Religious Contacts with England during the Bohemian Reformation

Zdeněk V. David (Washington, DC)

While there were contacts between Bohemia and England from the very start of the Bohemian Reformation, the subsequent course of religious development diverged in the two countries, often drastically. Indeed, it was only after the Elizabethan Settlement of ecclesiastical issues in 1563 that the English or Anglican Church at last firmly embarked on the religious middle way that the mainline Utraquist church of Bohemia had pursued since the 1420s.[1] Hence, three stages can be recognised in the process from the standpoint of the Utraquist church. Initially, during the first century after the onset of the Bohemian Reformation, the ideas of John Wyclif (c.1330–1384) obtained a strong, but mixed reception. Second, during the thirty years after the onset of the English Reformation its course swung – from the Utraquists' point of view – from unacceptable conservatism to unacceptable radicalism and back (1534–1558). Only after 1563 and until the suppression of the Utraquist church in 1620 did the two churches pursue a parallel course along the middle road (*via media*) between Rome and Geneva.

This study attempts to place two hundred years of religious contacts between England and Bohemia into a single continuum for the first time. The central thesis of this study is that the Utraquist church's negative image in historiographical literature primarily stemmed from its distinctive religious orientation. Its middle way initially ran against the ingrained principles of the chief protagonists emerging from the Reformation era (post-Tridentine Catholicism and fully reformed Protestantism), and subsequently against the conventions of nineteenth- and twentieth-century secular historiography, which favored a more or less determinist, linear progress from Catholicism to Protestantism to Secularism.[2] Nevertheless, the Utraquist church made a fundamental theological contribution in the field of ecclesiology, akin to that of the Church of England. Like the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, Utraquism stood out as a model of a national church, emerging in the milieu of distinctly Western Christianity, and with a traditionalist emphasis on the antiquity and historical continuity of its doctrines and institutions.

1 David, *Finding*, 18–32.
2 Ibid., 1–2.

Early Contacts between the Bohemian Reformers and England

John Wyclif

Aside from the later, formal resemblance of the two churches, there were in fact concrete historical links between Czech and English religious thought, particularly on the issue of papal authority, as early as the turn of the fifteenth century. Above all, the writings of Wyclif – superimposed (often awkwardly) on indigenous Bohemian ideas of religious reform – had an undeniable influence on Jan Hus and his colleagues in the area of ecclesiastical governance, although much less, if any, on their eucharistic concepts.[3] Even in the assessment of Wyclif, the positions of mainstream Utraquism seem to have paralleled those of the later English Reformation. As Anthony Kenny notes:

> In the latter part of Henry VIII's reign Wyclif's anti-papalism was congenial to those in power, but his Eucharistic doctrine remained anathema. … On the same day as Edward Powell was hanged for protesting against the King's rejection of Papal authority, the Lutheran Doctor Barnes was burnt for denying transubstantiation.[4]

Wyclif's influence evidently also strengthened the Bohemian reformers' opposition to monasticism and ecclesiastical landholdings, as it had apparently done in England during the Peasant Rebellion of 1381.[5]

While the University of Paris had likewise played a role in shaping the ideas of the early Bohemian reformers,[6] there were special reasons for the development of the intellectual links between Bohemia and England, and primarily between the universities of Oxford and Prague. The outbreak of the Great Schism in 1378 diverted Czech students from Paris, which was obedient to the Avignonese popes, to England because that nation maintained its loyalty to the popes in Rome, as Bohemia. Contacts increased with

