A BRIEF HONEYMOON IN 1564–1566:
THE UTRAQUIST CONSISTORY
AND THE ARCHBISHOP OF PRAGUE

By Zdeněk V. David

The purpose of this study is to assess the distinctive status of the Bohemian Church half a century after the onset of the Protestant Reformation in light of the historians' doubts about the viability of its centrist position. The object is to take a measure of its stability and soundness as it continued to steer its via media with respect to both Lutheran Protestantism and the Roman Church at one of the crucial junctions in its development, namely at its confrontation with the restored Roman Archbishopric of Prague in the 1560s. The processes of the Archbishopric's restoration, as well as of gaining the papal permission for lay communion sub utraque in Bohemia, have been meticulously covered, most recently by František Kavka and Anna Skýbová. What remains obscure is the institutional and, especially the doctrinal, response of the Utraquist Church to these events. The topic merits an examination, particularly in view of the historians' claims that the archiepiscopal appointment spelled an effective ecclesial end of Utraquism with one wing drawn to Luther's teachings and the other toward a merger with the Roman Church.

Ordination of Utraquist Clergy: 1539–1561

First let us examine the genesis of the concept of a Roman Archbishop in Prague from the Utraquist perspective. During the sixteenth and into the seventeenth century the Utraquist Church maintained an unshakable attachment to the ecclesiastical principle of apostolic succession. This stance related integrally to the Utraquists' empha-

---

3 On the principle of apostolic succession see, for instance, Molinar, Enrico: The Catholicity of the Utraquist Church of Bohemia. Sewanee, Tenn. 1959, 3–5. – Kroftra, Kamil: Bojo kon-
tic allegiance to the liturgical and sacramental practices of the medieval Church, particularly the mass and the eucharist which represented the centerpieces of their worship. The liturgy and the sacraments depended for their validity on priests who received ordinations from canonically consecrated bishops. Thus the Church observed the traditional, essentially Roman, liturgical Christian year, as well as the traditional form of the mass which it frequently celebrated. The Utraquists preserved virtually all the components of the Roman mass, namely, the Introit, the Kyrie Eleison, the Gloria, the Epistle, the Alleluia with the Gradual, the Sequence, the Gospel, the Creed, the Offertory, the Preface, the Sanctus, the Canon of Consecration, the Lord’s Prayer, the Agnus Dei, Communion, and Benediction. The liturgical year of the Utraquists followed the traditional Roman temporal cycle, as well as the more subordinate sanc-
torial cycle. Utraquist priests also said masses for the dead. Both Czech and Latin were employed as liturgical languages. In 1525, 1539, and again in 1549, the Church formally affirmed against the Lutherans its adherence to the seven sacraments recognized by the Roman Church.

The Utraquist insistence on ordinations by canonical bishops has puzzled Protestant and secular historians who tended to see in it an unwillingness to break a useless, if not harmful habit, or a spirit of residual servility to the Roman ecclesiastical establishment, or a response to the demands of the Habsburg kings. The reasons, however, were not deviant or sinister, but traditionally theological. The transmission of sacramental power depended on a historically uninterrupted transmission of the apostolic office. In the Utraquists’ view, without this basis of apostolic succession there were no valid sacraments, no true church, no real Christian life. Lacking their own authentic hierarchy, once Archbishop of Prague, Konrád of Vechta, who joined the Bohemian Reformation, had died in 1431, the Utraquists relied for the Ordination of their priests on itinerant bishops from Italy who occasionally had taken up residence in Bohemia during the fifteenth century. Subsequently, after the turn of the
In response to this predicament, an assembly of the clergy and estates sub utraque proposed to elect an Archbishop of Prague locally, and to ask the king to secure a papal approval for his consecration. For the meantime Ferdinand I was asked to induce the bishops of Olomouc to perform the ordinations, as the Compactata had stipulated, but in fact the bishops had traditionally declined to comply.

Bishop Jan Dubravius (1541-1553) followed his precursors' example in refusing to ordain Utraquist priests despite the formal request of the Bohemian Diet of 15 June 1543, although otherwise he maintained correct relations with the Utraquists and did not interfere with the jurisdiction of the Administrator. His advice was to seek an Archbishop for Prague in connection with the forthcoming Council of Trent which would at long last open in December 1545.

In February 1544, Ferdinand I helped to remove the obstacles to the ordination of Utraquist clergy in Venice. Bishop Titus Cheronensus, also at Sancta Maria del Horto in Venice, apparently replaced Dionysius. On 30 March 1549 the Consistory sent him a request for holy oils, accompanied by a gift of twelve knives. The bishop's desire for a good and elegant horse [bonum equum et elegantem], however, could not be fulfilled a year later.

The Consistory's records show that between 1539 and 1555...
altogether more than 170 Utraquist priests were ordained in Venice.\(^{17}\) In the meantime, on 2 May 1548 the Consistory had likewise appealed to the bishop of Vienna, Friedrich Nausea (c. 1496–1552), also since 1534 a court preacher and councillor of Ferdinand I, to ordain five candidates to priesthood, and—like certain bishops in Italy—waive the requirement of communion \textit{sub una}. At least four priests were ordained by this prelate in 1550 and 1551.\(^{18}\) František Tischer notes that in 1555 Ferdinand I induced Bishop Marek Kuen of Olomouc to ordain priests in Prague. It is not clear, however, whether the priests were Utraquist or Roman.\(^{19}\)

