at the time of the Council of Trent.[10] The Czech Catholic historian Václav V. Tomek, reported the situation thus:

> In the first terrible phase of a complete uprooting of the country's legal order [1621], the party of the Old Utraquists raised once more its voice… Some of its priests approached the viceroy, Count Karl of Lichtenstein, asking that they be permitted, according to the established custom, to distribute communion

---

[7] Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse: Její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Prague: Česká akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1912), 572.

[8] Josef Pekař, „Bílá Hora: její příčiny a následky," *Postavy a problémy českých dějin*, ed. František Kutnar (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1990), 183; for the Jesuits' praise of Utraquism in 1618 see Adam Tanner, *Apologia pro Societate Jesu ex Boemiae Regno ab eiusdem regni statibus religionis sub utraque, publico decreto immerito proscripta. Anno M. DC. XVIII. die VIIII Junij*, (Vienna, 1618), 53. see also Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách* , 2 vols. (Prague: Česká akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění,1895), 1: 275.

[9] Anton Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*. 4 vols. (Prague: Tempský, 1880), 4:33. On "salami tactics" advocated for the sequential suppression of religious dissidents in Bohemia under kings Rudolf II and Matthias, see Philip Longworth, *The Making of Eastern Europe: From Prehistory to Postcommunism* , 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 80, 231.The term is based on a brag by Mátyás Rákosi, the Stalinist dictator, about his way of suppressing the democratic opposition in Hungary in the late 1940s, using the simile of the Magyars' treatment of their favorite sausage.

[10] *Ibid*., 4:433.

> in both kinds…and to be administered by a Consistory composed of their own clergy…[11]

In the end, however, in the aftermath of the White Mountain, Ferdinand did not seek to tolerate Utraquism or to promote its reconciliation with the papacy (on an admittedly remote chance that a compromise could be found between Utraquist liberalism and Roman authoritarianism). Moreover, schooled in forcible suppression of religious dissent in Inner Austria, which he had previously ruled (1596–1619), Ferdinand rejected a peaceful approach toward a restoration of religious unity that was effective in neighboring Poland.[12] One need not be a committed secularist or a Protestant fundamentalist to feel dismay about the resolution of the religious conditions in Bohemia through a heavy-handed Spanish-style Counter Reformation, indiscriminately suppressing the mainstream Utraquists together with the Protestants, that is, the largely German Lutherans and the marginal Brethren.[13] Whatever may have been true earlier, by the seventeenth century the use of force to alter religious conviction no longer seemed obviously natural or normal. The principle *cuius regio, eius religio* by no means worked smoothly, much less automatically, even in the area of its chief application – among the German people. This was specifically demonstrated by the failure of the Elector of Prussia, Johann Sigismund, to change the faith of his subjects from

---

[11] Václav V. Tomek, „O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách, od r. 1415 až 1622," *Časopis českého muzea* 22 (1848), 463; see also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 574–5; Anton Frind, „Urkunden über die Bewilligung des Laienkelches in Böhmen unter Kaiser Ferdinand I," *Česká společnost nauk. Abhandlungen* vol. 6, no. 6 (1873), 42–43; Tomáš Bílek, *Reformace katolická; neboli Obnovení náboženství katolického v království českém po bitvě na Bílé Hoře* (Prague: F. Bačkovský, 1892), 15–16; Kamil Krofta, *Bílá Hora: Kurs šestipřednáškový* (Prague: J. Otto, 1914), 222.

[12] See, for instance, Janusz Tazbir, "The Fate of Polish Protestantism in the Seventeenth Century," in J. K. Fedorowicz, ed., *A Republic of Nobles: Studies in Polish History to 1864* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 198–217.

[13] Concerning the influence of Spanish religiosity and political style on the Austrian Habsburgs see Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1962), 450–452. Robert Bireley, *Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counterreformation: Emperor Ferdinand II, William Lamormaini, S.J., and the Formation of the Imperial Policy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 5–6.

Lutheranism to Calvinism in 1613.[14] At the other end of Europe, the English had more sense than to apply brute force in order to "convert" the Irish, or for that matter to suppress the Roman faith entirely in Britain, as long as its adherents promised not to condone assassinating the monarch or call her/him a heretic in public.[15] Although subject to considerable discomfort, almost half of the population of Dutch Netherlands was able to retain the Roman faith in the seventeenth century.[16] The revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1598) in 1685 was the occasion of a major international scandal. Yet, the Bohemian dissidents were not treated by history with even that much consideration and Ferdinand II's act of outlawing religious freedom, his abrogation of the Letter of Majesty of 1609, has failed to find a definite place on the world register or inventory of infamous acts. There were, however, individuals on the Roman side, including Lohelius's successor as Archbishop of Prague, Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1623–1667) and the theologian Valerian Magni (1586–1661) who, for a long time, felt uneasy about the use of police and military coercion to establish the decreed orthodoxy in the Czech lands.[17]

What made the procedure even more lacerating in Bohemia was a superimposition of national prejudice on top of the Spanish-like religious zeal, which produced the peculiarly vengeful and spiteful character of the Counter Reformation there. This was largely the result of the character of the Roman Church's leadership in the country at the turn of the century. At the very top the first three archbishops of the restored see of Prague, officiating from 1564 to 1606, could be considered products of the Bohemian cultural milieu – the third Zbyněk Berka was even born and raised as a Utraquist and was subject to a

[14] Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), especially 111–131.

[15] On the attitude of the English/British government toward domestic Roman Catholicism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see articles by John Bossy and Hugh Trevor-Roper in Ole P. Grell, Jonathan I. Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, eds. *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 369–408.

[16] Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal*, 84–85.

[17] Bireley, *Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counterreformation*, 38–41; Eduard Winter, *Der Josefinismus: die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus, 1740–1848* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1962), 10–13.

humiliating purification ceremony prior to his assumption of office in 1593. Their two successors – Karl of Lamberg and Johann Lohelius – however, were outsiders who were not even able to speak the language of the population over whose fate they were destined to preside.

Thus by a conjunction of circumstances, the leaders of the Roman Church in Bohemia happened to be imbued not only with a militant religious ardor, but also particularly disliked Jan Hus and the Bohemian Reformation. The Catholics within the Holy Roman Empire felt a powerful aversion toward the Bohemian Reformation for two major reasons. In the first place, there was a sense of national grievance, inasmuch as ethnic Germans figured conspicuously among the victims of the Taborite religious terror. This was directed against the supporters of the Roman Curia – seen as a fifth column – during the initial radical phases of the reform movement in 1420–1431, when the Czechs almost literally fought for survival against overwhelming odds in the face of five imperial and papal crusades.[18] In the second place, Luther had used Hus's condemnation at Constance as a weapon to undermine the credibility of the Roman Curia.[19] Thereby he opened the door to a massive defection from Rome and to a painful division of the Holy Roman Empire along religious lines. It appears that these unfriendly sentiments could only be assuaged by a total victory following the Battle of the White Mountain, completely reversing the humiliations inflicted by the Bohemian Reformation.

In the context of the outsiders' input into the Bohermian Counter Reformation, it is important to consider that the archbishop of Prague, Johann Lohelius, stemmed from Cheb, and his two chief ecclesiastical associates and allies were Casper von Questenberg, the abbot of Strahov Monastery, born in Cologne, and Johann Ernst Platejs, a holder of multiple canonries, whose father was a Saxon convert to the Roman Church. The historians of the Bohemian Counter Refor-

[18] In fact, a recent author has suggested that the Catholics of the Holy Roman Empire viewed the Taborites' terror with an aversion comparable to preset-day public's attitude to the Nazi conduct of the Holocaust, see Richard Marius, *Martin Luther: The Christian Between God and Death* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 176.

[19] Pelikan, Jaroslav, Jr., "Luther's Attitude Toward John Hus," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 19 (1948), 747–763.

mation, among them Anton Gindely, Ernest Denis, and Josef Pekař (none of them susceptible to xenophobia), have credited the three prelates with the principal initiatives for the particularly drastic and insensitive suppression of Utraquism. Pekař wrote that they played:

> …the crucial role in the decision to what degree the Catholic religion should be restored in Bohemia. It appears, it was they, who furnished the incentive for the ultimate decision, they acted as informants for the new papal nuncio… they assailed the Emperor with ever new petitions, until the goal was reached. Among this trio, the chief opponent of the Bohemians was Casper von Questenberg…, a monk who never learned Czech although he had lived for a quarter century in Bohemia, a passionate, even rapacious, bigot, who felt no sympathy even for Czech Catholics (in particular he disliked the "kinglings," *i. e.*, the royal lieutenants, above all, Count [Jaroslav Bořita] Martinic). His brother, an Imperial Councillor in Vienna, thought similarly; from the numerous expressions of distate toward the Bohemians, communicated to Casper in Prague, let it suffice to quote this sentence: 'All Czechs of both genders nauseate me.'[20]

In other words, this zealous ecclesiastical troika bore a large share of responsibility for initiating the work of the Counter Reformation in Bohemia in the spirit of revenge rather than one of reconciliation or charity. The national bias in the Bohemian Counter Reformation was subsequently criticized on the Roman side by Anthony Bruodin, a member of the expatriated Irish Franciscan community which found refuge in Prague in the 1630s. The Irishman saw in the Bohemian Counter Reformation an extension of the national strife around Hus.[21]

---

[20] Pekař, „Bílá Hora: její příčiny a následky," 182–183. See also Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*, 4:431.

[21] In his book *Propugnaculum veritatis catholicae* (Prague, 1669), cited in Stanislav Sousedík, *Filosofie v českých zemích mezi středověkem a osvícenstvím* (Prague: Vyšehrad, 1997), 142, 220.

2. Methods of Obliteration

Whatever benign characteristics the Counter Reformation may have possessed elsewhere in Europe, and however many magnificent specimens of Baroque architecture it may have left behind, in Bohemia the strand of ethnic antagonism synergized with an anti-heretical zeal to produce a particularly harsh and mean-spirited campaign toward religious conformity. No less than an unconditional and complete merger with the Roman Church would assuage this outburst of energy. The subordination of the Utraquists to the iron rule of the Roman Curia and their complete fusion with the organizational structure under its command had been prematurely announced, dating variously to 1564, 1575, 1593, or 1609. Now all this would actually come to pass not on a voluntary basis, but through coercion. The protective cover of the Bohemian Diet vanished together with the Utraquists' alliance with Lutherans and the Brethren on which their previous security had been based. Because of its total victory, the restored royal government, moreover, had no need to proceed with the cumbersome "salami tactics" which might have bought some time for the Utraquists, while the Protestants – their more radical allies – were being suppressed. Ferdinand II's agents could deal with the three types of Bohemian dissidents almost simultaneously.

As had happened previously, the nobles cavalierly let the Utraquist towns bear the brunt of the most drastic punishments, despite their own primary responsibility for the uprising which the towns were initially reluctant to join. Thus their behavior repeated the pattern of 1547. During the most theatrical and gruesome Habsburg retribution for the uprising, the beheadings in the Old Town Square of Prague on June 21, 1621, of the twenty-seven victims, seventeen were townspeople and only three barons. (The remaining seven were members of the gentry.) Many nobles escaped abroad, and some were pardoned.[22] In fact, the mainly Utraquist townspeople were repressed more severely than the largely Lutheran nobles.[23] These venomous

[22] Pravoslav Kneidl, *Městský stav v Čechách v době předbělohorské* (Ph. D. Dissertation. Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1951), 177.

[23] Josef Polišenský and Frederick Snider, „Změny ve složení české šlechty v 16. a 17. století," *Československý časopis historický* 20 (1972): 520, 525.

proceedings reflected the notoriously exploitative and restrictive policy that marked the Habsburg dynasty's self-defeating paranoia vis-a-vis the towns, incidentally, with disastrous consequences for the economic development of their realms. Here again the Austrian Habsburgs proved to be faithful students of the misguided lessons taught by their Spanish cousins.

Having Ferdinand II's ear, Archbishop Lohelius and the Jesuits responded with determined opposition to Lichtenstein and his secretary Pavel Michna of Vacínov, who favored tolerating the Utraquist clergy with their own Consistory, at least temporarily. It was an unequal contest which would extend until Easter 1622. In the next step in early 1621, the Archbishop together with the canons of the Prague Cathedral formally rejected a distinct order of clergy which would be entitled to distribute communion *sub utraque*. This decision signaled that only the Utraquist Church would be suppressed, but the distribution of the eucharist in both kinds, according to the minimalist concession of 1564, would be proscribed as well.[24] Accordingly, a convocation of clergy was held in April 1621 when the Utraquist priests (having episcopal ordination) were offered continuation in office, if (1) they agreed completely with the Tridentine Roman Church; and (2) pledged to distribute communion *sub una*. As the third and final condition, in an apparently compassionate gesture for its time and place – although lacking in courtesy – the priests were not asked to separate literally from their wives, but merely admonished to start referring to them as their housekeepers or cooks.[25] The exact result of this appeal is not known, but Platejs held another convocation of Utraquist priests in Prague in September 1621, and admonished them (1) to declare officially that communion *sub una* was no less beneficial than one *sub utraque*; (2) to admit none to communion without a prior auricular confession; and (3) to use Latin, instead of Czech, as the liturgical language.[26]

In gradually destroying Utraquism, the Archbishop and his two associates gained a powerful ally in the Nuncio to Vienna and the Imperial Court, Carlo Caraffa, a hardliner, who was likewise devoted

[24] Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*, 4:433.
[25] *Ibid*.; Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche*, 1:39.
[26] Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 18.

to complete conformity and opposed to any concessions to Utraquism. He valued particularly the anti-Utraquist zeal of Platejs in that connection.[27] As the next measure against Utraquism, the use of Czech language for liturgical purposes was proscribed in October 1621.[28] The Consistory *sub utraque* was abolished in the very same year.[29] The last Administrator, the Lutheran Jiřík Dykastus, was exiled from Bohemia with other Czech Protestant clergy in December 1621.[30] To forestall any semblance of compromise through the use of communion *sub utraque*, the Bohemian prelates turned with Caraffa's help to Rome, and rejoiced when the news arrived, dated December 22, 1621, that the Holy See had abrogated the permission of lay chalice for Bohemia. Questenberg and Platejs were then in Vienna and sought to persuade Ferdinand II to promulgate the papal ordinance against the opposition of Lichtenstein and Michna of Vacínov, who continued to favor a measure of tolerance for Utraquism.[31] The situation escalated when Lohelius, acting independently, promulgated a prohibition of lay chalice on February 28, 1622 declaring that the communion in both kinds for the laity, sanctioned by Pope Pius IV in 1564, was henceforth prohibited as harmful by a new decree of Pope Gregory XV.[32] The Utraquist clergy in Prague initially tried to evade the order, and Lichtenstein, advised by Michna, attempted a stalling action by granting permission for lay communion *sub utraque* in at least two churches in Prague at Easter. Moreover, Michna once more in a formal memorandum proposed the restoration of Utraquism, as long as the priests continued to receive proper episcopal ordinations, and required an auricular confession prior to communion.[33] The hardliners, of course, had made it clear earlier that even this diluted version was unacceptable. On Carafa's com-

[27] Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*, 4:435.

[28] Tomáš Bílek, *Dějiny řádu tovaryšstva Ježíšova a působení jeho vůbec a v zemích království českého zvláště* (Prague: F. Bačkovský, 1896), 491.

[29] Tomek, „O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463.

[30] Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 19.

[31] Jaroslav Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:74; Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*, 4:435.

[32] Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 22–23; Tomek, „O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463.

[33] Alois Kroess, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu*, 2 vols. in 3 (Vienna: Mayer, 1910–1938), 2:166.

plaint, Ferdinand II censured his two recalcitrant deputies in Prague, and confirmed Lohelius's order banning the lay chalice.[34] As a result, even the minimalist concession for Utraquism was finally foreclosed.