3 Gordon Leff, "Wyclif and Hus: a doctrinal comparison," in *Wyclif in His Times*, ed. Anthony Kenny (Oxford, 1986) 105–125; Paul De Vooght, *Hussiana* (Louvain, 1960) 1–6; Katherine Walsh, "Wyclif's Legacy in Central Europe in the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth century," in *From Ockham to Wyclif*, ed. Anne Hudson and Michael Wilks (Oxford, 1987), 397–417; and David R. Holeton, "Wyclif's Bohemian fate: a Reflection on the Contextualization of Wyclif in Bohemia," *CV* 32 (1989) 209–22, with a masterly contrasting portrayal of Wyclif and Hus, 217–19. There was even a legend that Wyclif sought refuge in Bohemia to avoid persecution in his own homeland, on which see James P. Carley, "'Cum excuterem puluerem et blattas:' John Bale, John Leland and the *Chronicon Tinemutensis coenobii*," in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale*, ed. Helen Barr and Ann M. Huchison (Turnhout, 2005) 163–190, here 184.

4 Anthony Kenny, "The accursed memory," in *Wyclif in His Times*, 147–168, 160.

5 Steven Justice, *Writing and Rebellion: England in 1381* (Berkeley, 1994) 67–101.

6 Vilém Herold, "The University of Paris and the Foundations of the Bohemian Reformation," *BRRP* 3 (2000) 15–24.

the preparations for a marriage in 1382 between the English King Richard II and Anne, the sister of the Bohemian King Wenceslaus IV. A scholarship for Czech students was also established in 1388.[7] The later reception of Wyclif's theological views in Bohemia, dating to the beginning of the fifteenth century, largely coincided with the return of the young Jerome of Prague from Oxford in 1401. The available stock of Wyclif's theological writings substantially increased thanks to the labors of two Czech scholars who spent the year 1406–07 at Oxford and were apparently in contact with the Lollards, the English followers of Wyclif.[8] Interestingly, certain of Wyclif's writings can be only found in Bohemia rather than in England, although Anne Hudson points out that this should not be surprising. Rather, it was surprising that any of Wyclif's writings did survive in England, where they had been subject to systematic burning.[9]

Having read Wyclif's philosophical works earlier, Hus began to study the English reformer's theological writings by 1408. As Oakley notes:

> In the next half-dozen years, by his borrowings from those works, his propensity for expressing some of his own views in Wycliffite language, and his willingness even to defend in public some of the condemned Wycliffite propositions, he set his feet on the path that led to his condemnation by the Council of Constance in 1415 and his subsequent burning as a heretic.[10]

A prime example of Hus's use of Wyclif's terminology with his own, contrary meaning was his speaking of the church as the "community of the predestined" [*universitas praedestinatorum*], while his actual understanding of the church coincided with the orthodox "community of the faithful" [*congregatio*

7 Francis Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1979) 195. Early English reformers found an inspiration to translate the Bible into English from lectionaries translated into Czech and German and brought from Bohemia to England by Ann; see Ctirad V. Pospíšil, *Husovská dilemata* [The Hussite Dilemma] (Kostelní Vydří, 2015) 160–161.

8 Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages*, 196–97. See also Anne Hudson, "II. From Oxford to Prague: The Writings of John Wyclif and His English Followers in Bohemia," in *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings* (Burlington-Aldershot, 2008) 642–647; eadem, "XIV. Which Wyche? The Framing of a Lollard Heretic and/or Saint," in *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings*, 221–238, here 234–235. The work of the two Czech copyists, Faulfiš and Kněhnic, has been useful in dating and interpreting Wyclif's treatise *De dominio divino*. See Anne Hudson, "I. Wyclif's Works and Their Dissemination," in *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings*, 1–16, here 7–9.

9 Anne Hudson, "*Opera omnia:* Wyclif's Works in England and in Bohemia," in *Religious Controversy in Europe, 1378–1536*, ed. Michael Van Dussen and Pavel Soukup (Turnhout, 2013) 49–70, especially 51–52.