Conversions of Roman priests also provided a steady streak to augment the ranks of Utraquist clergy. At least twenty-seven such converts originally ordained by bishops in Cracow, Esztergom, Poznań, Slupsk, Vienna, Wiener Neustadt, and Wrocław, are on record as joining the Utraquist priesthood from 1539 to 1555. Inasmuch as the Utraquist Church was charged with sheltering runaway monastics, it should be noted that only seven in our sample were formerly monks.\(^{20}\) There was also some movement in the opposite direction.\(^{21}\) On the whole, however,—contrary to the view of Václav Novotný—\(^{22}\) the existing system of recruitment seemed to provide a sufficient number of Utraquist clergy. In 1566 Archbishop Brus would even complain that the Consistory had more priests than it could accommodate in parishes under its own jurisdiction.\(^{23}\)

Nevertheless King Ferdinand I wished to transcend the improvised arrangements for Utraquist ordinations, and promised in 1545 to secure the appointment of a regular Archbishop in Prague who would be in communion with Rome, yet who would be authorized to ordain Utraquist clergy. The pattern for this unusual, even somewhat


\(^{18}\) Borový: Jednání a dopisy, vol. 1, 224 f., 238 f. Concerning ordinations, see documents of 22 August, 24 October 1550, 7 January, and 15 June 1551, ibid. 284, 289, 293, 299.

\(^{19}\) Tischer, František: K dějinám sporu arcibiskupův Pražských o právo metropolitní nad biskupy Olomouckými v XVI. století [Apropos the History of the Contest of the Archbishops of Prague for a Metropolitan Right over the Bishops of Olomouc in the Sixteenth Century]. Česká společnost nauk. Věstník. Třída filosoficko-historicko-jazykозpytná (1905) 2.

\(^{20}\) For secular priests, with the number of individuals (if more than one) indicated in brackets following the page number, see Borový: Jednání a dopisy, vol. 1, 129, 160, 163, 181, 214 f. [3], 221 [2], 242, 301, 302, 305, 314, 316 f., 318, 325 f. [2], 329 [2]; for monks, ibid., vol. 1, 195, 211, 222, 248, 316, 330 [2].

\(^{21}\) A notable priestly defector from Utraquism to the Roman Church was Václav Hájek of Libočany, author of a monumental Kronika česká [The Czech Chronicle], 1541. The Utraquist Consistory referred to him as an “apostate,” but it did approve the book’s publication; see Jireček, Josef: Rukověť dějinám literatury české [A Guide to the History of Czech Literature]. Prague 1875, 219. For other cases of defection from Utraquism see Borový: Jednání a dopisy, vol. 1, 214, — Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 43, 260, 334 f.

\(^{22}\) Novotný: Náboženské dějiny české ve století 16., vol. 1, 608.

bizarre, arrangement began to emerge at the Bohemian Diet of August 1545 when the estates, both sub utraque and sub una, jointly asked for a bishop who would ordain priests, suggesting a Roman prelate, Jan Horák, who served as preceptor of young Archdukes and as provost of Litoměřice. According to the Utraquist theory (in relation to Rome) this bishop would have a very narrow role, essentially ordaining the priests, but the power of appointing them to specific churches, and administrative and judicial jurisdiction over their respective clergies would belong mainly to the Utraquist and the Roman consistorys. It was in a way a revival of the arrangement maintained under Archbishop Konrad of Vechta at the dawn of Utraquism, when the prelate was restricted to ordaining clergy, while the actual governance of the Church was entrusted to the Administrators. Presumably a similar pattern prevailed with the three Roman bishops who resided in Bohemia to serve the Utraquists in the fifteenth century. This arrangement more or less replicated the Utraquist view of the ecclesiastical establishment at its highest level: While the papal judgment could not be admitted in the matter of governance, the pope's sacerdotal power was indispensible for a proper ecclesiastical functioning. The exclusion of papal administrative and judicial jurisdiction as far as the Church of Bohemia was concerned dated to 6 January 1436, and was reaffirmed by the estates sub utraque on 17 March 1547 by arguing that the exercise of papal authority had caused considerable harm to the country from judicial murders to massive invasions by marauding crusaders under Pope Martin V, and the efforts to depose the Utraquist King George of Poděbrady by Pope Paul II (reminiscent of the papal efforts to depose Queen Elizabeth of England a century later). As if to underscore the harm done by the papacy to the Bohemian cause, the scathing denunciations of Utraquism by Pope Paul II (1464–1471) appeared in Prague in Czech translation in the year of the Bohemian Diet's debates on papal authority. An illustrative analogy of the Utraquist stand on the papacy may be that of the eighteenth-century British monarch who would be expected to reign, but not to rule. The Utraquists expected the Bishop of Rome to sanctify, but not to govern. Such a view of the papacy likewise resembled the stances of Marsilius of Padua in his famous Defensor pacis (1324), and of William of Ockham in his Octo quaestiones super potestate ac dignitate


25 On the three bishops, see Holeton: Church or Sect, 26. This pattern also prevails in modern Moravian Church, the descendant of the Unity of Brethren. The function of each of the provincial bishops is to ordain priests, while the administrative power is vested in a synod which elects for its exercise a Narrow Council of three; see Jednota bratrská. Katolický týdeník, 9 March 1997, 4.


papali, or De potestate pontificum et imperatorum (between 1339 and 1342), either of whom may have influenced Wyclif. 