The mean-spirited character of the Counter Reformation was symbolized by the response of Platejs who decided to mark the final prohibition of lay chalice in a particularly humiliating way for the Utraquists. He chose to celebrate a mass with communion *sub una* in St. Martin's Church on March 28, 1622, and noted that he had done so in order to end the Utraquist tradition in exactly the same spot where it had been initiated by Jakoubek of Stříbro more than two hundred years earlier (in 1414).[35] On August 7, 1622 the administration of the Týn Church, the principal temple of Utraquism, was entrusted to a Roman priest, Ctibor Kotva of Freyfeld. Surreptitiously, under the cover of darkness, on the night of January 17, 1623, Kotva together with his assistant, Jiří Fer, removed the chalice and the statue of the Utraquist King George of Poděbrady from the tower of the Týn Church.[36] Soon the tombstone of Jan Rokycana, depicting him in the regalia of an archbishop, as well as his grave, were taken from the sanctuary. Also removed from the sanctuary were the remains of the Utraquist Bishop Augustine Sancturien.[37] Both were burned in the church yard. These energetic efforts, replicated in all corners of Bohemia, rapidly eliminated or disguised Utraquism's physical memorabilia. Moreover, the Counter Reformation disregarded the Utraquists' attachment to religious art of Gothic-like sobriety and simplicity, and replaced the sacral objects, which it had destroyed, by unusual decorations in the flamboyant Baroque style.[38]

Whatever might have been the case elsewhere in the world of the Counter Reformation, in Bohemia even the image of the Blessed

---

[34] Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 23, 25.

[35] *Ibid*., 24.

[36] Josef Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury české do konce XVIII. věku*, 2 vols. (Prague: Tempský, 1875), 1:400; Jos. Riss, „Jan Ctibor Kotva z Freyfeldu," *Časopis českého muzea* 54 (1880), 472.

[37] Jungmann, Josef J., *Historie literatury české*, 2d ed. (Prague: Řivnáč, 1849), 239; Eduard Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf im Sudetenraum* (Munich: Aufstieg-Verlag, 1938), 204.

[38] On the Utraquist taste in religious decor see Jan Chlíbec, „K vývoji názorů Jana Rokycany na umělecké dílo [The Development of Jan Rokycana's Views Concerning the Works of Art]," *Husitský Tábor* 8 (1985), 54–56.

Virgin was enlisted for an unsavory campaign. Although traditionally venerated by the Utraquists starting with Jan of Příbram and Rokycana,[39] it was now converted into a symbol of Utraquism's suppression. The Utraquist mementos in the Old Town Square would characteristically replaced – at the behest of Ferdinand II's son and successor Ferdinand III – by a Marian Column in 1652,[40] and the Roman Church made the person of Virgin Mary one of the centerpieces of the proselytizing in the post-White Mountain era. A characteristic aspect of this new emphasis was the republication in 1629 of the book by Kašpar Arsenius of Radbuza, *Pobožná knížka o blahoslavené Panně Marii* [A devout book about the Blessed Virgin Mary], which had originally appeared in 1613. Arsenius, then Dean of the Chapter at St. Vitus Cathedral, now vicar general of the archdiocese of Prague, inserted stories into the post-White Mountain edition, that reveal the manner by which the Virgin was recruited for the cause of the Counter Reformation. One such story credited the survival of Jaroslav Bořita of Martinice to her special intervention after his defenestration at the start of the Bohemian uprising on May 23, 1618.[41] In a particularly distasteful episode the Virgin was made to share responsibility for the Old Town executions on June 21, 1621. According to Arsenius, the beheadings reflected a divine retribution for the destruction of Marian imagery and other religious art in St. Vitus Cathedral by the Calvinist purge on the same day the year before.[42]

Another misuse by the Counter Reformation in Bohemia involved the auricular confession. While the rite itself might have had in its

[39] Zuzana Všetečková, "Iconography of the Mural Paintings in St. James's Church of Kutná Hora," *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*. Vol. 3: Papers from the XIXth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bratislava 1998, eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Main Library, 2000), 138.

[40] Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo*, 110.

[41] Kašpar Arsenius z Radbuzy, *Pobožná knížka o blahoslavené Panně Marii* (Prague: Pavel Sessius, 1629), f. A4v.

[42] *Ibid*., f. H4r-H5r. In this light, the removal of the Marian Column at the end of the Habsburg era in 1918 may be viewed, as an act of disrespect not for the Virgin, but for the parody of her which the Bohemian Counter Reformation had promoted. In addition, it may be seen as a long delayed response to the removal of the chalice from the Týn Church, and the desecration of the remains of Archbishop Rokycana and Bishop Sancturien. Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf im Sudetenraum*, 204.

essence a humane and salutary effect of relieving tender consciences of their sense of guilt and fear of punishment,[43] it was now in large part converted into an instrument of thought control. A certificate of confession became a legal requirement to be submitted annually by every inhabitant to the appropriate municipal or manorial office. The numbers of certificates were scrupulously counted and tabulated as an index of the Counter Reformation's success. Attempts to evade the official edict led to what from the ecclesiastical point of view would regarded as a variety of sacrilegious (or perhaps Švejkian?) behavior. The recalcitrants would offer to purchase certificates from the clergy "for money, grain, calves, geese, or other goods." Elsewhere, hardened individuals would collect certificates from numerous confessors and distribute the coveted documents to others for pay or as a free service. An evader would ask an unscrupulous friend to confess and obtain a certificate in his name.[44]

The task of religious repression was, in fact, formidable considering the size of the dissident population. In Prague alone of the 120,000 inhabitants in 1620, only two thousand were adherents of the Tridentine Roman Church.[45] Contrary to the assertions in standard historical literature that classical Utraquism had virtually disappeared by 1609, and had been replaced by a Bohemian variant of Lutheranism (or "Neo-Utraquism"), available evidence indicates that most of those outside obedience to the Holy See in Bohemia in 1621 were not Protestants, but Utraquists. The high proportion of Utraquists was also indicated by the reported "conversion" figures. Already, in an early rehearsal of the Counter Reformation, the Jesuits "converted" eleven Utraquists for every two Lutherans in late 1619, and seventy-one Utraquists for every thirty-three Lutherans in 1620.[46] Moreover, most of the Lutherans in Český Krumlov were probably German.

The most cogent evidence for the Utraquist preponderance, however, comes from the Roman side. Thus the papal instruction to nun-

[43] Such is the sensible understanding of the rite, for instance, in the Anglican communion. See Howard Harper, *The Episcopalian's Dictionary* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974), 49–50.
[44] Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace*, 97–98.
[45] Bílek, *Reformace katolická*, 6.
[46] Bílek, *Dějiny řádu tovaryšstva Ježíšova*, 480.

cio Carlo Carafa, dated April 12, 1621, stressed the existence of the Utraquists (Hussiti), presenting the other dissidents as marginal in post-White Mountain Bohemia. It is clear that by Hussiti the document referred to the Utraquists and not to the Lutherans or Crypto-Lutherans ("Neo-Utraquists") since it spoke of the Hussiti not as heretics, but as those eligible for reunion with the "Catolici," that is the mere schismatics.[47] That the Roman authorities by the term "hussiti" designated Utraquists, not Protestants, is attested by no less a figure than Platejs, whose Tridentine orthodoxy was beyond doubt. For instance, in March 1621 he made it clear that by the term "parochi hussitici" he meant Utraquist priests who had episcopal ordination [*sacerdotes rite consecrati*].[48] Another sign that the Bohemian dissidents were considered mere schismatics by Rome was that, to legitimize their ecclesiastical status, the candidates were not required to abjure particular heresies, which would be the case with Lutherans or Calvinists. Simple auricular confession and reception of communion under one species were sufficient.[49] Similarly, most of the Bohemian clergy were viewed as Utraquist, with canonical ordinations, even in the uncompromising eyes of the Curial representatives. Thus at the clerical convocations in Bohemia, such as assembled by Platejs in September 1621, the clergymen were offered admission to the fold of Roman priesthood without the condition of reordination.[50] This could not have applied to Lutheran ministers who would have been instituted outside the historical episcopal framework, and hence unacceptable as Roman priests without being ordained afresh.

An indication of the Utraquists' prevalence in Prague came also

---

[47] *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregors XV. Für die Nuntien und Gesandten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen, 1621–1623*, ed. Klaus Jaitner, 2 vols. (Tubingen: Niemeyer, 1997), 2:621–622.

[48] Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 10, n. 37 and n. 40.

[49] Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace*, 92. Looking at the procedure from the opposite shore, this is reminiscent of the simple admission of converts from *sub una* by the Utraquists. In comparison, more elaborate procedures were required for the reception of members of the Unity of Brethren, such as a profession of belief in the veneration of saints. See Chlíbec, „K vývoji názorů Jana Rokycany na umělecké dílo," 54; Pavel Bydžovský, *Odvolání jednoho Bratra z Roty Pikhartské*. 2nd ed. Prague: Jan Jičínský, 1588. [1st ed. Prague: Jan Kantor, 1559.] Available in photocopy at the National Library in Prague, sign. f Zc 54.

[50] For instance, Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 18.

from the behavior of the common believers. When in 1622, the observance of the holiday of Jan Hus and the Bohemian martyrs was secretly prohibited, it was reported that the people of Prague gathered in front of the locked churches on July 6.[51] Since Lutherans normally opposed veneration of saints, and their attitude toward honoring Hus was, to say the least, ambiguous, the conclusion can be drawn that most of Prague's inhabitants were Utraquists at that point. This is supported by the report that more than a thousand believers came to receive communion in both kinds from Jan Locika of Domažlice earlier in the year.[52] The strength of Utraquism is also made evident by the major presence of its priesthood after the Battle of the White Mountain, as reported by the Catholic historian and not a friend of Utraquism, Václav V. Tomek, as cited earlier.[53] In addition to this group of clergy, which must have been substantial, another group of six Utraquist priests had submitted unconditionally to Archbishop Lohelius in March 1621.[54]

Even later after several years of Counter Reformatory suppression we find evidence of strong Utraquist feelings among the rural population. When rumors of religious tolerance spread in 1627 in the district of Litomyšl, peasants from many villages demanded from the Catholic dean of the town masses in Czech language and communion in both kinds.[55] In view of the Lutherans' rejection of the canonical mass, these were evidently Utraquist, not Lutheran (or "Neo-Utraquist"), desiderata.

Looking at the situation from another angle, the fact that there were relatively few Czechs among the Lutheran exiles from Bohemia would indicate that most of the Bohemian Lutherans were German, while most of the Czechs were Utraquists and hence Lutheran Saxony

---

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

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

[53] Tomek, „O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách," 463; see also Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 574–5; Anton Gindely, *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, ed. Theodor Tupetz. (Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1894), 107–111; Bílek, *Reformace katolická*, 16–17.

[54] Against Hrejsa's opinion, Líva shows that the two groups were not identical in Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 9, 11 n. 42; referring to Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 575.

[55] *Dopisy Reformační komisse v Čechách z let 1627–1692*, ed. Antonín Podlaha (Prague: Nákl. vlastní, 1908), 5–6.

did not attract them.[56] For instance, the town of Pirna in Saxony was one of the principal gathering sites for religious refugees from Bohemia, and the lists of exiles, compiled there in 1621–1639, showed a striking prevalence of German names.[57] Even making allowance for Czech-speakers with German names, or for Czech names mutated into German by the recorders, it would still appear that most of the Lutheran exiles were Germans rather than Czechs, supporting the idea of Utraquism rather than Lutheranism as the prevalent religion among the Czechs in 1620.

3. Resistance and Collaboration

An authentic hero of Utraquist resistance was Jan Locika of Domažlice, pastor of the principal church of Utraquism, that of Our Lady Before the Týn in Prague. In the absence of a Utraquist Consistory, he may be viewed as Utraquism's head or chief representative, who was also a learned man with at least two theological treatises to his credit.[58] Locika followed Lichtenstein's permission for distribution of communion *sub utraque* in the churches of Týn, as well as St. Henry's, at Easter.[59] and administered communion in two kinds at Easter of 1622 (March 27) to more than a thousand faithful. On Easter Monday (March 28) he invited the congregation to receive communion in both kinds and declared that "some wish to prevent it, but it is more proper to obey God than people. Although they want to suppressed your hereditary faith, remain faithful and do not be misled. I will stay with you of one mind like a shepherd with his flock."[60] Subsequently, he continued to defy the Archbishop's reiterated prohibition of lay

[56] Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:83–84.

[57] Bobková, Lenka, *Exulanti z Prahy a severozápadních Čech v Pirně v letech 1621–1639* (Prague: Scriptorium, 1999), 6–131.

[58] *Kázání o posledním soudu* [Sermon About the Last Judgment] (1618?), and *O užitcích velikých z útrpného umučení Syna Božího* [On the Great Merits of the Suffering and the Death of the Son of God] (1618) The wholesale destruction of Utraquist literature during the Counter Reformation has probably deprived us of ever knowing more about Locika's books, see *Knihopis českých a slovenských tisků*, 2 vols., vol. 2 in 9 parts (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1925–1967), 2, pt. 4 (1948), 316, nos. 4923 and 4924.

[59] Líva, „Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 23.

[60] František Tischer, ed., *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610–1619* (Prague: Historický spolek, 1917–1925), 447.

chalice. Two weeks later he still urged fidelity to the Utraquist practices to his congregation, although anticipating his own approaching demise. The contingent of troops, with loaded muskets and flaming torches, which, at the archbishop's behest, actually came to seize him in the midst of a religious service on April 10, 1622, was repelled by the assembled congregation. Despite a final attempt by Michna to protect him, Locika was captured in his lodgings three days later in the early morning of April 13. Thereupon he was deposed by the archbishop, and taken to jail where he soon died.[61] He might have been beheaded in the castle of Křivoklát.[62] Incidentally, in the spirit of recent ecumenical trends, the martyrdom or near-martyrdom of Locika may suggest that his canonization, rather than sainting one of the architects of the Counter Reformation, would be an efficacious gesture, if the Vatican were seriously interested in conciliating the Bohemians and in making the Roman Church more widely acceptable in their eyes in the third millennium.[63]

In a flashback, it may be seen that the mistreatment of Locika despite his promise of cooperation with the Roman Curia showed how precarious the offers of accommodation had been, which Rome had proffered under Rudolf II and Matthias. Of course, the Roman side could argue that the Utraquists had forfeited its trust by their alliance with the Lutherans and the Brethren, even though this association was political, not confessional. The witness of Locika's martyrdom also appears as an ultimate rebuke to those who would maintain that Utraquism had lost its vitality, and was turning into an ossified phenomenon. In his views and demeanor he symbolized the

[61] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 580–1; Tischer, ed., *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí*, 447–8; Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf*, 203; Kroess, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu*, 2:167.

[62] According to Skála, Locika was beheaded at Křivoklát, Pavel Skála ze Zhoře, *Historie česká od r. 1602 do r. 1623*, ed. Karel Tieftrunk, 5 vols. (Prague: Kober, 1865–1870), 5:213. See also Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*, 4:443; Bílý, *Jesuita Antonín Koniáš*, 69.