10 Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages*, 198. On Hus's expressing his own ideas in Wyclifite terminology, see also Johannes Hus, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, ed. Samuel H. Thomson (Boulder CO, 1956) ix.

fidelium].[11] Hus entirely omitted Wyclif's reference to the Church "as a congregation of the predestined and the foreknown" from his translation of Wyclif's *De simonia*.[12] Similarly, Hus spoke in a Wyclifite manner of the body of Christ after consecration as bread, while adhering firmly to the doctrine of transubstantiation.[13] In addition to the eucharistic tenet of remanence, Hus eschewed Wyclif's other innovative doctrines anticipating later, Protestant stances.[14] Recently, Ctirad V. Pospíšil considered it paradoxical that, while rejecting Wyclif's heretical ideas in theology (especially concerning remanence), Hus clung so firmly to Wyclif's ideas in the fields of philosophy and ecclesiastical politics, particularly with regards to castigating the moral lapses of the clerical establishment.[15]

Yet, at its core Hus's relationship with Wyclif was not particularly complex or enigmatic. He felt a deep kinship, even affection, for Wyclif as long as the evangelical doctor stayed within an orthodox fourteenth-century agenda seeking to purify the church. In 1408 he even stated that he wished to share a post-mortem existence with Wyclif.[16] In his cautious approach to Wyclif's theology, however, Hus was influenced by his favourite teacher at the University of Prague, Štěpán of Kolín, whom he calls "the most fervent zealot for his homeland" (*zelator patrie ferventissimus*).[17]

Robert Grosseteste, the Venerable Bede, and the Lollards

Among his English contacts, Hus is also known to have corresponded in 1410–1411 with two of Wyclif's disciples: Sir John Oldcastle and Richard Wyche. To the latter, he wrote: "I am thankful that Bohemia has under the power of Jesus Christ received so much good (…) from the blessed land of England."[18] Displaying his knowledge of English ecclesiastical history in his

11 Paul De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Huss* (Louvain, 1975) 2:525.

12 Pavlína Rychterová, "Theology Goes to the Vernaculars: Jan Hus, 'On Simony', and the Practice of Translation in Fifteenth-Century Bohemia," in *Religious Controversy in Europe, 1378–1536*, 231–250, 240.

13 Gordon Leff, "Wyclif and Hus," 119.

14 De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Huss*, 2:832–833 and 837. On the difference between Hus and Wyclif in the understanding of the authority in the church, see Enrico Selley Molnár, "Wyclif, Hus and the problem of Authority," *HENC*, 173–177.

15 Ctirad V. Pospíšil, *Husovská dilemata*, 174–177. František Šmahel has wondered whether the certain reserve that Hus observed in defending Wyclif's theological views was motivated by his desire to avoid inquisitorial attention. See: František Šmahel, *Jan Hus* (Prague, 2013) 263.

16 Carley, " 'Cum excuterem puluerem et blattas,'" 181 n.73.

17 Jan Hus, *Positiones, recommendationes, sermones – M. Jan Hus, Univerzitní promluvy*, ed. Anežka Schmidtová (Prague, 1958) 126.

18 Novotný, 84: "Petam orationis auxilium, et regracier, quod de benedicta Anglia tanta bona per tuum laborem prestante Ihesu Christo domino Boemia iam suscepit." For a recent, thorough attempt to unravel the obscure and complicated history of Richard Wyche and his correspondence with Bohemian religious leaders, see Anne Hudson, "Which Wyche?" 221–237. On Wyche and Oldcastle, see also; Margaret Aston, "Lollardy and Sedition, 1381–1431," *Past and Present* 17 (1960), 1–44; Christina von Nolcken, "Richard Wyche,

famous appeal of 1412 from the pope's judgment to that of Christ, Hus cited as a precedent Robert Grosseteste's 1253 defiance of Innocent IV in refusing to appoint the pope's nephew to a lucrative benefice in England.[19] As indicated by surviving copies of Grosseteste's works in Prague from the early fifteenth century, Czech scholars showed a significant interest in his teaching during the Bohemian Reformation.[20]