It might then be concluded that an outcome, which would not provide a regular governing bishop for the Utraquists, was seen by the Utraquist Church not just as an emergency measure dictated by necessity, but rather, on the whole, as an acceptable, or even preferable, solution. The absence of such a functionary would permit the settling of ecclesiastical governance in the customary neighborly, almost a homey, spirit which had developed over the last century and a half. On the contrary, the emergence of governing bishop, a monarchal figure dependent on the wishes of the Curial nomenklatura, would tend to unbalance this established, and reasonably effective, organization of authority. The proposed Utraquist solution would also be consistent with the traditional opposition to the Caesarian clergy stemming from the fourteenth-century reformatory (partly Wyclite) roots of Utraquism, and with the early course of the Bohemian Reformation with its determination to thwart the exercise by papal juridical and administrative power in Bohemia. This principle was tested in a modified, yet dramatic, form in 1505 when Philip of Sidon the resident Italian bishop serving the Utraquists, wished to declare an interdict in Prague because of a priest’s arrest by the town government. Pavel Žátc, the Utraquist Administrator, assisted by his predecessor Koranda, overruled the bishop’s anathema which was a weapon in the Roman Church’s arsenal, particularly distasteful to the Utraquists, reminding them, as it did, of the church’s heavy-handed proceedings against the Bohemian Reformation in the fifteenth century.

The assertion that the failure to receive a regular bishop and become fully integrated into the hierarchical structure of the Roman Church could be viewed as a defeat for Utraquism only by those historians who postulated the existence of an unlikely “Old Utraquism,” namely of a movement yearning to be fully fused with the Roman Church, if only the “technicality” of communion sub utraque were granted by the Roman curia. In fact, the Utraquist stand contradicted the entire concept of the medieval monarchist power structure of the papacy. Nothing short of renouncing this...
power apparatus by the papal establishment would satisfy the Utraquist reformist stance. Moreover, the Utraquist concern for ecclesiastical reform was not confined to the national sphere, but in its ecumenicism embraced the entire Western Christendom.

In 1556 the Utraquist type of solution, concerning the dispensation of episcopal power, received another impetus from consultations between the Lieutenant of Bohemia, Ferdinand I's son Archduke Ferdinand, and the highest officials of the Land, the judges of the Court of the Land, and the members of the Royal Council. These dignitaries collectively urged the appointment of a bishop in Bohemia who—like the bishop in Venice—would be authorized by the pope to ordain priests both sub una and sub utraque. Thus more priests could be placed in office because of lesser expense. In January 1558, Ferdinand I himself repeated his promise to intervene in Rome for the appointment of such a bishop. The system, originally proposed by the Utraquists and endorsed by Ferdinand I, would be actually tested with the restoration of the Roman archbishopric of Prague in 1561 that promised to furnish once again a Roman prelate who would ordain Utraquist clergy in Prague. In that year the pope approved the appointment of Antonín Brus (1561-1580) as the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Prague.

Testing Lutheran Ideas

Before proceeding to explore the confrontation of the Utraquists with the Roman Archbishop, let us examine the character of the Utraquist Consistory and the Bohemian Church it governed in the light of the dire predictions of the Church's imminent demise, voiced in the historical literature on Utraquism. As noted previously, in the mirror of conventional historiography, the Utraquist Church at this point was on the verge of disintegration, with one part just about to turn its back on Rome entirely, embracing the principles of Lutheranism, and another part—on the contrary—just about to be entirely coopted by the Roman Church.

Let us consider first the supposed turn toward Lutheranism. As in the 1520s and early 1540s, it was alleged that in the mid-1550s the Utraquist Church strongly inclined toward embracing Lutheran doctrines and thus was ready to abandon its traditional via media. These assumptions rested largely on the allegations against the leadership of the Utraquist Church from priest Havel Gelastus Vodňanský, a member of the Consistory until 1554, who had contributed to the temporary deposition of Administrator Mystopol, accusing him in 1554-55 of adherence to errors and erring clergy. Despite an admonition from Ferdinand I in 1559, Gelastus continued periodically to voice charges against Administrator Matěj Dvorský, and against certain professors of the University of Prague, particularly for denying him the right to

33 See Kavka/Skýbová: Husitský epilog, especially 35-158.
34 In 1549 the Consistory clearly adhered to the Articles of 1539, including the observance of fast, and celebration of feast days, see Borový: Jednání a dopisy, vol. 1, 250, 255.
deliver lectures in theology. Finally in January 1562 Gelastus submitted to Ferdinand I a new complaint together with twenty-two clerical associates, accusing altogether twenty-three Utraquist priests as deviating from Utraquism and supporting Lutheran innovations. Among the latter were the three under consideration in the election of 1562 for Administrator: Matěj Lounský, Jan Mystopol, and Martin Mělnický. Incidentally a future Administrator, Jindřich Dvorský (appointed in 1572) was included among the accusers. Responding to Gelastus, the accused solemnly declared their orthodoxy, by affirming their adherence to the decisions of the Utraquist synods of 1421 and 1524. Kamil Krofta suggests that the endorsement of the decisions of 1524 implied an agreement with Lutheran principles.

Subsequently, however, Frederick G. Heymann, having examined the synodal articles of 1524, found them free of any specifically or peculiarly Lutheran doctrines. According to Krofta, Matěj Lounský was the least orthodox among the three candidates for the office of Administrator. This was based on Matěj’s profession of faith in 1562 when he conceded that he qualified the belief in the assistance of saints, though he had not ridiculed their veneration. Matěj also admitted preaching against fasting, and against the belief in the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Thus for Krofta, Matěj was a less attractive candidate from Ferdinand I’s point of view than was Mystopol despite Mystopol’s earlier alleged interest in Lutheran doctrines, as well as the earlier accusations by Gelastus which had resulted in his removal from the administration in 1555.