[63] On recent Vatican efforts to come to grips with the issues of the Bohemian Reformation see František Holeček, "The Problems of the Person, the Life and the Work of Jan Hus: The Significance and the Task of a Commission of the Czech Bishops' Conference," in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, Vol. 2: Papers from the XVIIIth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Brno 1996, eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Main Library, 1998), 39–47.

genuineness of the Utraquist via media. While opposed to Protestantism, he was no lackey of the Roman Curia. As a quintessential Utraquist, he preached critically against the Tridentine Roman Church, while warning his followers against embracing the Reformed religion, particularly Calvinism.[64] In fact, he had so bitterly criticized the Roman Curia at his parish church in Prague in 1613 that he received a reprimand from Administrator Zykmund Crinitus, a Lutheran.[65] At the other end of the spectrum, he warned his flock against being confused and misled by the Protestants, or those who "do not conform with our ancient religion of those communicating in both species."[66] During the height of the Bohemian Uprising, he would incur a retribution in December 1618 for his unabashed attachment to the Corpus Christi procession.[67] In consequence, needless to say, he was subject to much maligning from both parties headquartered on each side of the via media. On the contrary, the Utraquists of Prague signified their ardent support for their spiritual leader in the face of both the Lutheran persecution in 1618, and Lohelius's suppression in April 1622. [68]

Some of the Utraquist priests, who complied with submission to the archbishop hoped to continue the old rites in practice. However, the machinery of the Counter Reformation was too powerful and well-tuned to tolerate any equivocation.[69] As noted earlier, part of the perfection of the enforcement system was that its operatives were not natives with at least a vestigial empathy with the local ways, but harshly unsentimental outsiders. Needless to say, the local population did not like it. Complaints about foreign priests and monks in the Roman Church could be heard frequently in Bohemia since the late sixteenth century, not only from the Utraquists, but also from the adherents of Rome.[70]

---

[64] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 537, n. 2, n. 4.
[65] Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách*, 1:272.
[66] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 536–537, n. 4.
[67] Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí*, 446–447.
[68] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 537, n. 4; Tischer, *Dopisy konsistoře podobojí z let 1610–1619*, 447.
[69] Líva, "Studie o Praze pobělohorské," 7 (1933), 22.
[70] For instance, *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu*. 15 vols. (Prague: Zemský výbor, 1877–1941), 7:439–440.

While the shortage of clergy initially forced the Roman Church to utilize Utraquist priests, they were closely watched and permitted no role in theological training. The Utraquist clergy had traditionally received their instructions from parish priests who served as mentors, since the University of Prague had lacked a theological faculty in any case.[71] Henceforth the education of priests was conducted by and large by the Jesuits and in strict isolation from any influence of the Bohemian Reformation. The Jesuit fathers eagerly assumed the task as soon as Ferdinand II placed the University of Prague under their control on November 10, 1622.[72] The resulting lack of training facilities was particularly lethal to the Utraquists who depended on canonically ordained clergy. The Lutherans and the Brethren could secure clandestine services from clergy from abroad.

Most of the Utraquist priests had little choice, but to accept assignments from the Roman Church after 1621. The incorporation of the Utraquist clergy and their congregations in the Roman ranks was a rough and ready process. A typical example was its application in the decanate of Litomyšl. The Dean, Vojtěch Hájek, called together the priests of the decanate on May 23, 1622, and read them a directive that henceforth the lay communion in both kinds was proscribed. Lay persons who refused communion *sub una* should be denied marriages and church burials. Those turning to any remaining unauthorized priests were to be punished more severely by confiscation of property or otherwise.[73] We can assume that, with rare exceptions (noted later), the priests submitted resentfully, and the Roman Church just as naturally did not trust them and could not rely on them to advance its objectives of imposing a post-Tridentine rigid conformity. Initially, their assignments were in rural parishes, although toward the end of the 1620s a few returned to Prague.[74] There were known instances of resistance. A former Utraquist priest, who returned to Prague, Vavřinec Hanžburský of Kopeček, pastor of St. Vojtěch, continued com-

[71] Apprenticeship to an experienced priest was a common way of educating candidates for priesthood in sixteenth-century Europe, see Lewis W. Spitz, *The Protestant Reformation, 1517–1559* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), 51.

[72] J. Ježek, „Vatikánská zpráva o reformaci a protireformaci v Čechách a zemích s nimi spojených za Ferdinanda II," *Sborník historického kroužku*, 8 part 2 (1899), 6.

[73] Gindely, *Dějiny českého povstání*, 4:444–445.

[74] Winter, *Tausend Jahre Geisteskampf*, 203–204.

munion *sub utraque* to his parishioners and issued them the officially required certificates of confession and communion *sub una*. He was beheaded in Prague in 1630. The investigating commission claimed or suspected other such cases, especially in the countryside. Thus another priest Havel Zemánek of Sadská was tried also in 1630 for having issued false certificate to forty families.[75] At times, the resistence to communion *sub una* was so strong in certain localities that even the Roman Church had to compromise and, despite the overt prohibitions, temporarily tolerate communion in both kinds.[76] Even later after several years of Counter Reformatory suppression, there was evidence of strong Utraquist feelings among the rural population, as in the district of Litomyšl in 1627 when the villagers asked for masses in Czech language and communion in both kinds.[77] It is possible that during the brief restoration of religious freedom in Prague, when the Saxons occupied the city temporarily from November 1631 to May 1632, some of the Utraquist clergy resumed church services. Among the temporarily restored clergy are listed two former monastics and five who reverted from the Roman Church.[78]

It appears that the Reformation Commissions pursued the Utraquists with the same vigor as the Protestants. Thus declarations in Mladá Boleslav in 1627 lumped those "who are non-Catholic or hold schismaticall opinions," exhorting them to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church.[79] A related decree threatened schismatics with banishment not only from the town, but from the entire Kingdom of Bohemia.[80] As noted earlier, the term "schismatic" – in other cases

---

[75] *Dopisy Reformační komisse v Čechách*, 138, 194; Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace*, 97.

[76] Zdeněk Jan Medek, *Na slunce a do mrazu: První čas josefinské náboženské tolerance v Čechách a na Moravě* (Prague: Kalich, 1982), 23–24.

[77] *Dopisy Reformační komisse*, 6.

[78] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 591 n. 1. See also Antonín Rezek, *Dějiny saského vpádu do Čech a návrat emigrace* (Prague: I. L. Kober, 1889), 121–135.

[79] Jan Amos Komenský, [Johann Amos Comenius,], *The History of the Bohemian Persecution* (London: By A.A. for Iohn Walker, 1650), 288.

[80] Komenský, *The History of the Bohemian Persecution*, 290. On the forcible Counter Reformation see, for instance, Josef Hanzal, „Rekatolizace v pobělohorských městech," *Česká města v 16.–18. století: Sborník příspěvků z konference v Pardubicích 14. a 15. listopadu 1990*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek (Prague: Historický ústav, 1991), 197–202.

"hussite" – was the Bohemian Counter Reformation's code word for the Utraquists, while "heretic" referred to the Lutherans or other Protestants. The directives of the Reformation Commission in Prague, charged with extirpation of religious dissent in Bohemia, went into considerable detail. Its letter of August 2, 1629 to the town council of Mělnik deals with three married women, who had refused to receive communion *sub una.* To break resistence in such cases, the commission mandated imprisonment with a diet of bread and water, and a subjection to a continuous exhortation of a priest. In the case of one of the women, who escaped from town, her husband was held responsible because of his alleged hesitation and lack of firmness in making his spouse conform.[81] Aside from punishments, procedures were employed to camouflage the transition from Utraquism. Thus unconsecrated wine [*neproměněné víno*] was offered to communicants *sub una*.[82] This type of ersatz utraquist lay communion would continue in some localities into the eighteenth century, and as a rare curiosity even into the nineteenth century.[83]

A few priests of the Utraquist Church appeared to serve willingly the new ecclesiastical regime. Two prominent ecclesiastics who in contrast to Locika's resistence, or grudging services of others, conformed and rendered an unqualified obedience to Rome, were Jindřich Hoffman and Symeon Kapihorský. Assisting their superiors, the two converts in their writings sought to trivialize, if not entirely deny, the existence of a non-Protestant Utraquism. They became typical participants in the campaign of obliterating the history of a coherent Utraquism, a procedure by which in the long run the Counter Reformation probably did the most damage to the Czech religious consciousness. The objective of this propaganda blitz was to deny the emergence of a prevalent consolidated and stable Utraquist faith, and to contrive instead the image of an unmanageable kaleidoscope of factional contestations. Thus Hoffman portrayed the whole era of the Bohemian Reformation as one of confusion and strife. Appealing to Hájek, he claimed falsely that Hus never approved lay communion

[81] *Dopisy Reformační komisse v Čechách*, 198–199.
[82] Skřivánek, „K náboženským dějinám východočeského města," 185.
[83] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 580, n. 4; lists literature on the topic.

sub utraque and, in fact, had categorically rejected the practice.[84] Hoffman further misinformed his readers that the nation had entirely repudiated the Bohemian Reformation in 1567 when the Lutheran and Unity nobles demanded exclusion of the *Compactata* from the constitutional laws of the Kingdom of Bohemia. In contrast to what he portrayed as endless disputes and quarrels of the past, Hoffman extolled the general peace which was guaranteed by the Counter Reformation's single faith.[85] Along the same lines, Kapihorský claimed that the betrayal of Hus had occurred as early as the 1520s when the Bohemians rallied behind Luther.[86]

In another example of misappropriating Bohemia's religious past, Utraquist liturgical books continued in use after the purge of objectionable passages. A case in point is the gradual of the Utraquist church in Litomyšl.[87] More generally, David Holeton calls attention to the use of "sanitized" Utraquist liturgical books in the new parishes of the Roman Church: "Often, this involved little more than the excision or mutilation of the feast of Hus. The Kutná Hora Gradual… has had the proper for the feast excised as has the small antiphonary… Other texts, like the Gradual of Martin Bachelor, have had the pages containing the feast so badly mutilated that they are unusable."[88] Aside from mutilation of texts, there was a meticulous and persistent campaign to eliminate Utraquist writings, as well as Czech Protestant literature.[89] The scale of destruction was impressive (and depress-

---

[84] Jindřich Ondřej Hoffman, *Ocularia. A neb oči sklenné starého Čecha, které podává Čechu nynějšímu skrze něžby hleděl na předešlou staročeskou nábožnost* (Prague: Jiří Sedlčanský, 1637), 210–211.

[85] *Ibid*., 218–219, 262.

[86] Symeon Evstachyus Kapihorský, *Hystoria kláštera Sedleckého* (Prague: Pavel Sessius, 1630), 66.

[87] Milan Skřivánek, „K náboženským dějinám východočeského města v 15. až 18. století," *Česká města v 16.–18. století: Sborník příspěvků z konference v Pardubicích 14. a 15. listopadu 1990*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek (Prague: Historický ústav, 1991), 181.

[88] David R. Holeton, "'O felix Bohemia – O felix Constantia': The Liturgical Commemoration of Saint Jan Hus," *Jan Hus: Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1997), 393, n. 37; on the mutilation of Utraquist texts see also Thomas A. Fudge, *The Magnificent Ride: The First Reformation in Hussite Bohemia* (Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1998), 233–234.

[89] Derek Sayer, *The Coasts of Bohemia: A Czech History* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1998), 48–49.

ing). A single Jesuit missionary, Antonín Koniáš (1691–1760) – although undoubtedly an overachiever – was credited by his would-be hagiographer with consigning sixty thousand books to the flames in the early eighteenth century. Subsequent research has scaled the figure down to still a formidable thirty thousand.[90] As a result of this campaign of book-burning, as noted above, the contents of the two theological treatises of Locika remain unknown. Similarly, the main work of Matauš Pačuda, prior to Locika, Utraquism's leading ecclesiastical figure, is available only in one defective copy.[91]

We may briefly touch on the possibility of Nicodemism, i. e., the concealment of religious beliefs in the face of persecution, such as was practiced in Elizabethan England by both the recusants and the Puritans.[92] The prospects of Utraquism's continued existence under persecution were virtually nil in Bohemia, partly due to the extreme intrusiveness of the Counter Reformation, partly to the Utraquist dependence on the services of canonically ordained sacramental clergy. (1) The thoroughness of thought and behavior control was epitomized by the continuing requirements of confessional certificates issued by Roman priests.[93] (2) Unlike their Lutheran counterparts, the Utraquists could not function without a distinct order of clergy. Even under the conditions of lesser need, the Lutherans could receive underground sustenance of ministers from surrounding areas. With their

[90] J. J. Hanuš, „O působení Jesuity Antonína Koniáše v literatuře české," *Časopis ceského musea* 37, no. 1 (1863), 77–90, 194–210; Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo*, 195–197; Bílý, *Jezuita Antonín Koniáš*, 160–163.

[91] Matauš Pačuda, *Spis v němž se obsahuje které věci (z stran lidského pokolení) předešly příchod a narození mesiaše pravého Krista* (Prague: Matěj Pardubický, 1616), ends abruptly at f. K8v [p. 152] in the one available copy of his work, held by the Strahov Monastery Library in Prague under the call number BX VI 22. While it was inaccessible under the Counter Reformation, enough literature has, of course, survived (abroad, or in Bohemia either kept as incriminating evidence [see Bílý, *Jezuita Antonín Koniáš*, 160], or in a mutilated state) to reconstruct Utraquist ecclesiology and liturgy. An important step in that direction is the series *Monumenta liturgica bohemica*, eds. David R. Holeton and Anna Vlhová, launched with vol. 1, *The Litoměřice Gradual of 1517*, ed. Barry F. Graham (Prague, 1999).

[92] So named after the disciple who visited Jesus only at night; see Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Brookfield, Vt.: Scolar, 1996), 6–7, 24–26, 53, 90–92; Perez Zagorin, *Ways of Lying: Dissimulation, Persecution, and Conformity in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), 131–152, 223–233.

[93] *Dopisy Reformační komisse*, see, for instance, 138–139, 149–150.

sense of distinctiveness from Eastern Orthodoxy, the Utraquist had no access to clergy ordained in the process of historical apostolic succession in the West. As pointed out earlier, there were no concrete relations with the Anglicans. The other kindred Church, the Dutch Old Catholics would not emerge until 1724. The national accent of these Churches, in opposition to the Roman ultramontanism, would have created an additional difficulty in any case. Conversely, the ultimately transnational orientation of Utraquists, regarding themselves as an integral part of the Western Patriarchate of Rome, made them more susceptible to cooptation and absorption by the Roman Church. The most that the Utraquist faithful could hope for was to find an ex-Utraquist priest who would minister to them in the cherished Utraquist manner at the risk of his own life.[94]

The difficulty of Utraquism's long-term survival without its own clergy is perhaps illustrated by the figures of "converts" to the Roman Church in 1661–1678. If the breakdown of Bohuslav Balbín, the ranking Jesuit geographer and historian, can be trusted, the total figure included 141 Utraquists, compared to 21, 757 Lutherans (presumably from the German-speaking area), out of a total of 29,588.[95] The bulk of the disgruntled Utraquists had by this time been (mis)-labeled as faithful children of Rome. Nevertheless, the influence of Utraquism seemed to linger on. Surveys of library inventories of the burghers of Prague for 1700–1784 revealed that 42 percent of Czech language books dated from the period before 1620 related to the Bohemian Reformation, but were not Protestant.[96] Also there is a record of surreptitious communion *sub utraque* having a specifically Utraquist (rather than Protestant) basis as late as 1710 in Prague.[97]

---

[94] For instance, Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace*, 97–98.

[95] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 581, n. 4.

[96] Jiří Pešek, "Protestant Literature in Bohemian Private Libraries *circa* 1600," in Karin Maag, ed., *Reformation in Eastern and Central Europe* (Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1997), 49, n. 25, referring to Jiří Pokorný, „Knihy a knihovny v inventářích pražských měšťanů v 18. století, 1700–1784," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 28/1 (1988), 56–58.

[97] Marie Elisabeth Ducreux, "Reading unto Death: Books and Readers in Eighteenth-Century Bohemia," in *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Roger Chartier, trans. Lydia J. Cochrane (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), 218–219.