Were the allegations of Crypto-Lutheranism justified? It appears that the discussions within the body of Utraquist theologians, as reported in the substantive sources, moved safely within the established traditions and did not, in fact, cross the boundary toward outright Lutheranism. Thus the alleged transgressions did not involve the cardinal issues that would have moved the adherents into the Lutheran fold: the mass as a sacrifice, the distinct order of priesthood (nobody suggested that the Utraquist would depart from canonical ordination and accept the Lutheran-style ministry), the apostolic succession, or man’s cooperation with grace in his salvation (or salvation through faith manifest in good deeds). Issues that were raised involved the degree of saints’ veneration (including the litanies), clerical marriages, the character of fasting,
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37 Borový: Jednání a dopisy, vol. 1, 386.
38 Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 1, gives the names of twenty-one of the accused.
40 Heymann, Frederick G.: The Impact of Martin Luther upon Bohemia. CEH 1 (1968) 119f.
42 Krofta: Boj za konsistoř podobojí, 300.
celebration of feast days, or the dogmatic character of the bodily assumption of Mary. None of those went beyond the bounds of traditional Christian orthodoxy, and thus were all negotiable without implying a commitment to the Lutheran stance. Moreover, the principal suspect, Matěj Lounský traced his caution about invocation of the saints to the early Utraquist tradition. This cautious, although not negative, attitude can be, in fact, documented by the pamphlet of Martin Žatecký, *Knížka proti ošemenné poctě pokryté Svatých*, originally published in 1517. Concerning his disbelief in the Assumption, Matěj pointed out correctly that the matter was still disputed by the Church doctors.

Raising subordinate or secondary issues of potential Lutheran significance in the 1550s and 1560s appears to have continued the efforts that had occurred in the 1520s and 1540s. The object was to respond to the challenges of the Protestant Reformation without disturbing the essential framework of Utraquism. Moreover, this inquisitive approach harmonized with the principle of the free teaching of the Word of God, enshrined in the basic confessional documents of Utraquism, especially the Four Articles of Prague and the *Compactata*. Not even Ferdinand I apparently considered the accusations by Gelastus and his associates particularly serious.

Another act that some might consider as evidence of the appeal of Lutheranism was the translation by Šimon Ennius Klatovský of Robert Barnes's *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum, quos Papas vocamus* (Basle, 1535), published in 1565. Barnes has, in fact, earned a reputation of an, almost notoriously, dedicated English Lutheran. He also holds the distinction of being one of the few Lutheran martyrs. The book, which attracted a particular attention of the Utraquists, however, focused on questioning the legitimacy and value of the historical exercise of the popes' authority, and its object was to bolster the Henrician rejection of papal supremacy as part of nascent Anglicanism. It did not concern any specifically Lutheran doctrines. The skepticism about the popes' governing function within the Church was, of course, also an angle of vision that the Utraquists had found traditionally congenial, and that would be eventually shared with the Anglicans. The same was true of Barnes's efforts to portray the exercise of temporal power by the popes as a basic reason for the decline of the Roman Church.

Moreover, the publication of Barnes's book in Czech was timed to coincide with the restoration of the Roman archbishopric in Prague and the implanting in Bohemia of the missions of those ardent champions of papal supremacy, the Jesuit fathers. Thus the Czech version of Barnes's work can be viewed as helping to mobilize theological resources by the Utraquists for the coming encounters with, and challenges of, the

---

43 Žatecký, Martin: *Knížka proti ošemenné poctě pokryté Svatých* [A Book Against a Deceitful and Covert Veneration of Saints]. 2nd ed. Prague 1593.
44 Winter: *Život církevní*, 133.
agencies of the Roman Church. The use of Barnes for such a purpose is further indicated by an addition to the translated text of an original section, presumably by Ennius, covering the period from Lucius III (1181–1185) to Pius IV (1559–1565), which emphasized particular Utraquist grievances against the popes, as well as against the General Councils of the period. Thus the Utraquist interest in Barnes probably should not be seen as stemming from a historical or theological connection with Luther or his heritage. Instead, the significance of this episode was to show the Utraquists imbibing from the same source as the germinating Anglicanism. It is significant in that regard that the Czech translation omits Luther’s preface, which appeared in the original Latin editions of Barnes’s history (1535 in Basel, and 1536 in Wittenberg). It contained Luther’s characterization of the pope as Antichrist, a stand which neither the Utraquists, nor the Anglicans would unequivocally associate. In the part that Ennius added to Barnes’s original text, it is true that he praised both Luther and Melanchton, and took pride in Luther’s lauding of Hus. Speaking respectfully of the founders of Lutheran without endorsing their particular views was, however, fairly common in Utraquism. Above all, one can cite the praises of Luther and Melanchton in the 1540s in the works of that quintessentially orthodox Utraquist, Pavel Bydžovský. As a parallel, praise for Luther or Calvin was also voiced by Anglican theologians, such as Jewel and Hooker, who were dedicated to the via media and, like the Utraquists, opposed to the full-fledged Protestant reformation. It is relevant to point out that Ennius likewise called “noble and learned” (vznešený a učený) Thomas More with whom he must have had fundamental disagreements. After all More had sacrificed his life in defense of papal supremacy in its juridical form which would have been unacceptable (as distinct from a sacerdotal or pastoral form) to even the mildest of the Utraquists. Moreover, the Roman Bishop of Vienna, Friedrich Nausea, belonged among Ennius’s patrons in the late 1540s during the latter’s brief stay in the Austrian capital.

What was, however, of paramount significance was that when the dust had settled and the air had cleared, the Consistory clearly reaffirmed the Utraquist Church’s continued adherence to its apostolic and sacramental roots, and its immunity to the Lutheran reforms in a letter to Maximilian II of 13 January 1570. The Consistory explicitly condemned the following propositions as erroneous and pernicious: (1) that faith alone justified and that good deeds had no bearing on salvation; (2) that the number of sacraments was limited to two only; (3) that Christian ministers did not differ significantly from laymen, lacking any God-given sacramental powers, or powers to
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48 See also Hejnová, Miroslava: Barnesovy Kroniky a jejich české pokračování [Barnes’s Chronicles and Their Czech Continuation]. FHB 13 (1990) 588–592.
50 Barnes: Kronyky, f. 194(v)–195(r).
52 David: Pavel Bydžovský, 57f.
53 Barnes: Kronyky, f. 195(v).
54 Rukověť humanistického básnictví, vol. 2, 103.
Diplomatic Contests with the Archbishop, the Roman Curia, and the Jesuits

Let us now turn to the charges emanating from the other point of view, not that the leadership of the Utraquist Church was turning Lutheran, but to the contrary, that it was becoming coopted by the Roman Church. Negative images of the toadyism and submissiveness of Utraquist ecclesiastics to Roman prelates were sometimes based on misinformation, or on misinterpretation of common courtesy (deriving from the gentleness and reasonability of the via media), or—most likely—on misperception of negotiating tactics.

The charges of willingness to virtually fuse with the Roman Church have first of all centered on the initiatives of Ferdinand I in 1549. He then pressured the convocations of the clergy and of the estates sub utraque to reaffirm the points of agreement with the Church of Rome concerning liturgy and sacraments in order to pave the way for the episcopal appointment by the pope. Using the Compactata as a criterion, one of the demands was abandonment of communion of infants which the Compactata did not specifically approve, but left as an open issue. In response to this pressure the Utraquist Consistory indicated its good will, while at the same time unfolding its two-mode method of resistance applied to thwarting royal requests which could not be flatly contradicted. One mode was alibiing, namely seeking an excuse by reference to the intense opposition of the believers, making a change virtually unenforceable. The other mode was procrastination, promising a gradual change over an unrealistically long period of time so that the communion of infants and other Utraquist deviations from the contemporary Roman Church would continue until the end of Utraquism in 1621.

The critics have tended to take the excuses at face value, and have claimed that the leaders of Utraquism were, in fact, eager to merge with the Roman Church and only the fear of their flock’s reaction kept them from doing so. They were portrayed as both cowards and deceivers, and the „people“ as heroes of the anti-Roman resistance.

56 „... že biskupu žádní Antikristy a kněží, kteří od nich ouřad svatýho kněžtví přijímají, Antikristovými kněžími býti soudí a praví.“ I b i d ., 437.
58 K r o f t a: Boj o konsistoř podobojí, 387.
Such tactics of making promises, not intended to be kept, in order to gain desired concessions, were a common practice in the sixteenth century, and apparently not considered particularly reprehensible, though they may have shocked the nineteenth-century moralists and historians. The Roman Church, for its part, engaged in such devious tactics as a matter of course. Already the grant of the Compactata to the Utraquists was intended by Cardinal Palomar as a ruse to gradually make them fully conform to the Roman Church. As he said concerning the Czechs: “It is, therefore, necessary to deal with them with cleverness and a good subterfuge, like with a horse or a mule to be tamed. One has to deal with them affably, until the halter is placed on their neck.”

Jan Rokycana as early as February 14, 1437 pointed out the duplicity of the Council of Basel in its dealings with the Utraquists, and he repeated these complaints in April and May of that year. Among the promises given to the Utraquists by the Council was consecration of Rokycana as archbishop, and the ordination of Utraquist clergy by the bishop of Olomouc. Neither promise was kept. Similarly Pius II abrogated the Compactata on March 11, 1462 on the pretense of their relevance, not for all times, by only to the generation of 1436. No great devotee of Utraquism, Josef Pekař, nevertheless characterizes Pius II’s act as “indeed, a true felony.” According to Karel Stloukal, the instructional manual for papal diplomats in the late sixteenth century “did not prohibit the nuncio to lie, only to let himself be caught lying.”

Thus the Utraquists played the customary diplomatic games with the archbishops, the nuntios and the Jesuits. It was almost a matter of each party trying to outwit the other.

An illustration of this tactic on the Roman side is also provided by a memorandum which Archbishop Brus sent to Emperor Ferdinand on 28 May 1563. The object was to outline a strategy for bringing the Utraquists in conformity with the Roman Church. According to this early statement the proposed ordination of Utraquist clergy by the Archbishop of Prague and other bishops of Roman obedience was to be used as a first step in overcoming the other obstacles to a full unity of which the most important were communion for infants and small children, veneration of Jan Hus as a saint, and the jurisdictional autonomy of the Utraquist Consistory. The Archbishop was aware of the difficulty of eliminating such distinctive marks not only because of the clergy’s attitude, but even more because of the common believers’ attachment to these practices. He suggested overcoming some of this resistance by means of a deception (sancta aliqua deceptione), for instance, by substituting for the veneration of Hus
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61 Palacký: Obrana husitství, 58.
63 Stloukal, Karel: Ke kritice Hlídky [About the Critique in Hlídka]. ČČH 33 (1927) 469-470.
64 Concerning an earlier episode of such a duplicity in 1525, see Novotný: Náboženské dějiny české ve století 16., 592.
another Utraquist holiday that would be acceptable to the Roman Church, such as the Transfiguration on Mount Tabor. The Roman hierarchy would perpetuate this devious approach to solving the religious problems in Bohemia, as evident from the statement of the Archbishop of Prague, Johann Lohelius writing to the papal nuncio on August 22, 1614 about the Czechs: "This nation is by nature impetuous and wild, it cannot be overwhelmed by reasonable arguments, and if it is not overcome by goodness and kindness, it will become recalcitrant ..." Secular, otherwise entirely respectable, rulers also routinely practised various forms of dissimulation. Thus Elizabeth I of England after her accession to the throne in 1559 sought to keep alive the expectations of a reunion of the English Church with Rome, but as John E. Booty points out such hopes were "based upon such tenuous evidence as rumors at court and abroad and the deliberately misleading statements [emphasis by Z. V. D.] which the Queen made to over-anxious ambassadors.