4. Lutherans and Brethren

In contrast to the Utraquists, their Protestant countrymen had other places to go. Czech Lutherans sought refuge in adjacent Lutheran lands, especially in Saxony, where most of the noble and middle-class emigration aimed in 1620–1627.[98] Their German hosts required full conformity from them which involved shedding any reminiscences of Bohemian Reformation, as well as a clear differentiation from the Brethren, and the Calvinists.[99] Only those who conformed strictly with German Lutheranism could remain in Saxony according to the Elector's decisions of January 18, 1623, and August 28, 1627. Those suspected of deviations, usually in the Calvinist direction, had to move on elsewhere.[100] In 1635 more of the Bohemian refugees had to leave Saxony for suspicion of disloyalty to the Augsburg Confession, and another oath of loyalty was required from the rest in 1638.[101]

The Brethren tended to seek refuge with their coreligionists mainly in Poland. Their theologians continued to maintain intellectual ties with the Puritans. In an impressive – although perhaps not the most felicitous – gesture the Brethren had previously dedicated their Czech translation of Calvin's *Institutes* to King James I in 1616.[102] In exile, the famous bishop of the Unity, Jan A. Comenius, promoted the popular work *Praxis pietatis* by the Puritan theologian, Bishop Lewis Bayly (d. 1631). Comenius had a Czech translation published in Leszno, Poland, in 1630, and another in Amsterdam in 1661.What

[98] Eduard Winter, *Die tschechische und slowakische Emigration in Deutschland im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955), 14.

[99] The exiled Lutheran minister Martinius mentions contacts with the Puritans in this context, Samuel Martinius z Dražova, *Obrana M. Samuela Martiniusa z Dražova: Proti ohlášení starších kněží Bratrských*. Pirna: Dědici Jana Ctibora, 1636, 433. See also Bobková, Lenka, „Česká exulantská šlechta v Pirně v roce 1629," *Folia Historica Bohemica* 19 (1998), 83–116.

[100] Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse*, 583–584, 588–589.

[101] Bobková, *Exulanti z Prahy a severozápadních Čech*, xlix.

[102] Tyrrel, E. P., and J. S. G. Simmons, "Slavonic Books Before 1700 in Cambridge Libraries," *Transactions of Cambridge Bibliographic Society*, 3 (1963), 383, 394, the copy is deposited in the Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; E. Urbánková, „Několik poznámek k českému vydání Kalvínovy Instituce," *Literární archiv*, sborník PNP 1 (1966), 237ff.; William B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 125.

attracted the Brethren was apparently Bayly's emphasis on good deeds, especially fast and prayer, as aids to salvation – a stance which distinguished them from the Lutherans. At the other end of the spectrum, the Brethren could also heartily endorse the bishop's distaste for venerating the saints, not excluding the Virgin. The interest of the Puritans in the Brethren would also lead to the story, possibly apocryphal, that of the presidency of Harvard College in New England's Massachusetts was offered to Comenius in the 1640s.[103] Likewise in the post-White Mountain period, the Unity was asked to supply additional material for a new edition of Puritanism's *chef-d'oeuvre,* Foxe's martyrology, *The Acts and Monuments*. After the deadline was missed in 1632, the Brethren's intended contribution was published separately in an English-language edition as *The history of the Bohemian persecution* (London, 1650).[104]

The polemics between the Lutherans and the Brethren continued abroad. The Lutherans looked askance on the relationship between the Brethren and the Puritans. Martinius of Dražov condemned in 1636 Bayly's *Praxis pietatis* of which, as noted earlier, Comenius had two Czech translation published. Martinius called it a gloomy book, which contained much that was misleading and questionable, indeed even heretical.[105] What the Lutherans found objectionable was

[103] Lewis Bayly, *Praxis pietatis. To jest O cvičení se v pobožnosti pravé knižka milostná* (Leszno, 1630?), 284–291, 442–44. The Amsterdam edition was published by: Kopydlanský, 1661. On Comenius and Harvard see Samuel E. Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), 243–245.

[104] Jan Amos Komenský, [Johann Amos Comenius], *The history of the Bohemian persecution* (London: By A. A. for Iohn Walker, 1650). It was preceded by a Latin translation, *Historia persecutionum ecclesiae bohemicae* (published originally in Leiden in 1647 and 1648); see also in Jan Amos Komenský, *Opera omnia* (Prague: Academia, 1989), vol. 9, part 1, 199–338. The Czech original was published subsequently as Jan Amos Komenský, *Historia o těžkých protivenstvích církve české hned od počátku jejího na víru Křesťanskou obrácení v létu 894 až do léta 1632 za panování Ferdinanda Druhého. S připojením historie o persekucí valdenských roku tohoto (1655) stálé* (Leszno, 1655); 2nd ed. (Amesterdam: Jan Paskovský, 1663); see also in Komenský, *Opera omnia*, vol. 9, part 1, 53–198.

[105] Lewis Bayly, *Praxis pietatis. To jest O cvičení se v pobožnosti pravé knižka milostná* (Leszno, 1630[?]; Amsterdam: Kopydlanský, 1661); Samuel Martinius z Dražova, *Pět a třidceti mocných, znamenitých a slušných důvodů a příčin pro které všickni Evangelistští Čechové za jedno býti* (Pirna: Dědici Jana Ctibora, 1635), f. G4r-G4v, also "…Kniha…velikými zmatky a bludy a urážlivými slovy naplněná… [A book…filled with great confusion and heresy and offensive words]," *ibid*., f. H3r.

apparently Bayly's emphasis on good deeds, especially fast and prayer, as aids to salvation.[106] The Brethren defended their sponsorship of Bayly's devotional text in their response to Martinius.[107] The Brethren, for their part, were aggrieved that the Lutherans would cite arguments from Václav Šturm against the Unity's orthodoxy, pointing out that the Jesuit had been just as severe in his negative judgments on Luther's teaching.[108]

Victorious Counter Reformation?

At this point the task of reconstructing the character of Bohemian Utraquism from 1517 to 1622 has been completed in this and my other articles.[109] What follows will abandon the solid ground of the Rankean "wie es eigentlich gewesen" [how it really happened] for a more speculative approach, largely to suggest areas for further exploration. This look ahead will begin with an assessment of the Counter Reformation's place in Bohemian history, and end with suggestions of the long-term effects of Utraquism.

---

[106] Bayly, *Praxis pietatis* [Leszno, 1630?], 284–291.

[107] *Na spis proti jednotě bratrské od Samuele Martinia etc: sepsaný… Ohlášení* (Leszno, 1635), 137–139.

[108] *Ibid*., 177.

[109] Zdeněk V. David, "The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517–1621," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 46 (1995), 641–668; idem, "Central Europe's Gentle Voice of Reason: Bílejovský and the Ecclesiology of Utraquism," *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997), 29–58; idem, "Pavel Bydžovský and Czech Utraquism's Encounter with Luther," *Communio Viatorum*, 38 (1996), 36–63; idem, "A Brief Honeymoon in 1564–1566: The Utraquist Consistory and the Archbishop of Prague," *Bohemia: A Journal of History and Civilization in East Central Europe*, 39 (1998), 265–284; idem, "The Plebeianization of Utraquism: The Controversy over the Bohemian Confession of 1575," in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, Vol. 2: Papers from the XVIIIth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Brno 1996, eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Main Library, 1998), 127–158; idem, "Utraquists, Lutherans, and the Bohemian Confession of 1575," *Church History*, 68 (1999), 294–336; idem, "A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609–1620," *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*. Vol. 3: Papers from the XIXth World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Bratislava 1998, eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton (Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Main Library, 2000), 173–214.

It has been maintained that, thanks to the Counter Reformation, the Czech nation was "thoroughly Recatholicized."[110] Such a dramatic conversion of ex-Utraquists from abominating the Counter Reformation (as they had demonstrated, for instance, by sacking the monasteries in Prague in 1611[111]) to turning into its dedicated supporters would seem like an astonishing transformation. From the glowing descriptions one almost gets the impression that – had it not been too early – the Jesuit Fathers had performed a feat of genetic engineering, having successfully implanted Tridentine Spanish cells into Bohemian brains. Marie-Elisabeth Ducreux, for one, has questioned the reality behind this success story:

> How are we to evaluate the depth and the authenticity of this conversion that continued over a century and a half? Historically, the problem remains open. There are too many overlapping and contradictory elements in a process that was both personal and social… A change of religion over an entire land is…the sum of thousands of individual conversions. That this was the case in Bohemia remains doubtful…[112]

The bright image of a Counter Reformatory euphoria was supported, on the one hand, by the lack of resistence and, on the other, by indifference to Protestantism. The population maintained an overt conformity without a frequent application of harsh penalties, or the emergence of a significant number of active resisters. The Bohemians remained relatively unresponsive to Protestant proselytizing from abroad, and ultimately to the option of embracing the Reformed faith,

---

[110] „…národ důkladně rekatolizovaný…" in Noemi Rejchrtová, „Role utrakvismu v českých dějinách," in *Traditio et Cultus: Miscellanea historica bohemica Miloslao Vlk, archiepiscopo Pragensi, ab eius collegis amicisque ad annum sexagesimum dedicata*, edited by Zdeňka Hledíková (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1993), 76. See also Paul Shore, "The Society of Jesus and the Culture of the Late Baroque in Bohemia," *East European Quarterly*, 34 (2000), 2–3; Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo*, 184–185, 191.

[111] James R. Palmitessa, "The Prague Uprising of 1611: Property, Politics, and Catholic Renewal in the Early Years of Habsburg Rule," *Central European History* 31 (1998), 304–314; Josef Janáček, *Rudolf II. a jeho doba* (Prague: Svoboda, 1987), 477–478.

[112] Ducreux, "Reading unto Death," 195.

once it became available. In what follows, the aim is to review what has apparently become the politically correct position in Czech historiography following the Velvet Revolution,[113] and to suggest an alternate scenario for explaining the Bohemian docility under the Counter Reformation. The topic will be approached under two rubrics – (1) the presence and pervasiveness of intimidation, and (2) the loss of collective historical memory. This examination may suggest that the impression of consent and internalization of the Counter Reformation was more illusory than real.

(1) As late as the eighteenth century the Austrian government did not share the sanguine view of the Counter Reformation's success, and continued to suspect the Bohemians of hidden heresy.[114] Constant vigilance was thought to be the price of conformity. From the viewpoint of Vienna's bureaucratic authoritarianism, religious observance was not something stemming from the grass roots, but an obligation to be exacted, policed, and enforced like the performance of serf labor, collection of taxes, or gathering of recruits.[115] The routine surveillance via the certificates of confession was fortified by penalties periodically announced and investigatory campaigns launched. Thousands of people were intimidated by investigations at the diocesan level and had their cases were either settled by ecclesiastical punishments or referred to civil authority. [116] On the ecclesiastical side, the main philosopher of the system of thought control in Bohemia, the Belgian-born Jesuit William Lamormaini, had justified the use of compulsion on two grounds. First, if an individual were compelled to perform certain acts, he would gradually adopt a positive attitude toward them. Second, since the Bohemian dissidents – unlike the Jews or the infidels – had been baptized, the Church held a rightful jurisdiction over them, and had the authority to compel their

[113] Judging from the furor elicited by Jan Fiala's *Hrozné doby protireformace* (1997) which, despite its acerbic style and flawed organization, presents an essentially truthful account.

[114] Marie-Elizabeth Ducreuxová, „Čtení a vztah ke knihám u podezřelých z kacířství v Čechách 18. století," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, 2, no. 1–2 (1992), 53–54.

[115] On the nexus between temporal and religious exactions see Fiala, *Hrozné doby protireformace*, 114–115; Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:92–93; Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo*, 191–192.

[116] Ducreux, "Reading unto Death," 198–199.

obedience by relying on the secular arm.[117] As another sign of insecurity, the Counter Reformatory regime found it relevant to engage in continuing propaganda against the legacy of the heterodox past. The suspicion of underground heresy seemed to intensify with the progressive aging, even decrepitude, of the system of enforced conformity. Warnings were issued against the legacy of Jan Hus and the Bohemian heresy,[118] and as late as 1777 the authorities of the Roman Church found it apropos to publish in Czech an extract from Florimond de Remond's *Histoire de la naissance, progrès et décadence de l'herésie de ce siècle* (Paris, 1605), under the title *Husitského v Čechách kacířství počátku, zrůstu, a pádu vejtah* [An Extract Concerning the Origin, the Growth, and the Fall of the Hussite Heresy in Bohemia].[119]

The relatively limited use of repressive violence, particular of capital and other harsh punishments for religious transgressions during the Counter Reformation era, has been cited as evidence for the willing, even joyful, acceptance of the Counter Reformation culture in Bohemia.[120] Nevertheless, examining the situation more closely, while the administration of drastic punishments was relatively infrequent, its incidence was ever-present. The research of Marie-Elisabeth Ducreux into the Counter Reformation's modus operandi revealed that between 1704 and 1781 altogether 729 cases of heresy were referred to the Court of Appeals in Prague from the three dioceses in Bohemia. Altogether 44 death sentences were pronounced.[121]

What to make of this? The low number of victims may reflect the progression from medieval lack of sophistication to early modern subtlety, which led the managers of thought control to abandon mass murder for more artful means of imposing ideological conformity.

---

[117] Bireley, *Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counterreformation*, 38.

[118] On failure to carry out the Counter Reformation program completely, and on the concern with persistent "Hussite" influences, see, for instance, Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:96–97; Winter, *Der Josefinismus: Die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus*, 166.

[119] Florimond de Remond, *Husitského v Čechách kacířství počátku, zrůstu, a pádu vejtah* (Prague: Jan K. Hraba, [1777]), especially the anxiety over the spirit of Hus stil sparking under the ashes of the Bohemian Reformation, f. A4v. See also Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche*, 1:407–421.

[120] Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal*, 76–77.

[121] Ducreux, "Reading unto Death," 198–199.

Instead of wiping out the heretics, as was done in the crusades against the Albigensians and proposed during the crusades against the Bohemian dissidents in the early fifteenth century, the managers of the Counter Reformation could employ tools developed and tested in the sixteenth-century, particularly in Spain, a country on which (as noted earlier) the Austrian Habsburgs heavily depended for religious and political inspiration.[122] Consequently, the policy of the Counter Reformation in Bohemia could get much milage of intimidation out of a moderate, but judicious use of capital, or other harsh, punishments. Parenthetically – for only functional comparisons, without drawing axiological equations – one may also recall such phenomena of later Bohemian history as Heydrich's Protectorate, or the Brezhnevite normalization. The number of victims of the Nazi occupation in the Protectorate was relatively small and yet it produced the appearance of prevalent consent or even support, which is known to have been spurious. The method of Brezhnevite normalization was virtually bloodless, yet the number of individuals involved in overt resistence, let us say in Charter 77, was relatively small, and the illusory impression of broad-based assent prevailed. Some observers – not without a mischievous touch – have wondered whether, in history's *longue durée*, the experience under the Counter Reformation, might not have served as a training ground, or a dress rehearsal, for the accommodation by the Bohemians to the several unpalatable regimes of the future.[123]

(2) It can also be argued that the crucial reason why the inhabitants of Bohemia exhibited a passive docility toward the Counter Reformation regime, which could be mistaken for acquiescence, was the loss of historical memory of their real religious identities – a collective religious amnesia. The evidence of their ecclesiastical past was mutilated or destroyed. From this point of view, the Czechs had been denied a religious heritage and subjected to what may be called a grand larceny from both sides of the fundamental religious divide.

[122] See, for instance, Virgilio Pinto Crespo, "Thought Control in Spain," in *Inquisition and Society in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Stephen Haliczer. Totowa, N.J.: Barnes and Noble Books, 1987, 171–188; Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History*, 451.