One prominent episode of alleged near-fusion with the Roman Church was based on misinformation. The original claim on the basis of Johann Schmidl's eighteenth-century account was that Administrator Mystopol's ties with the Jesuits (to whom he entrusted the education of two of his sons) and the Roman Archbishop went to the point of his unconditionally joining the Roman Church in 1572 and promising to take the entire Utraquist Church with him. Actually, Mystopol had been dead for four years by 1572, and apparently had no sons. According to reliable records his relations with the Jesuits was not only free of any seditious intent, but in general rather distant. What really happened was that Mystopol registered a boy, a remote relative or a servant, in the Jesuit school to learn music. The youngster recited poems with fellow pupils at the feast of Corpus Christi in May 1567. Somewhat earlier the Administrator met by chance two Jesuits in the office of the Royal Chancery, shook hands with them, and spoke politely about the boy, promising to visit the Jesuit rector in order to check on the youngster's progress.

Another instance of erroneous attribution of Roman beliefs is in the case of Blažej Nožička of Votín, a prominent Utraquist layman, who in his Knížka proti bludům (1566) devotes much space to chastizing the Taborites and the Brethren for their theological errors. In the typical Utraquist tradition he also denounces the Lutheran sola
fide position. Catholic apologists have seized upon his praise for Ferdinand I for the latter's willingness to safeguard the freedom of communion *sub utraque* under the *Compactata*, and "to secure therefor a concession [povolení] from the highest Bishop." However, this position was no different from that of the Utraquist decisions of 1539 and 1545. Furthermore, against the authoritarianism of the Roman Church, Nožička reaffirms the rule of reason, embodied in the Judge of Cheb of 1432, for the interpretation of the Christian tradition. The latter he sees expressed primarily in the definitions which were adopted thousand years earlier, and thus he implies a distinct skepticism - characteristic of Utraquism - about the papal and conciliar decisions which were proclaimed subsequent to the eleventh-century transformation of the papacy into an imperial and imperious power structure. In fact, when he defends traditional Christian rituals against Luther's challenges, he argues on the basis of patristic literature of the first millennium of the Christian era.

There is nothing in Nožička's position that would indicate his readiness to repudiate traditional Utraquism, or to view the bishop of Rome not as a pastor only, but also as a governor, judge, or commander. Catholic historians have also stressed the endorsement of Nožička's work by Archbishop Brus. One must, however, bear in mind that the book was written during the relatively brief honeymoon period between the Utraquist Consistory and the Archbishop in the mid-1560s. Brus then expected to entice the Consistory into fully rejoining the Roman Church, and the Utraquists assumed that Brus could be cajoled into supplying episcopal services while preserving the ecclesiological status quo. In his rejoicing over the appointment of Archbishop Brus, Nožička did not go beyond the sentiments, voiced by Administrator Mystopol, upon the ordination of twelve Utraquist priests in January 1566: "the entire Consistory rejoices greatly that God, the Lord, has deigned to turn to us and to our nation, so that what has not been for many years that this land would have its own archbishop, it has one now."

The most serious charge of fusion, an alleged agreement to merge fully with the Roman Church, was advanced by historians concerning the events of August 1566. Prior to ordaining thirty Utraquist priests on 13 August, the Archbishop insisted on promises, repeated before the Royal Lieutenant of Bohemia, Archduke Ferdinand, that the Consistory owed him obedience in view of his episcopal authority, and that it
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intended to remove gradually its practices objectionable to the Church of Rome, starting with the communion for infants. These events in any case were alleged to have transpired in secret, and were never promulgated, much less implemented. Thus, even if the report were true in part or in toto, the subsequent course of events showed that the Consistory had not intended to fulfill such obligations extracted under duress. The Utraquist engagements, if actually made, would fall in the category of what, on the opposite side, Archbishop Brus called sancta aliqua deceptio. It showed both sides able to play the diplomatic game. Surprising as it might seem, it is even possible that the negotiations in the 1560s may have been conducted in good faith, inasmuch as the exact meaning of the term “submission” did not seem to have been fully clarified (in a way definitely unacceptable to the Utraquists) until 1571–1572, as a result of the negotiations between Administrator Jindřich Dvorský of Helfenburk and Archbishop Brus, discussed below.