[123] Lonnie R. Johnson, *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 92–93.

The current captor, Rome, as well as their would-be rescuers, the Reformed churches, portrayed the past inhabitants of Bohemia as either true sons of the Roman Curia, guilty only of minor misbehavior, or as true children of the Reformation, marred only by a few national oddities. Neither picture corresponded to historical truth, which was that in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century it was the normal state for a Czech was to be a Utraquist, and only exceptionally a Protestant (Lutheran or Brother), or an adherent of the Roman Curia. The pseudo-reality of the Roman/Protestant view involved a blatant denial of the earlier existence of a full-bloodied Utraquist Church with its distinct ecclesiology and liturgy. Victimized by these campaigns of disinformation, the disinherited Utraquists had nowhere to turn for a reality check to reaffirm their true history. Their proper liberal ecclesiology had vanished with the alienation of Utraquist clergy and institutions by the Roman Curia, and – as noted earlier – the Utraquists had not been accustomed to look abroad for kindred sojourners on the via media or to seek alliance with them.

The counterpart to the sullen resentment of Rome's iron rule was the relatively feeble effect of Czech Lutheran emigration on the spiritual life of Bohemia which was cited as a sign of the Counter Reformation's victory.[124] The cause of this phenomenon was not necessarily the pressure or the effect of the Counter Reformation, severe as the latter undoubtedly was. This might be attributed to the fact that the émigré propaganda did not resonate with the Czech religious psyche, if the latter had been formatted not by Luther and Protestantism, but by Hus and Utraquism. It would find the full fledged Reformation just as uncongenial as Counter Reformation Catholicism. In other words, neither the Counter Reformation nor the Protestant Reformation resonated with their customary behavior, or sensitivity to ethical and esthetic values, which had been formulated over quarter of a millennium. It is doubtful that such ingrained habits could be eradicated in the period of the Counter Reformation's comparatively short *durée* (to take advantage of Fernand Braudel's terminology[125]). The

[124] Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo*, 109–110, 185, 193.

[125] Braudel referred to such historical events, contrasted with the *la longue durée*, as "crests of foam that the tides of history carry on their strong backs," cited in *Blackwell's Dictionary of Historians*, ed. John Cannon (Oxford, Eng.: Basil Blackwell, 1998), 50.

Czechs knew what they were not, but – due to the collective religious amnesia – they did not know what they should be. As Marie-Elisabeth Ducreux has pointed out: "In this country [Bohemia] that accomplished the first Reformation in Europe a century before Luther, an obligatory conversion to Catholicism thus probably contributed to the laicization of people's consciences."[126]

This brings up the consideration of yet another phenomenon which has been cited as an ultimate proof of the Bohemians' whole-hearted conversion to the Tridentine Roman Church. It was the lukewarm reaction in Bohemia, following the dissolution of the Jesuit Order in 1773, to the Toleration Patent of Joseph II of 1781 which permitted leaving the Roman Church for either Lutheranism or Calvinism. Less than two per cent of the population took advantage of this option.[127] It may be argued again that it was not the attachment to Rome, but the inarticulate pull of Utraquist Prague, which prevented a stampede to Wittenberg or Heidelberg/Geneva. The reason was that neither of these denominations coincided with the ideals of the autochthonous Reformation. The failure of the Czechs to rally behind one or both of the churches of the Protestant Reformation may be explained by the fact that the Czech religious mentality was Utraquist not Protestant Hence it was not an attachment to the Roman Curia but the lack of appeal of the Reformed churches, which kept the Bohemian populace from flocking toward them. It might even be concluded in this light that the Czech orientation was not Protestant, but Catholic. This Catholicism, however, was not a product of the Counter Reformation, but related to the lingering sense of the Utraquist past. In other words, it may be suggested that, if the Czech psyche was at bottom formatted by Catholicism, it was not the Catholicism of Bohuslav Balbín, but that of Bohuslav Bílejovský and Pavel Bydžovský, the towering theologians of sixteenth-century Utraquism. That the Tridentine Catholicism had not sunk real roots in Bohemian mentality would be further confirmed by its future lack of relevance to Czech intellectual and cultural life.

---

[126] Ducreux, "Reading unto Death," 196. See also Franco Venturi, *The End of the Old Regime in Europe, 1768–1776*. Vol. 1: *The First Crisis*, tr. R. Burr Litchfield (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), 170–171.
[127] Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:161–162.

Thus a case can be made that the imposed religious system, instead of being internalized, was passively resented, while the earlier predisposition to religious and political liberalism persisted. Returning to the science fiction metaphor, broached earlier, it might be said that Bohemian Counter Reformation created a Frankenstein monster in whom a transplanted Tridentine brain worked at odds with the liberal Utraquist heart. The creature – in an afterlife of Utraquism – would eventually turn against its Roman progenitors in such forms as Josephin ecclesiastical reformism (explained below), or the fierce anti-clericalism of the nineteenth-century liberal movements. At the end, the Bohemian Counter Reformation produced a no-win situation. Rome lost adherents, the Reformed churches did not gain a significant number, and the Czechs lost the conscious awareness of their authentic religious tradition. If one chose to regard history as a morality play, he might see in the outcome the fallacy of ends justifying the means.

Afterlife of Utraquism

It appeared that the demise of Utraquism, which Czech historiography dated prematurely and variously to 1517, 1524, 1539, 1564, 1575, 1593, or 1609 did finally occur in 1622. But did it really? It may also be said that Utraquism did not die in 1622, but merely descended from the level of conscious thought into the substrate of habitual patterns of reactions and behavior at odds with the existing *Gleichschaltung*. Perhaps there was some truth in the suspicions voiced by the local activists of Counter Reformation and other coryphaei of thought control, including the Habsburg bureaucrats and Curial dignitaries, that there persisted a hidden presence of the resentful, and even rebellious, "Hussite" spirit among the Czech people including the rural folk.[128]

This article will conclude with speculative suggestions of possible

[128] As during the Bohemian rural uprisings in 1775 in the reign of Maria Theresia, see Venturi, *The End of the Old Regime in Europe*, 166–167; Miroslav Toegel and others, eds., *Prameny k nevolnickému povstání v Čechách a na Moravě v roce 1775* (Prague: Academia, 1975), 535.

long-range consequences of Utraquism in its afterlife. It may be argued that the Utraquist mentality was to gain a new lease on life, rising like Phoenix from its ashes, after the hiatus of the Counter Reformation's rigidity and intolerance. There appear to have been two significant manifestations of this survival – one secular and fairly clear, the other religious and as yet conjectural.

(1) The one clear effect was to animate the libertarian spirit of the Czech national awakening in the nineteenth century. The revival in its initial stages led to a massive return to the literature, which had preceded the Counter Reformation and had been nurtured by the two and a half centuries of Utraquism. Once the Josephin enlightenment had discredited the world of the Counter Reformation both intellectually and politically, creating a near intellectual tabula rasa, the void could be filled in Bohemia with the cultural legacy of the Utraquist era. The political and cultural values were transmitted through several channels across the hiatus separating the Bohemian Reformation from the national revival. The transfer was effected by the means of (a) reprinting of sixteenth-century classics; (b) reproducing sixteenth-century writings in school and university textbooks; (c) celebrating Bohemian Reformation in history and literature; and (d) embracing as a political program the historical rights of the pre-1620 Bohemian state. The national awakening also involved the reestablishment of the sixteenth-century grammatical norms for the literary language.[129] It is possible to argue that the impact of sixteenth-century writings was more significant in the reprints of the early nineteenth century than in the originals of their own time because greater spread of literacy; and lower cost of printing had made literature more widely accessible. If, as R. G. Collingwood in his *The Idea of History* has argued, in reading sources of the past the reader in effect thinks the thoughts of the writer,[130] then the Bohemian students and intellectu-

[129] Hugh L. Agnew, *Origins of the Czech National Renascence* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993), 117, 122–123; Kolár, Jaroslav, *Návraty bez konce: Studie k starší české literatuře*, ed. Lenka Jiroušková. Brno: Atlantis, 1999, 290, 294–295; Jireček, *Rukověť k dějinám literatury*, 2:146–147. These means of transfer are discussed systematically in my contribution to a forthcoming Festschrift.

[130] R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, rev. ed by Jan Van der Dussen. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, especially, 282–302.

als of the early nineteenth century to a considerable extent acquired the habit of their sixteenth-century ancestors' thought.

Aside from the clear and incontestable link between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries in Czech intellectual life through the transmission of literary texts, we may add in a speculative vein the possibility of a more covert or discrete link of Czech political culture with the judicious moderation, verging on latitudinarianism, of the Utraquist Church's via media. Although the Church of Rome cannibalized the organization and personnel of the Utraquist Church, it seems unlikely, as noted earlier, that it would have been able to eradicate altogether the indigenous habits of mind, formed under Utraquism and reaching back almost quarter of a millennium, despite its energetic authoritarian zeal in the post-White Mountain era. Without embracing the premordialist theory of nationalism or the essentialist view of national character, it may be assumed that the erasure of memory was only partly successful. The Czechs could be deprived of the knowledge of their own distinct religious via media, and the images of Jakoubek, Rokycana, Koranda, Bílejovský Bydžovský, and Locika exorcized,[131] but not the liberal and centrist inclinations implanted by those ecclesiastical teachers. Thus, as a result of the Counter Reformation, the liberal political culture became divorced from the religious belief, from the symbiosis with which it had originally emerged, the religious aspects having been (mis)appropriated by the Tridentine Roman Church. In other words, the liberal spirit continued after its religious moorings vanished having been wiped out physically by the Counter Reformation, and even more ominously from the collective cultural memory by the subsequent virtual denial of their existence in historiography. Among others, Kamil Krofta[132] saw a continuity in the liberal mentality of the national awakening with that of the Bohemian Reformation, while emphasizing the divorce of this political culture from its original religious context.[133] Krofta's

[131] See references to book-burning, especially in reference to Antonín Koniáš in note 84 above.

[132] After Josef Pekař, Krofta (1876–1945) was the dean of Czechoslovak historians between the two World Wars.

[133] Krofta maintained that even after the White Mountain the traditions of the Bohemian Reformation "were not entirely eradicated within the Czech nation. …their psychological essence revived in the minds of the awakened nation, despite the

argument in turn supported Thomas G. Masaryk's assumptions that Czech liberalism and humanitarianism had their roots in the Bohemian Reformation, although the eminent statesman, philosopher and religious thinker saw the source in the Unity of Brethren rather than in the mainline Utraquism.[134]

(2) The second posthumous role of Utraquism is of a wider significance. It involves the question to what extent Utraquism may have provided an inspiration for the religious reforms of Josephinism. The ecclesiastical policies, applied within the Habsburg Empire, including Bohemia, during the reign of Emperor Joseph II (1780–1790), in some salient aspects reproduced the approaches characteristic of Utraquism in the ecclesial and liturgical spheres.[135] While there are formal resemblances, the subject as yet awaits a full exploration.[136] In any case, to a considerable degree Joseph's ecclesiastical reforms, curtailing clerical power, papal authority, church decorations and devotional practices (deemed extravagant), and monasticism can be viewed as a victory of the Utraquist model over the Tridentine model of the Counter Reformation.[137] There were more particular parallels

---

nation's alienation from the religious ideals of its ancestors, and bestowed a distinct coloration on its character and mentality." Kamil Krofta, „Husitství po Husovi," in his *Listy z náboženských dějin českých* (Prague: Historický klub, 1936), 124.

[134] Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize. Jan Hus*, Spisy T. G. Masaryka, vol. 6 (Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 2000), 149–151, 313–314, 350. See also Miloš Havelka, *Spor o smysl českých dějin, 1895–1938* (Prague: Torst, 1995), especially, pp. 98–106, 305–316, 762–765.

[135] I am indebted to Franz Szabo for a suggestion of this relationship, although it is not noted in his own Franz A. J. Szabo, *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism, 1753–1780* (Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1994). On the ecclesial aspect see reference to Hus in Ferdinand Maass, ed., *Der Josephinismus: Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich, 1760–1850*, 5 vols., Fontes rerum Austriacarum, Zweite Abteilung, Band 71–75 (Vienna: Verlag Herold, 1951–1961), 2:492–493.

[136] Historical literature so far seems to have ignored the potential connection between Bohemian Utraquism and the support for Josephinism in Bohemia. For instance, there is no mention of Bohemian influence in Elisabeth Kovács, ed., *Katholische Aufklärung und Josephinismus* (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1979); or in Harm Klueting, "Kaunitz, die Kirche und der Josephinismus. Protestantisches landesherrliches Kirchenregiment, rationaler Territorialismus und theresianisch-josephinisches Staatskirchentum," in Grete Klingenstein and Franz A. Szabo, eds., *Staatskanzler Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz-Rietberg, 1711–1794* (Graz: Andreas Schneider, 1996), 186–195.

[137] Klueting, "Kaunitz, die Kirche und der Josephinismus," 174–75, 182; Maass, ed., *Der Josephinismus: Quellen*, 3:ix-x; Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:168–169.

between Utraquism and Josephinism. First, both resembled the via media of the Anglican Church, and harkened to the Wyclifite principles in opposition to clerical power and wealth, as well as monasticism, but without embracing Protestant ecclesiology.[138] Second, the ecclesiastical reforms and toleration were introduced in a religious rather than an anti-religious secularist context, as in other areas under the previous sway of the Roman Church. Eduard Winter refers to the Austro-Bohemian Josephinism as Reform Catholicism [*Reformkatholizismus*].[139] Third, the reforms of Josephinism found a ready acceptance in Bohemia, and their prime inspirer Václav Kounic (1711–1794) stemmed from the Bohemian Lands.[140] His right-hand man, Franz Joseph von Heinke, who headed the department for ecclesiastical affairs in the Austro-Bohemian Chancellery, although born in Silesia, was a graduate of the University of Prague and had served most of his life in Bohemia.[141] Professor of theology at the University of Prague, Kasper Royko, sought to clear Hus of the charge of heresy in his lengthy critical history of the Council of Constance,[142] drawing denunciations from the papal nuncio, Guiseppe Garampi. The reform Catholicism of the Josephin era continued to be influential in Bohemia into the first half of the nineteenth century, perhaps most notably through the circle of Bernard Bolzano in the 1830s.[143] Fittingly, it was left up to the Holy See to draw an explicit link between Josephinism and the Bohemian Reformation. Responding to the proposal to severely circumscribe, if not eliminate, direct papal jurisdiction within the Habsburg Empire, Pope Pius VI, pointed out on May 16, 1787 that such a questioning of ecclesias-

[138] Klueting, "Kaunitz, die Kirche und der Josephinismus," 183–185; Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2: 150, 154; 163–164.
[139] Winter, *Der Josefinismus: Die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus*, 357.
[140] Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin*, 2:153, 167–168.
[141] Winter, *Der Josefinismus: Die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus*, 358; Maass, ed., *Der Josephinismus: Quellen*, 3:4–5.
[142] Kaspar Royko, *Geschichte der grossen allgemeinen Kirchenversammlung zu Kostniz*. 5 vols. (Graz, 1781–1782; Prague, 1784–1796).
[143] Royko's work provided a link between the two phases of reform Catholicism, Winter, *Der Josefinismus: Die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus*, 199–200, 314.

tical authority reflected one of Hus's articles (number 15), condemned at the Council of Constance in 1415.[144]

It would be of course unduly simplistic to see the roots of the Josephin reforms only or primarily in subterranean Utraquist reverberations. The recent work on the Josephin era by Franz Szabo points to the French Enlightenment, as the prime source of Kaunitz's ideas and hence of Joseph's religious policy. He particularly cites the influence of Diderot's *Encyclopédie*, specifically the article on ecclesiastical discipline.[145] In turn, Szabo has been criticized by Harm Klueting who saw the jurisprudence of Protestant Germany as the primary source of Josephin ecclesiastical reforms. According to Klueting, Kaunitz's ideas and actions reflected the kind of views represented specifically by the Leipzig law professor, Christian Thomasius (1655–1728), in his work *Dreyfache Rettung des Rechts Evangelischer Fürsten in Kirchensachen* (1701), or by the law professor at the University of Halle, Justus Henning Böhmer (1674–1749).[146] Klueting argued that at the University of Leipzig, where Kaunitz studied in his youth, the juridical tradition of Thomasius was still very much alive, even if the future Austrian reformer did not study the famous jurist's works directly. Klueting firmly denied that there was any need to trace the roots of Josephismus to Gallicanism, to Diderot or the other encyclopedists; the influence of German Lutheran jurists provided a sufficient explanation.[147] None of this, of course, erases the similarity between Utraquism and Josephinism.