The Archbishop and the Utraquist Ordinations, 1564–1572

Uneasy attempts at a symbiotic coexistence had begun in earnest in 1564 when, under pressure from Ferdinand I, the pope permitted lay communion in both kinds for the Utraquists, and authorized the ordination of Utraquist clergy by Brus, the Roman Catholic Archbishop appointed to the restored see of Prague in 1561. In addition, Brus appealed in 1564 to the bishop of Olomouc, Marek Kuen (who incidentally was reluctant to recognize Brus as his ecclesiastical superior) to apply the newly approved rules to issues concerning the Utraquists in Moravia who were under the jurisdiction of the Prague Utraquist Consistory. After some delay, Brus ordained twelve Utraquist priests in January 1565, requiring only a promise of preserving the rules of the Utraquist Church and due respect for the Archbishop. Before next ordinations in August 1566, however, he developed serious scruples about the propriety of the procedures. In particular he was worried by the Utraquists’ laxity on confession, their administration of communion to small children and infants (the belief in its necessity had been anathematized by the Council of Trent), and, above all, the Consistory’s insubordination. The prelate indeed feared that, if he continued the Utra-
quist ordinations, he would incur the danger of suspension from office or even excommunication.

At the crux of the breakdown of cooperation between Brus and the Utraquist churchmen was the conflict in the perception of their proper mutual relationship. As the Archbishop explained to King Maximilian II, who had replaced Ferdinand I on the throne in 1564, in a letter on 19 February 1566, the Consistory begged him to spare it and not to send the decrees of the Council of Trent since it would not know what to do with them. When he sent them under imperial seal the papal permission for communion sub utraque and the accompanying provisions, the Consistory after some delay returned the packet still sealed with a notation that the documents did not concern it. The Archbishop further complained that, despite his requests, the members of the Consistory would not meet with the cardinals and nuncios visiting Prague. In particular, they ignored his request to plead the cause of the ordinations with Cardinal-Legate Giovanni F. Commendone who stayed with him an entire week. Also the Administrator and his colleagues objected to Brus’s giving instructions to the candidates for priesthood in opposition to their practices such as the communion for infants.

The Consistory’s reactions, as described by the Archbishop, have often been characterized by historians as capricious, illogical, naive, or churlish. Actually, such behavior was consistent with the the Consistory’s established attitude and had a definite logic and reasons. On the one hand, it represented once more a recognition of the papal and episcopal function in priestly ordination, and, on the other hand, the rejection of the claims of popes, curia officials, or church councils to administrative or judicial powers over the Bohemian Utraquist Church. Thus Brus also complained in 1566 that the Consistory simply wished him to ordain their priestly candidates, without in any way instructing or admonishing them. In addition to barring his jurisdiction from its own traditional sphere, the Consistory attempted to encroach on his own by appointing Utraquist priests to parishes that had been hitherto sub una.

Similarly, the Consistory and the priests of Prague rejected in July 1565 the Archbishop’s request for special prayers on the grounds that the Utraquist clergy did not owe him administrative obedience.

More specifically, with respect to the papal decrees on communion sub utraque, a theological issue was at stake in addition to the administrative and juridical ones. By returning the documents unopened, the Consistory meant to signal a denial of the need of papal permission for a practice, viewed as based on the Bible and hence beyond the pope’s authority to permit, deny, or alter. Moreover, the refusal to acknowledge the papal documents permitting communion sub utraque was important to the Consistory for two other related reasons: (1) since the papacy still generally insisted on
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communion sub una, accepting the dispensation could be construed as implying an agreement with what was seen as an illegitimate or even heretical position of the papacy on the issue; (2) accepting the permission would imply a consent that it was in the power of the papacy to deny the communion sub utraque since what was granted could also be withdrawn. The latter interpretation was, in fact, the avowed view of the Roman Church.

Thus the act of permitting lay chalice may have been theologically meaningful from the erroneous standpoint of the curia. It was irrelevant, or even theologically vitiated, from the viewpoint of the Utraquists. This stand could be clearly traced to the Utraquists' response to the abrogation of the Compactata by Pius II in 1462. In his statement Contra papam, Martin Lupáč argued that by his act the pope harmed himself and the Roman Church, not the Utraquists. The latter would continue to observe the law of God without the Compactata, while the Roman Church could have been lead to the true faith by them. Hence fundamental issues, not petty differences, were at stake, and at the heart of the confrontation between Papal Rome and Utraquist Prague. From the Utraquist point of view, the acceptance of the papal permission would have meant an implicit acknowledgement of the right of an erring human institution over the infallibility of a divine commandment. One may wonder how under such conditions Rome and its bishops could still bestow proper priestly ordinations in the eyes of the Utraquists. Here another principle came to the rescue. An ecclesiastic in sin could still validly exercise God-given sacramental powers. The reader might find this view shockingly mechanistic. Nevertheless, this anti-Donatist stance was basically in harmony with the teaching on the transmission of sacramental power by the Roman Church. Thus the Utraquists, in this regard at least, acted as good Catholics.

Under these circumstances, unwilling to engage in direct discussions with the curia, lest it appeared to recognize Roman administrative and juridical jurisdiction over itself, the Consistory sought to enlist intermediaries on the issue of the ordinations. Somewhat later in 1571, it would try to gain the Jesuits' assistance to plead its cause in Rome. Not surprisingly, the Jesuit fathers turned out to be an inappropriate choice to undertake a mediation. In monitoring Brus's conduct in office, the Society of Jesus had in fact greeted the initial papal concession, to put it mildly, with deep skepticism and had, in particular, opposed the Utraquist ordinations, comparing them maliciously, but picturesquely to releasing foxes into a chicken coop. Archbishop
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Brus, on his part, urged Maximilian II in 1566 to negotiate with the nuncio or directly with the Pope on the matter of Utraquist ordinations.97 The last Utraquist ordinations that Brus would, in fact, perform under pressure from Archduke Ferdinand and King Maximilian II were those of the thirty priests on 13 August 1566,98 following the Consistory’s promise of submission in the same month, discussed earlier. The Consistory’s noncompliance with those assurances was subsequently confirmed by Archbishop Brus in his letters of 21 July 1568 to King Maximilian II and to the papal nuncio99, as well as in his letter of 28 November 1568 to Cardinal Commendone in answer to Pope Pius V’s inquiries about the impropriety of Utraquist ordinations in 1565 and 1566100.

Without yielding on the issue of submission to the administrative establishment of the Roman Church, the Utraquist Consistory, in vain, appealed to Brus on 9 August 1568 to complete his ordination of several Utraquist candidates on the grounds (more or less independent of the juridical framework of the Roman Church) of (1) an implied obligation to exercise, not to withhold, his God-given episcopal power, and of (2) safeguarding the flock under the care of the Consistory from godlessness and sectarianism for lack of proper shepherds101. Maximilian II likewise in December 1568 urged Brus to continue with the ordinations, instructing, at the same time, his Councillor Sinckmoser to request a dispensation for Brus from the Curia for that purpose102. Responding to Maximilian’s notification of 14 April 1569 about seeking a papal indulgence, the Archbishop once more on 12 May 1569 explained at great length his qualms about the propriety of ordaining Utraquist priests.103 Thereupon, on 1 June 1569, the King acknowledged the gravity of Brus’s reservations, and postponed the matter for the time being, as he also notified the Royal Council of Lieutenancy in Prague on October 3, 1569104.

An abortive attempt to restore the Utraquist ordinations by Brus followed the appointment of Jindřich Dvorský of Helfenburk as the new Utraquist Administrator in 1571. The Archbishop initially enjoyed good relations with Dvorský, though presumably he did not take seriously the assurances of submission, similar to those of his predecessors in 1566, that Dvorský allegedly had given in 1571.105 The cause of ordinations had made a significant progress by the summer of 1572 when there seemed to be a satisfactory resolution of issues, such as the candidates’ belief in the invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, and the view of the mass as a sacrifice. In December, however, the papal nuntio insisted on a profession of faith by the candidates, prescribed by the Council of Trent, which the Utraquist Consistory found unacceptable,

---

97 Borový: Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, 188.
98 Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 283, 296 f., 356, 365, 430. For a list of candidates see ibid. 173.
99 Borový: Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, 257–262. – Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 381.
100 Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 387 f., 389–396. – Borový: Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, 268 f.
101 Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 382 f.
102 Borový: Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, 270. – Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 385.
103 Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 389–396. – Borový: Antonín Brus z Mohelnice, 192 f.
104 Pažout: Jednání a dopisy, 397, 402.
presumably mainly for its stress on an unequivocal and complete subordination to Rome. Brus felt unable to proceed any further without incurring excommunication from the Roman Church.

Thus, after 1566 the Utraquists resorted again to bishops outside Bohemia, especially to Passau, Olomouc, Wroclaw, and Poznań, and later also to Nitra. Occasional conversions of Roman priests also continued to replenish the Utraquist clergy's ranks. The Archbishop, however, continued to supply the Consistory, for the purposes of sacramental activities, with holy oils requiring episcopal consecrations, especially those used in baptism. Evidently, this transaction could be performed more discreetly than the ordination of clergy. More interestingly, it also implied that he was not utterly out of sympathy with the Utraquists. All this indicates that the alleged Old Utraquists, differing from Rome only on the lay communion sub utroque, were an extremely rare species, if they existed at all. The bulk of the Czech people were simply Utraquists rejecting both the authoritarianism of the Roman Church and the hallmarks of Lutheranism, based on the principles of sola fide and sola scriptura.

** Histories who were impatient to see the Utraquist Church disappear have often pointed to the 1560s as a crucial landmark in the demise of Utraquism. Some have maintained that the Utraquist Church virtually vanished through a cooptation of its leadership by the Roman Church. Others saw its virtual end in an irresistible attraction of Lutheran doctrines for the Utraquist clergy. Neither of these scenarios was in fact correct. The reservation of the Utraquist leaders toward the Roman Curia prevented a symbiotic relation with the Roman Archbishop, and the Utraquist Church continued to maintain its administrative and judicial independence of the Roman Church throughout the rest of the sixteenth and into the seventeenth century. The alleged Lutheran influences on certain Utraquist leaders, on a closer examination, involved secondary matters, not the core doctrines of the apostolic liturgical and sacramental Christian tradition. Thus it is not necessary to conjure up a struggle between an imaginary Old Utraquism and an unlikely Neo-Utraquism, or to postulate a chaotic oscillation between Rome and Wittenberg within Utraquism. The Utraquist Church, in fact, continued to maintain its steady course, the via media vis-à-vis the Roman authoritarianism on the Right, and with respect to the Lutheran biblical reductionism on the Left.
This is not to say that by the late 1560s there were not individual Czech theologians accepting authentic Lutheranism, just as there were atypical cases of Czech champions of the Counter Reformation. There was also the significant group of the Unity of Brethren which stood close to the Protestant Reformation. Nevertheless, the theological mainstream, flowing out of the Bohemian Reformation and represented by the Consistory, remained loyal to Utraquism as defined by Jakoubek of Stříbro, Jan of Příbram, and Jan Rokycana in the fifteenth century, and reaffirmed by Bohuslav Bílejovský and Pavel Bydžovský in the 1530s and 1540s.