Subsequently – and this might be considered yet another posthumous effect of Utraquism – instances of a curious symbiosis of the secularized heritage of Utraquism with liberal Catholicism would emerge in the Bohemian context. Political liberalism interacted with liberal or reform Catholicism in the minds of the prime leaders of Czech intellectual life. This symbiosis is illustrated in particular by the seminal influences on Karel Havlíček Borovský, and on Masaryk, two of the most influential writers and actors of modern Czech political history. Havlíček felt a boundless admiration for Bernard Bol-

[144] Maass, ed., *Der Josephinismus: Quellen*, 2:492–493.
[145] Szabo, *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism*, 230.
[146] Klueting, "Kaunitz, die Kirche und der Josephinismus," 187.
[147] *Ibid*., 193–194.

zano,[148] and Masaryk found his guru in Franz Brentano.[149] It would appear as though Czech political liberalism was gravitating toward its religious source or counterpart, or as if Utraquism, which had revived in its secularized form, searched for a religious dimension in the form of liberal Catholicism.[150] This might also be viewed, in a way of speaking, as an attempt to close the circle, whereby the liberal Catholic dimension of Utraquism would return home to fructify intellectual life there or, conversely, whereby the Czech political mind groped for contact with its original religious roots.

As the main conclusion, however, and this once more transcends the Bohemian context, it is plausible to argue that the idea which the Utraquists represented did not vanish with them, but kept reemerging. Echoing Marx's and Engels's dictum of Europe haunted by the specter of Communism, it could be said that henceforth the Roman Curia would be haunted by the specter of liberal Catholicism in such forms as the Union of Utrecht, Josephinism, Old Catholicism, modernism and, in a muted expression, in the nearly liberal spirit of the Second Vatican Council.[151] All these may be viewed as echoes, if not as direct consequences, of Utraquism. If the Hussite upheavals of the 1420s could be called the first in the chain of European "great revolutions,"[152] the Utraquist Church could be called the first, and

[148] Jan Šimsa, „Respekt k víře jiných – Karel Havlíček Borovský," in ed. Milan Machovec, *Problém tolerance v dějinách a perpektivě* (Prague: Academia, 1995), 132; Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka. Naše nynější krize. Jan Hus*, Spisy T. G. Masaryka, vol. 6 (Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 2000), 15, 79, 103.Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Karel Havlíček: Snahy a tužby politického probuzení*, Spisy T. G. Masaryka, vol. 7 (Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 1996), 191–195.

[149] Karel Čapek, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*, Spisy, 20 (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1990), 71–72; Karel Mácha, *Glaube und Vernunft: Die Böhmische Philosophie in geschichtlicher Übersicht*, Vol. 2: *1800–1900* (Munich: Sauer, 1987), 150–151; Smith, *Austrian Philosophy: The Legacy of Franz Brentano* (Chicago: Open Court, 1994), 21, 26. E. Husserl credited Masaryk with introducing him to Brentano's philosophy in 1877, *ibid*., 26.

[150] On the liberal Catholicism of Bolzano and Brentano see Eduard Winter, *Über die Perfektibilität des Katholizismus* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1971), 87–166.

[151] On the ideological connection between Josephinism and Second Vatican Council see Winter, *Der Josefinismus: die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus*, 345–348.

[152] On "great revolutions" and the place of the Hussite Revolution see Jaroslav Krejčí, *Great Revolutions Compared: The Search for a Theory* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 22–48; Leslie C. Tihany, *A History of Middle Europe* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1976), 41.

perhaps – until the partial *aggiornamento* of the twentieth century – the most substantial or extensive of the epiphanies of "liberal Catholicism."[153] This would be the case whether or not there was an actual causal relationship between Utraquism and Josephinism. As a form of liberal Catholicism, Utraquistm could also symbolize a bridge between Rome and the Reformation, a role which was once envisaged for the Utraquist via media by no less a figure than Gerhard Gerhards, better known as Desiderius Erasmus, and his circle who had proposed to resolve the conflict between Rome and Wittenberg by an "Utraquistization" of the Roman Church.[154]

In the light of the foregoing it could be said that in the long run Utraquism has had the last laugh. One may wonder whether Utraquism in a way did not replicate the destiny of its most illustrious member, Jan Hus, proceeding through annihilation to apotheosis. The spirit of responsible intellectual freedom and toleration of dissent, represented by Utraquism, may be judged as a worthwhile contribution to the intellectual treasury of civilization. The dean of North American specialists on Bohemian Reformation, Howard Kaminsky, has said something similar about the lasting role and legacy of the Utraquists' radical cousins, the Taborites: "…Tabor itself was conquered, its leaders, including Nicholas, thrown into prison, its unique reformational religion suppressed. Tabor in the diachron had tried and failed. But Tabor in the eschaton created for it by its bishop had played its role in the divine scenario with heroic vigor – a performance for the 'Ages'."[155]

[153] On liberal or reform Catholicism see David Sorkin, "Reform Catholicism and Religious Enlightenment" with comments by T. C. W. Blanning and R. J. W. Evans in *Austrian History Yearbook* 30 (1999), 187–235.

[154] Alain Dufour, "Humanisme et Reformation,"in his *Histoire politique et psychologie historique*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1966, 54. See also Peter Fraenkel, "Utraquism or Co-Existence: Some Notes on the Earliest Negotiations Before the Pacification of Nuernberg, 1531–1532," *Studia theologica* 18,2 (1964), 130, 132–134.

[155] Howard Kaminsky, "Nicholas of Pelhřimov's Tabor: an Adventure into the Eschaton," in Alexander Patschovsky and František Šmahel, eds., *Eschatologie und Hussitismus*, Internationales Kolloquium, Prague, September 1–4, 1993 (Prague: Historický ústav, 1996), 167.

CLOSE ENCOUNTERS OF THE PIETISTIC KIND: THE MORAVIAN-METHODIST CONNECTION

Ted A. Campbell, Evanston

Introduction

On the 28th of February, 1736, Anglican priest John Wesley observed the Moravian community in the new American colony of Georgia as that community elected and consecrated a bishop.[1] Despite Wesley's vehement Anglican prejudices against European Protestants, this service struck him with considerable spiritual force and initiated a series of events which would unfold as Wesley's Evangelical conversion in 1738, his unorthodox field preaching in 1739, and his leadership of the Methodist movement through the remainder of his life up until his death in 1791. Although it was the spirituality of the Moravian assembly that impressed Wesley on this occasion, it was their claim to an uninterrupted succession of bishops from the medieval church, by way of the "Ancient Unity" of the Bohemian Reformation, that seems to have dissolved his initial fears about the legitimacy of the Moravian church.

This article deals with one of the later effects of the Bohemian Reformation. The narrative of the genesis of the "Bohemian" and then "Moravian" Brethren is a complicated tale in itself, involving multiple points of division from the Utraquist community, followed by a series of inter-Protestant divisions within the "Brethren" community. This community led an itinerant existence between 1620 and 1721, when they accepted an offer from the Graf or Count von

[1] John Wesley's *Journal* for 28 February 1736 (in W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journal and Diaries* [Bicentennial Edition of the Works of John Wesley; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988ff.] 1:171–172).

Zinzendorf to settle on his estate, Herrnhut. In the traditioning of the Moravian Church, this event marks the transition from the "Ancient Unity" to the "Modern Unity" of the Moravian Brethren. The contact between Methodism and the Moravians came, then, in the formative decades of the "Modern Unity" of the Moravian Brethren.

A. Common Base: The Religion of the Heart

A Moravian synod meeting in 1740, at the time when English Moravians had already come into conflict with Anglican Evangelicals, identified itself with a broad religious movement throughout Europe, specifically naming

> …those zealous servants of God, who, in Germany, by some were called Pietists, in England, Methodists, in France, Jansenists, in Italy and Spain, Quietists, in the Roman Church in general often known by the character of preacher of repentance and ascetics, but in the Protestant Church generally thought Mystics…[2]

My own study of *The Religion of the Heart* (University of South Carolina Press, 1991) has tried to substantiate the claim that movements for affective piety in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries represented a broadly based European cultural movement. Both Moravians and Methodists are, in their own ways, the spiritual heirs of these movements for affective piety, and so I begin with a consideration of the "common base" shared by Moravians and Methodists, their common grounding in the culture of the "religion of the heart."

I should note, though, that it is not entirely easy to talk about a "religion of the heart," and "piety," for Protestant theologians have had a "thing" about affective piety since about the morning after Schleiermacher died. There are, no doubt, problems engendered by an individualistic piety that does not account for the corporate nature of the Church or the needs of the external world. But sometimes, I

[2] Cited (and translated) in Ward and Heitzenrater, 1:220, n. 25.

think, the distinctions between personal piety, ecclesial identity and social activism have been unnaturally exaggerated.

In fact, in the background of the religion of the heart lay the harsh realities of nearly a hundred years of inter-Christian warfare, culminated on the European continent by the Thirty Years War (1618–1648) and in Britain by the English Revolution (1640–1660). It should not come as a surprise that in a period when corporate Christian states had engaged in slaughtering fellow Christians, some Christians should conclude that a "religion of the heart" was a preferable option.

For Moravians, though – and this is a critical factor differentiating the Moravian experience – the period of Protestant-Catholic warfare only exacerbated the long-standing hostility that reached back all the way to the pre-Reformation Utraquist and Brethren communities. There's simply nothing like this in Methodist experience, so I have to say that the culture of the religion of the heart influenced the origins of Methodism and the reformation of Moravianism under Zinzendorf's leadership in very different ways.

The distinctive culture of the religion of the heart grew out of the period of European inter-Christian warfare. Through all of its expressions – Catholic, Protestant, and even Jewish – it emphasized the role of the affections in religious life, especially heartfelt repentance, faith as affective trust, and love for God and one's neighbor. Within seventeenth-century Catholicism it appeared in the Jansenists' claim that sacraments apart from genuine repentance and faith cannot convey divine grace. It appeared in the Catholic Quietists' claim that persons in the highest states of meditation no longer need either sacraments or meditation on the humanity of Christ. It appeared most prominently in the rise of devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, a form of affective devotion that has flourished in popular Catholicism since the Baroque age. Within European Jewish circles in the eighteenth century, it appeared in the claim of the early Hasidic movement that true Judaism consisted in three things: love for God, love for Israel, and love for Torah.[3]

[3] Cf. Ted A. Campbell, *The Religion of the Heart* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), pp. 18–41, 144–150. The reference to love for God, Israel and Torah in Hasidism is based on a quotation from the Baal Shem Tov, given

Within European Protestantism, the culture of the religion of the heart appeared in English Puritan piety from the early 1600s, and then in the movement we identify as Pietism within the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of the European Continent. F. Ernest Stoeffler has demonstrated that there was a direct connection between pietistic Puritanism and nascent European Pietism in the person of William Ames, who moved from Cambridge to The Hague in the early decades of the seventeenth century and from whose influence Reformed Pietism arose.[4] Pietism flourished in Lutheran Churches from the 1670s, grounded in the pastoral work and writings of Philipp Jakob Spener, and in the educational reforms and charitable work of August Hermann Francke at Halle University.

In all of its forms, Pietism displays certain characteristics that would mark both the Moravian and Methodist traditions. a) In the first place, Pietists insisted that Christian faith involves more than mere doctrinal assent: it involves heartfelt repentance and heartfelt faith in Christ. b) In the second place, Pietists developed a rich tradition of devotion to the humanity of Christ, especially to the wounds and sufferings of Christ, expressed in Pietistic hymnody (for example, Johann Heermann's hymn, "Ah! Holy Jesus"). c) In the third place, Pietists explored the use of small groups for discipline in the Christian community. This marked a departure from the older spiritual practice of the Reformed tradition, in particular, where discipline was administered at the level of the whole congregation.

Both the Methodist and Moravian traditions shared these characteristics of Pietism. I do not mean to suggest, however, that Pietism accounts for all there is of Methodist and Moravian traditions. What happened, I believe, was that in each case an older set of Church and spiritual traditions intersected the contemporary movements for the religion of the heart in the form of Pietism. Take the trajectory of seventeenth-century Protestantism and the history of the Moravian "Ancient Unity," blend these in the presence of Lutheran Pietism,

---

in Salomo Birnbaum, *The Life and Sayings of the Baal Shem* (tr. Irene Birnbaum; New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1933) 105.

[4] F. Ernest Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism* (Studies in the History of Religion, no. 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), pp. 133–141; cf. Campbell, *Religion of the Heart* 71–72.

and you emerge with something like the reformed Moravian Unity under Zinzendorf's leadership. Take the trajectory of eighteenth-century Anglicanism, with its complex experience in the time of the Reformation and in the seventeenth-century struggles between Anglicans and Puritans, blend this with a healthy portion of Lutheran Pietism and renewed Moravian piety, and you emerge with something like the early Methodist movement under the leadership of John Wesley. In each case there was a longstanding and complex history that had gone on before and that continued to shape each tradition in distinctive ways. In each case, however, it was the culture of the religion of the heart that served as a catalyst for the renewal or the inception of a new spiritual movement. It is in this sense that we can speak of the broad cultural impulse of the religion of the heart as the "common base" from which Methodism and Moravianism grew.

B. First Contact

From this "common base" in the religion of the heart, I may now consider the crucial era of "first contact" between Moravians and Methodists in the fifteen-year period between 1735 and 1750. John and Charles Wesley set sail aboard the *Simmonds* late in 1735, bound for General Oglethorpe's Georgia colony, where Charles would serve as Oglethorpe's personal secretary and John would serve as Anglican chaplain to the colonists. By coincidence or providence (and Methodists have generally regarded it as the latter) Wesley met two groups of Christians influenced by the Pietist movement on this voyage. One was a group of Lutheran refugees from Salzburg in Austria, whose Pastor, Johann Martin Bolzius, had been appointed from Halle University. They represented the main stream of Lutheran Pietism. But also present on the *Simmonds* was a group of Moravians, led by August Gottlieb Spangenberg, bound for the new colony. By the time the passengers arrived at St. Simons Island (6 February 1736), Wesley had already begun to be challenged by the spiritual impetus of Pietism. I want to note at this point, though, that some Methodist accounts of Wesley's experience in Georgia have mentioned only the encounter with the Moravians, and it is important to realize that Wesley met both of these groups representing different forms of Ger-

man Pietism. This is one more reason why I want to stress the "common base" that Methodists and Moravians both share in Pietism and the religion of the heart.

To return to the initial narrative with which this article began, three weeks after arriving in America John Wesley observed a Moravian episcopal election. Despite his strong Anglican prejudices on the issue of episcopacy, which he had already confided to Spangenberg, Wesley was obviously impressed with the Moravian episcopal election:

> After several hours spent in conference and prayer, they proceeded to the election and ordination of a Bishop. The great simplicity, as well as solemnity, of the whole, made me forget the seventeen hundred years between, and imagine myself in one of those assemblies where form and state were not; but Paul the tent-maker, or Peter the fisherman presided; yet with the demonstration of the Spirit and Power.[5]

Even on board the *Simmonds*, Spangenberg had queried John Wesley about his own faith and the "assurance of pardon" which Moravians and Pietists in general believed to be normative for true Christian faith.

It is obvious, from their own narratives, that both John and Charles Wesley continued to be challenged by these questions through the remaining time they spent in Georgia, their return to England, and through the time of their religious experiences in May 1738. Both John and Charles Wesley were in contact with English Moravians through the joint Moravian-Anglican Fetter-Lane Society when Charles and John Wesley both experienced the assurance of pardon, Charles on Pentecost Sunday (21 May) and John on the following Wednesday evening at the well-known meeting at Aldersgate Street.

Within a few weeks of the Aldersgate Street experience, John Wesley traveled to Germany, visiting the Moravian settlement at Zinzendorf's estate, Herrnhut. Wesley interviewed several persons at

[5] John Wesley's *Journal* for 28 February 1736 (in Ward and Heitzenrater 1:171–172).

Herrnhut about their religious experience, but was rejected from communion because the Moravian leaders present were not convinced about the sincerity of Wesley's faith (even after Aldersgate). This event has been taken by some of Wesley's interpreters to indicate the beginning of a rift with Pietism broadly. But this impression is misleading (at best). Wesley also traveled to Halle, where he met the son of August Hermann Francke and continued his immersion in mainstream Lutheran Pietism. Moreover, the later rift with London Moravians, as we shall see, was not with the Moravian movement as a whole but rather with a peculiar group of Moravians in England in a period that is now regarded as peculiar in light of the whole range of Moravian experience. I think, then, that we should understand this particular event at Herrnhut not as initiating a major shift in Wesley's attitude towards the Moravian community as a whole, and certainly not in his attitude towards Pietism, but simply as an unfortunate incident that foreshadowed the larger issue that came to the forefront of John Wesley's relationship with English Moravians in the early 1740s.

The rift in the 1740s did focus on the issue of access to Holy Communion, as well as other "means of grace." Wesley had insisted that seekers should wait for the full assurance of faith by using all the means of grace, including fasting, prayer, devotional scripture study and the Lord's Supper. This point of view was institutionalized later in the Methodist "General Rules," which make it clear that membership in Methodist societies was open to all "awakened" persons so long as they continued to "evidence" their desire of salvation by observing the means of grace. The particular group of Moravians in London in the period between 1739 and 1740 believed that because all works apart from faith in Christ had the nature of sin, the seeker should do nothing: the seeker should "be still and wait" on the Lord (we refer to their teaching as the "stillness" doctrine). In particular, these Moravians insisted that those who had not experienced the full assurance of pardon should not receive communion. After Wesley read to the Fetter Lane Society an excerpt attributed to the Eastern Christian mystical writer, "Dionysius the Areopagite," the Moravians present signaled their assent to the truth of the "stillness" teaching and claimed that Wesley laid too much stress on the "ordinances"

(including the sacrament of the Lord's Supper). Shortly after this, John Wesley parted company with the Moravians, led his followers out from the Fetter Lane Society, and founded the distinctly Wesleyan Foundery Society.[6]

This was a serious rift, and it is apparent that at least at this time, the Moravians felt that their perspective had the broad support of the Moravian Church. Nevertheless, Moravian leaders are keen to point out that in the long run, the views of this group of London Moravians did not prevail. This is a critical point to recognize in Moravian-Methodist discussions, for Methodist literature typically takes the London Moravians of this period as representing the whole of the Moravian tradition. As the Moravian tradition has developed, it has recovered much of the sacramental piety that it received from the ancient and medieval church by way of the Ancient Unity. Methodists need should be careful, then, not to take this particular incident in early Methodist history as representative of the views of contemporary Moravians.

Now it might be argued that the controversy over "stillness" and the means of grace was occasioned by the Moravians' pietistic concern with the priority of religious experience over sacraments or other "means." A further area of controversy between Methodists and Moravians came within a few years over the issue of sanctification and perfection, an issue in which the Moravians' Lutheran ties were much more prominent. A series of discussions between John Wesley and Moravian leaders (including Boehler and Spangenberg) led to a conversation between Wesley and Zinzendorf, conducted in Latin at Grays Inn, London. The conversation is remembered almost verbatim in both Wesley's and Zinzendorf's writings. It begins on a sour note – Zinzendorf asks *Cur religionem tuam mutasti?* "Why have you changed your religion?" – and goes downhill from there. At issue is the notion, precious to Wesley, of the goal of Christian perfection including growth in sanctity or holiness in this life. Zinzendorf here thinks in entirely Lutheran terms: our only perfection is the

[6] The event is recounted in John Wesley's *Journal* for 16 July 1740 (in Ward and Heitzenrater 2:160–161). Ward and Heitzenrater point out that Wesley had mistakenly attributed a quotation from the English translator of Pseudo-Dionysius to the mystical writer himself.

perfection of Christ, in justification is all the holiness to which a Christian should ever aspire, and to claim otherwise amounts to human arrogance. Wesley, with his grounding in patristic and Anglican spiritual writings, could not think in this way: God intends our growth in sanctity or holiness towards the goal that we should love God with all our hearts, minds, souls, and strength, and love our neighbors as ourselves. The conversation reached no resolution, and from this point Moravian and Methodist relations remained strained.

Even after the British Parliament in 1749 recognized the legitimacy of the Moravian Church (including its episcopal succession), relations remained cool. This is evident from a pamphlet published in that year or the next (1750), written either by Wesley himself or by one of his close associates, refuting Moravian claims to legitimacy as an independent Church. But despite these persistent issues and divisions, Wesley indicated at many points thereafter his desire for unity with the Moravians, and there were in fact practical proposals for union, even as late as 1785.[7]

Contemporary Methodists and Moravians might wish that their forebears in this initial period of contact had spent some time clarifying the issues that appeared to separate them, but the truth is that they didn't clarify the issues. Misunderstandings abounded, and personalities stood in the way (I think it would be fair to say that both John Wesley's personality and Zinzendorf's personality stood in the way). Well informed members of the Moravian Church will tell you that the period between 1740 and 1760 (Zinzendorf's death) was not a good time for the newly renewed Moravian Unity. And the Methodists were increasingly following their own trajectory in this period. The "first contact," then, was catalytic for the Wesleys but in the end abortive.

[7] The Grays Inn conversation and subsequent relations with the Moravians are documented in some detail in Martin Schmidt, *John Wesley: A Theological Biography* (tr. Norman Goldhawk; 2 vols., with the second volume in two separately bound parts; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972) 2:1:56–71, and the extensive notes accompanying this text.

C. Parallel Trajectories

Despite the abortive "first contact," however, there are a number of ways in which Methodists and Moravians have pursued "parallel trajectories" since the eighteenth century. I want to consider here some of these parallel trajectories between Methodist and Moravian communities since the eighteenth centuries, points at which Moravians and Methodists have common historical experiences (partly because of our common base in the religion of the heart) despite the lack of contacts between Moravians and Methodists in the intervening period. I would emphasize five points of parallel trajectories between these traditions: 1) *ecclesia* and *ecclesiola*, 2) episcopacy, 3) the role of doctrine in the Church, 4) worship and hymnody, and 5) small-group discipline.

1. *Ecclesia* and *Ecclesiola*. In the first place, both Methodists and Moravians understand their own roles in relationship to the ecumenical Church in a rather distinctive manner. Older Christian traditions, such as those of the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, have claimed to be churches in which the fullness or catholicity of apostolic faith resides in their own communions. National churches founded at the time of the Reformation claimed to have the fullness of "church" at least for their geographical regions. Many Evangelical and Pentecostal groups have claimed some area of doctrine or practice that marks their churches as the fullest restoration of the apostolic faith. If I understand Methodist and Moravian traditions rightly, though, neither of our traditions has ever made such a claim. We sometimes distinguish *ecclesiola*, the "little" church, from *ecclesia*, church in the fullest sense. This can apply to the use of small groups as *ecclesiolae* within the larger *ecclesia*, but here I think it can denote that Moravians and Methodists think of their own traditions as serving particular historic roles and missions, but never as representing the fullness of what the Nicene Creed calls the "one holy, catholic and apostolic church."

At least from the time of the renewed Moravian unity under Zinzendorf, the Moravians have understood themselves as having a particular calling or mission *within* the whole body of Christians, a mission that included missionary work, the infusion of affective piety

into other churches, and even the mission of serving as an ecumenical catalyst (one of Zinzendorf's more visionary claims for the Moravians). Similarly, Methodists understood their mission in the time of Wesley as "Not to form any new sect; but to reform the nation, particularly the Church; and to spread scriptural holiness over the land."[8] Methodists became separate churches only accidentally and tragically. Thus it may be said, for Moravians as well as for Methodists, that we are more like "religious orders" with particular apostolates than churches by ourselves. In my view, neither Moravians nor Methodists understand themselves as being fully "church" apart from fellowship with other Christians.

2. Episcopacy. A very particular experience that Moravians and Methodists have in common is the experience of episcopacy apart from the context of an ancient Christian communion or a state-supported church. That is to say, within the context of what British and Continental folk call "Free Churches" (churches not established by civil governments), Moravians and Methodists (and, I believe, some of the Mennonite groups) are unique in maintaining forms of episcopacy. I have mentioned above the fact that the British Parliament actually recognized the legitimacy of Moravian episcopal succession in 1749. This does not mean that all Anglicans would accept that judgment, nor even all Moravians, for I understand that Moravians do not claim the necessity of an unbroken apostolic succession in the episcopacy. But Moravian bishops do have a distinctive sense of standing in a long succession: Bishop Arthur Freeman in Pennsylvania knows exactly which number he is in the Moravian succession of bishops. Episcopacy is a point at which Methodists might be able to learn from Moravians, for in recent years Moravians have worked to reduce the administrative load of bishops and to restore the role of the bishop as a teacher in the Church and as a pastoral leader.

3. The Role of Doctrine. The mention of the bishop's role as a teacher leads us to a third point of parallel between Methodists and Moravians, and that has to do with the role of doctrine within the

[8] The response to question 3 of the "Large Minutes" (in Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.* [14 vols.; London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872] 8:299).

Church. Neither Methodists nor Moravians have embraced the confessional method of the Reformation churches, nor the scholasticism that accompanied those churches' involvement in inter-Christian warfare. In fact, to understand the role of doctrine as corporate consensus in either of these traditions one must look not only at formal confessional documents such as the Methodist Articles of Religion or the Moravian "Ground of the Unity," but one must look to such other consensus-bearing documents as hymns that have been consistently utilized, the structure of hymnals, or such distinctive prayers as the Easter Litany of the Moravian Church. The tragic experiences of inter-Christian warfare and division had a deep effect on Pietism, giving it a suspicion of formal doctrine which Moravians and Methodists have both inherited. Consequently, doctrine functions differently in Methodist and Moravian churches than it does in other communions. This doesn't mean we don't have consensus or doctrines, as is sometimes alleged, but it means we teach them in different ways, and one has to look in other places to find them.

4. Worship and Hymnody. This leads to a fourth parallel point, namely, the distinctive forms of worship and hymnody that have prevailed among churches of these two traditions. You may be aware of the fact that some of these were held in common because of direct contact. Thus, the early Methodist institutions of the Love Feast, of vigils or "Watch Nights," and of occasions for hymn singing were inspired or influenced by contact with the Moravian tradition.

Beyond these services held in common, Moravians and Methodists have each developed distinctive forms of worship beyond the traditional liturgical occasions. Examples for Moravians would be the Easter Sunrise Service and the "Litany of the Wounds." Methodists developed a whole panoply of alternative services, including outdoor preaching, covenant renewal, camp meetings, revival meetings, and Wednesday and Sunday prayer meetings. It might be worth claiming, in this regard, that the "alternative" or "seeker" services popular today have long-standing historical precedents in these distinctive Methodist and Moravian services. (That's not said to legitimize everything that goes under the name of "alternative" worship today.)
Above all, it is the central place given to hymn singing that characterizes Methodist and Moravian worship. Catholic scholar Teresa Berger

has shown how the original *Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists* (1780) functioned to teach the distinctive theology and worship of the early Methodist movement.[9] I'm sure that a similar case could be made for collections of Moravian hymnody. The particular note of affective devotion to the humanity of Christ can be seen in both hymn traditions. Despite the exaggerations that can be found in the imagery of the blood and wounds, so common in Zinzendorf, it is not unusual in Charles Wesley's poetry and (I would say) not unusual in the broader traditions of Christian devotion. There is a distinctive contribution to Christian spirituality in the expression of affective devotion in pietistic hymnody, a contribution that still awaits adequate explication within Christian communities.

5. Small-Group Discipline. Finally, a fifth parallel trajectory between Methodists and Moravians involves the utilization of small groups for church discipline. There was on this point (as well as on the previous point about worship) some direct borrowing: Wesley acknowledged, in particular, that the Methodist development of specialized "bands" owed its origins to the Moravian use of similar, specialized groups. Placed in a broad ecumenical context, the use of small groups can also be seen as a distinct contribution of Moravians and Methodists. Christian spirituality has typically employed particular forms of community discipline: the monasteries and monastic rules of the ancient and medieval Christian church would have been the most common examples prior to the time of the Reformation. The Reformed Tradition enforced discipline at the level of the congregation, where the Pastor together with a local session or congregational assembly enforced discipline, for example, by restricting access to communion and by determining who would be admitted to the fellowship of the congregation. The location of discipline in small groups marks a distinct contribution of Methodist and Moravian spirituality, well suited to the modern concern that discipline can be practiced only to the extent that there is voluntary consent to be disciplined. (If you have visited [will visit] a Moravian settlement, either at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, or at Old Salem, North Carolina, you'll

[9] Teresa Berger, *Theologie in Hymnen? Zum Verhältnis von Theologie und Doxologie am Beispiel des "Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists" (1780)*. Altenberge: Telos Verlag, 1989.

see the buildings designated for the "choirs," and the division of the graveyard into choirs.)

Conclusion

The Moravian and Methodist movements were both influenced by the "religion of the heart," a widespread movement for affective devotion in the period following the European wars of religion in the 1600s. The early period of Moravian-Methodist contact, between 1735 and 1750, influenced the Wesleys, especially their experiences of "assurance," but proved abortive in the end due to theological rifts over the "means of grace" and the meaning of sanctification and perfection, and also due to serious personality conflicts. Methodist and Moravian traditions since the eighteenth century show parallel trajectories in their understandings of the role of their movements in relationship to the broader ecumenical church, in their understanding and use of episcopacy, in their understanding of the role of doctrine in the church, in their distinct forms of worship and their affective hymnody, and in their use of small-group discipline.

The transformation of the Moravian Brethren, and the origins of the Methodist movement, both occurred at the time of the Industrial Revolution and of the Enlightenment. Although John Wesley and the Count von Zinzendorf would have been surprised (or shocked) to be counted among those influenced by the Enlightenment, one does not have to look too far to see its broad influence. The idea of religious toleration, for example, was simply presupposed by both movements, and defended through their own conflicts with state churches. The critical importance of religious experience can be seen as a kind of empiricism: Wesley, in fact, utilized terminology directly from Locke in describing the epistemological value of religious experience. Zinzendorf took as a datum the facts of personal religious experience. The parallel trajectories between Methodists and Moravians, then, do not need to be accounted for by means of direct contact. Rather, these movements reacted to the political and social and cultural milieu of the eighteenth century in parallel ways that set in motion the parallel trajectories they have pursued since that time.

Pavel Hošek, Praha

Beyond Foundationalism

Stanley J. Grenz, John R. Franke, *Beyond Foundationalism. Shaping Theology in a Postmodern Context*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 2001, ISBN 0-664-25769-0, 298 pp.

In their book *Beyond Foundationalism* Stanley Grenz and John Franke propose a revised method for systematic theology. They start from the observation that due to the collapse of modernistic epistemology, theology is in a period of transition. The typical epistemological paradigm of modernity is the so-called foundationalism. Its basic presupposition says that people acquire knowledge as one builds a house. There are relatively few foundational axioms, which are self-evident, context-free, universal and absolutely sure. All knowledge is built on these foundations by means of inductive and deductive logical operations. Generally speaking, foundationalism is the epistemology of Enlightenment.

The two basic types of foundationalism correspond to two streams of Enlightenment: empiricist, building all knowledge of the foundation of sensual data, and rationalist, building all knowledge deductively on several basic self-evident ideas. In Protestant theology, foundationalism has taken two basic forms: conservative and liberal. Conservatives take the Bible as the basic source of relevant data. Bible is viewed as a depository of true propositions, revealed by God and therefore absolutely sure. The task (and method) of theology is to organize and systematize this loose collection of true statements about God into a coherent whole.

For liberals, the foundation of theology is the universal human religious experience. From the characteristic elements and features of this universal experience, we are to build step by step the whole system of theology.

Grenz and Franke claim that both conservative and liberal alternatives have one feature in common: the underlying rationalism of their epistemologies. With the fall of the modernistic project, theological method dependent on such kind of rationalism becomes very questionable. It becomes very clear these days that there is no such thing

as context-free, universal human rationality, all our knowledge is situated, culture specific, socially conditioned. The authors want to make a methodological proposal for theology in the postmodern context, a method that is free from the (now problematic) presuppositions of modernity.

This doesn't imply that they just give up to the relativist (perspectivist) despair of contemporary epistemology. Christian theology cannot give up its universal horizon. What Grenz and Franke have in mind is the emphasis on the pilgrim and servant status of theology. They view doctrine as secondary to the biblical witness, as heuristic constructions, which should help us to find coherence and orientation. They vote for what they call humble, chastened rationality in theology. Instead of uncritical acceptance of the traditional realist notion of truth (i. e. the so called correspondence view of truth) they want to apply the insights of other theories of truth, such as the coherentist, pragmatist and constructionist views of the nature of truth. In theology, they employ Wittgenstein's notion of language games as corresponding to particular forms of social life. In other words, they point to the fact that language is a social phenomenon and that all statements get their meaning in the process of social interaction. The same is true about theology, or the language of Christian community in general.

Against the foundationalist program, which strives to provide rational human beings with absolute incontestable certainty regarding the truthfulness of their beliefs, they agree with Pannanberg's modest program to show the inner coherence of the Christian semantic universe and the coherence of that universe with the rest of human knowledge and experience.

Grenz and Franke utilize the insights of the postliberal theologian G. Lindbeck and together with him they emphasize the social, communitarian character of the Christian vision of the world. Employing the observations of the sociologist P. Berger, they see the Christian worldview as anchored in the corporate life and worship of the believing community, which shapes and constructs its own symbolic universe, employing, of course, the normative symbols of biblical tradition.

After having described the shift from a realist, correspondence

view of truth (in theology) to a more coherentist, pragmatist and constructionist perspective, Grenz and Franke proceed (in the second part of their book) to propose (what they see as) the three essential sources of theology: Bible as the norming norm, tradition as providing the hermeneutic trajectory, and culture as theology's embedding context.

Concering the Bible, Grenz and Franke reject the traditional view of the Bible as a reservoir of true propositions, which results in the substitution of the biblical witness by systematized doctrinal edifice, which thereby silences the independent voice of the Scripture. They propose to shift the emphasis on the Spirit speaking through the Bible, illuminating the believer, using the Bible as an instrument of revelatory encounter. What is the goal of the Spirit's activity? In Grenz's and Franke's view it is to project a world, a particularly Christian world project with the story of Jesus at its center. Their bibliology is thus christologically and pneumatologically focused. The Spirit uses the biblical text to form a community of listeners (and readers), who share the vision of a God-intended Christ-centered world. The Spirit's activity is therefore creating the church, the body of believers, unified around a particular identity-shaping world project of the biblical metanarrative. The grand story of the Bible with its paradigmatic events provides the corporate identity and common memory and hope for the people of God and offers an interpretive framework from which to view all of reality.

This brings us to Grenz's and Franke's view of tradition. The Spirit's activity has not stopped with the closure of the canon. It continues as the church, surrounded by changing historical and cultural environment, strives to interpret and apply the biblical message. Grenz and Franke criticize the Protestant overemphasis on clarity and perspicuity of Scripture and the contemporary individualistic biblicist piety, which acts as if we could approach the Scripture directly without the mediating witness of church tradition. The authors insist that to interpret the Scripture we need to pay close attention to the hermeneutic trajectories of tradition, which is the treasury of wisdom and experience of our forefathers in faith.

The last source of theological reflection in Grenz's and Franke's view is the culture. They employ C. Geertz's definition of culture as

the pattern of meanings embodied in symbols that shapes the attitudes toward life. Culture constitutes the world people live in. This world is the story told and retold in order to fortify its spell of enchantment. The authors point out, that the Gospel is always embedded in a particular culture, which is the very principle of incarnation. We should take neither the Gospel (i.e. our grasp of it) nor the culture as preexisting static entities – they are dynamic and relational, in their encounter there is always mutual exchange and transformation. The Gospel therefore always has to be contextualized, or theologically speaking, incarnated. Moreover, the Spirit as Life giver is present everywhere, where life is – therefore He works in and through culture as well, not just within the walls of the church. The theologian must therefore consistently reflect on surrounding culture if he or she wants to fulfil his or her task in a responsible way.

In the last part of their book, Grenz and Franke propose what they call theology's focal motifs. These are: Trinity as theology's structural motif, community as theology's integrative motif and eschatology as theology's orienting motif.

Concerning the Trinity the authors reject the popular view that trinitarian doctrine is a heritage of Greek metaphysics, alien to the biblical message. They want the Trinity to return to the centre of theological reflection as its structural pattern. They claim that its beginnings are not in abstract speculation, but in the early church's experience of the Father's love, expressed in the Son's atoning work as it is realized by the presence of the Spirit. They put a strong emphasis on the history of God's self-revelation, which corresponds to His "inner history". They survey the hermeneutic trajectory of trinitarian thinking from Augustine through Hegel to Barth and Rahner, Moltmann and Pannenberg. They underline that trinitarian thinking expresses the intrinsic relationality of God, His communitarian nature. On that basis, they suggest that *person* might be a more appropriate primary ontological category instead of the traditional *substance*. If God is Trinity, to be an image of God implies to live in community.

This brings us to the second focal motif: community. As we have seen, community in Grenz's and Franke's view is essential for Christian epistemology, the Christian vision of the world is socially pro-

duced. The reference group of all Christians is the church, providing them with a common past and future, a shared memory and hope, incorporating them into its constitutive narrative. Theology then is a cultural practice of a distinct social group (namely, the church) and it has an essential part to play in the church's world- and identity-shaping activity. Since the symbolic universe of the Christian community is the biblical story of God's salvation history, this community is necessarily future oriented, expecting the consummation of history in God's eschatological triumph.

This brings us to the last key motif of theology: eschatology. Grenz and Franke agree with Moltmann that eschatology should not be an appendix or last chapter of systematic theology, but belongs to its very center. The element of hope must permeate the whole edifice of dogmatics. Not hope as an anthropological given, but a particular hope, based on God's promises concerning the future completion of His work. Christian hope is in one sense pessimistic, say Grenz and Franke, it doesn't trust human abilities to bring about heaven on earth. It trusts in God's intervention, it is well symbolized by the "impossible possibility": resurrection of the dead. Christian theology should look at everything from the perspective of its goal, its destiny, only eschatological fulfillment shows the true meaning to everything, as Pannenberg says. Christian theology prefers becoming over static being, only future shows the true essence of things, only from the perspective of its end does human life get its meaning, as Heidegger says. What the church (assisted by theology) now constructs as its vision of the world, will once become true. Theology must help the church to construct a world in accordance with the depth grammar of biblical story, so that it adequately prepares the coming of God's future into this world.

Grenz's and Franke's book opens a number of very important issues in contemporary theology. It is well organized and clearly structured. The authors propose a significant shift in methodology of the theologian's work – and that shift is obviously necessary, due to the dramatic changes in contemporary culture and due to the crisis and stagnation in contemporary systematic theology, especially in conservative circles (to which the book is primarily addressed).

The authors utilize a number of insights and notions of great con-

temporary theologians (Pannenberg, Moltmann, Lindbeck etc.), but also theories and ideas of such thinkers as Wittgenstein, Berger, Heidegger or Bloch. The potential contribution of this wide spectrum of scholars to a revision of methodology in theology is inspiring and thought provoking. However, the way Grenz and Franke use these diverse ideas appears to be very eclectic, unsystematic and sometimes quite arbitrary. They end up combining mutually incompatible emphases, such as a very pneumatological view of the Bible and secular culture (very much like Tillich) and the emphasis on a certain givenness and fixity of Christian community's semantic code (very much like Lindbeck or Barth). Sometimes they put into the center the Spirit's activity in the believer (*verbum internum*), at other times the proclaimed Word of God (*verbum externum*).

Since their book's goal is to encourage creative flexibility and offer fresh perspectives (especially to rigidly conservative theologians), these minor inconsistencies are understandable and may be even intentional. The book is decidedly a piece of solid scholarship, it is well written and deals with very important issues. It is certainly worth reading for all, who are interested in methodological problems and issues of systematic theology.

Tim Noble, Praha

Sacred Landscapes and Cultural Politics

Philip P. Arnold, Ann Grodzins Gold (eds.), *Sacred Landscapes and Cultural Politics: Planting a Tree*, Ashgate, Aldershot, Burlington USA, Singapore, Sydney, 2001, pp. xix + 219, ISBN 0 7546 1569 3

This volume arose out of a symposium held in April 1996 as one of the events marking the centenary of the Department of Religion at Syracuse University. The subtitle refers among other things to a part of that symposium which saw the planting of a Tree of Peace. The volume forms part of Ashgate's Vitality of Indigenous Religions series.

The book is divided into three parts. The first is entitled "Con-

tested Cultural Politics" and begins with an essay by Lynda Sexson on "Isaac and the Elk: Nature's Unnatural Acts". This is a potentially interesting piece, in which the author looks at the two founding myths of America, both ultimately imposed or devised by Europeans, of America as the natural (the Elk) and as America as the created (Isaac), iconic and iconoclastic, indigenous and possessing. The essay at its best points to the problematic of the mythic invention of America, but at its worst it descends into what might best be termed New Ageism, and the comments on Genesis and the biblical tradition would be alarmingly inaccurate for anyone with a passing knowledge of Biblical Studies. The next two essays in this part, by John Rennie Short on alternative geographies and Jane Marie Law on the problematic of trying to use minority and in some sense alien religious traditions in relation to environmental issues are more solid and interesting. Short argues that for too long geography has been reduced to cartography, "the particularities of place … turned into the abstractions of space" (p.31). Alternative geographies, on the other hand, would attempt to situate place within space, to locate the particular within the wider universe. Law first offers a story of an encounter between demonstrators and loggers in Montana, and then goes on to reflect on the problems of using non-western traditions in western environments. She does say that the problem is not in cross-cultural studies, but in their popularisation at the level of demonstrations, an important point. But the dangers she indicates (a useful corrective to some of the Sexson article in the volume) are real enough, and deserve careful attention. Thus she highlights, among other things, the need to get people in the Jewish and Christian traditions to reflect not on how negative their traditions are in relation to the environment, but on the positive elements that are contained within their traditions.

The second part of the book, "Once and Future Sacred Landscapes", looks at specific case studies. Alfonso Peter Castro and Adelle Tibbetts look at the sacred landscapes of Kirinyaga in Kenya, especially in terms of the phantoms which inhabit this landscape, and how the view of them and the landscape was changed by contact with Islamic and Christian missionaries, and also by the experiences of colonialism and post-colonial Kenyan history. Again the authors are clear that the Gikuyu, who inhabited this landscape, were interested

in mitigating the effects of deforestation, for which they were responsible, not out of some sort of spiritual ecology, but for severely practical reasons (which of course include religious reasons). People are at the centre of the worldview, not trees or nature. Ultimately, what had once been a local religious practice became, however, bureaucratised, and religious bonds which had united the Gikuyu were damaged.

Pramod Parajuli looks at the world of *adivasi* (a word meaning "first inhabitants" which he prefers to the more demeaning, if perhaps more common word, 'tribals') peasants in the Jharkand region of east-central India. The cosmovision of these peoples is formed through an interpretive scheme involving three spheres, the human, the natural and the supernatural. This long paper presents an interesting reading of this cosmovision, based on a close attention to the practices of the people but also set in a wider context. Ann Grodzins Gold contributes a paper which looks at a similar set of interactions, cosmology, ritual and action, based on field research in Rajasthan. She aims "to say something about the cultural construction of the natural environment in rural Rajasthan, and the symbolic nature of human beings' productive activities within that environment" (p.116).

The third and final part of the book, Planting a Tree, contains two chapters. One is a record of the tree-planting ceremony alluded to above, the other an article by Philip Arnold on the conflicting sacred landscapes of New York State, indeed of America in general. I suspect that the tree-planting was more impressive and moving for those who took part – in the book it comes across as very flat. Arnold's article, in part inspired by a panel discussion which followed the tree-planting, perhaps helps to articulate better in this volume some of what was going on at the ceremony itself. A key distinction which Arnold makes is between a locative and a utopian understanding of landscape, of place. Those who understand place locatively (such as the Native American traditions he refers to) are bound to be at odds with those who understand it in a utopian sense, and thus are more easily able to deal with concepts such as land ownership. The way in which these traditions conflict is seen as at the heart of problems over relationships to land which affect American society today, either because of dislocation, as with Native Americans, or because of the

appropriation – or misappropriation – of land by Americans of European descent who have always seen land as material to be owned and possessed.

There is some material in this book for those who are interested in the relationship between land, religion and culture, especially as these are understood in indigenous traditions. Most of the time the authors manage to avoid falling into sentimentalism, though not always, and there are a large number of misprints and other typographical errors which might have been avoided by more careful editing. However, in general, this book can be recommended as offering a useful contribution to an important area of contemporary religious and cultural studies, with some valuable insights into the possibilities and pitfalls involved.

ADDRESSES OF THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

David Holeton, hippolytus@volny.cz
Husitská teologická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy
Pacovská 350/4
CZ – 140 21 Praha 4

Vilém Herold, herold@lorien.site.cas.cz
Filosofický ústav Akademie věd České republiky
Jilská 1
CZ – 110 00 Praha 1

Zdeněk V. David, davidzde@wwic.si.edu
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
One Woodrow Wilson Plaza
1300 Pensylvania Avenue
Washington DC 20004-3027

Ted A. Campbell, garrett.president@garrett.edu
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
2121 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Pavel Hošek, hosek@etspraha.cz
ETS
Stoliňská 2417/41a
CZ – 193 00 Praha 9

Tim Noble, nobletim@volny.cz
The Institute of Ecumenical Studies
Vyšehradská 41
CZ – 120 00 Praha 2

Communio viatorum is indexed in the *ATLA Religion Database*, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606, E-mail: atla@atla.com, WWW: http://www.atla.com.