Aside from the late medieval theologians Wyclif and Grosseteste (c. 1170–1253), Hus also showed substantial interest in earlier English literature, mainly in the writings of the Venerable Bede (A. D. 672–735). In Hus's Czech sermons (*Česká sváteční kázání* and *Česká nedělní postila*), he cited only Augustine and Jerome more than he did Bede.[21] Indeed, Hus's Czech writings contain a total of fifty-three substantial citations from Bede.[22] Some quotations, in fact, fittingly support desiderata of the Bohemian Reformation, such as the insistence on the freedom of preaching and the opposition to the burning of heretical books. Others, Hus attributed to Bede erroneously or questionably, such as support for lay communion *sub utraque*, the harsh denunciation of clerical corruption, and an insistence on the limitation of the pope's magisterial authority.[23] Scholars have found evidence that these references were later insertions into Hus's writings, most likely by Jakoubek of Stříbro. In other instances, Hus appears to use Bede as a point of departure to introduce Wyclifite materials. The knowledge of, and the interest in, Bede's writings continued after Hus during the Bohemian Reformation. Thus, Jakoubek of Stříbro referred to Bede in 1414 as an authority on lay

a Certain Knight, and the Beginning of the End," in *Lollardy and the Gentry in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. Margaret Aston and Colin Richmond (New York, 1997) 127–154, here 143; and Maureen Jurkowski, "Lollard Book Producers in London in 1414," in *Text and controversy from Wyclif to Bale*, 201–228, 214.

19 Jiří Spěváček, *Václav IV, 1361–1419* (Prague, 1986) 448–49; Novotný, 135. In a way, it could be argued that Grosseteste's focus on scaling down the pretentions of the papacy and insistence on moral reform was more reflective of the ideological thrust of mainline Utraquism than the more extreme views of Wyclif which found acceptance in more transient radical trends, above all Taboritism.

20 Václav Koranda, *Manualník*, ed. J. Truhlář (Prague, 1888) xvi-xvii; Hans-Eberhard Hilpert, "Die Insel der Gläubigen? Über die verspätete Ankunft der Inquisition im regnum Angliae," *Die Anfänge der Inquisition im Mittelalter*, *Mit einem Ausblick auf das 20. Jahrhundert und einem Beitrag über religiöse Intoleranz im nichtchristlichen Bereich*, ed. Peter Segl (Cologne, 1993) 253–268, 264. Concerning Grosseteste, "Wycliff's model in so many ways," see also: Pamela Gradon, "Wyclif's *Postilla* and his Sermons," in *Text and controversy from Wyclif to Bale*, 67–78, here 76–77.

21 Zdeněk V. David, "Nationalism and Universalism in Ecclesiology: Utraquists and Anglicans in the Latter Sixteenth Century," *BRRP* 9 (2014) 198–220.

22 Zdeněk V. David, "Hus a anglická homiletika: Beda Ctihodný a Wyclif v Husových českých spisech" [Jan Hus and English Homiletics: The Venerable Bede and Wyclif in Hus's Czech Writings], in *O felix Bohemia! Studie k dějinám české reformace*, ed. Petr Hlaváček (Prague, 2013) 59–80, 66–67.

23 David, "Hus a anglická homiletika," 74–77.

communion *sub utraque* in his treatise of 1414, "*O Boží krvi* [On the blood of Christ]".[24] Even, Jan Želivský referred to Bede in 1419 in his sermon on the Third Sunday after the Trinity, preaching on the day's gospel (Luke 15:1–10).[25]

Even in the fifteenth century, Wyclif's teachings affected the Bohemian Reformation through Lollard sources. A particular Lollard input entered through Peter Payne's contributions to Taborite theology, which – in contrast to mainstream Utraquism – stood closer to Wyclif than to Hus.[26] Active relations are likewise documented by surviving copies of English Lollard writings from fifteenth-century Bohemia that are not currently to be found in England, with the manner of their transmission from Oxford to Prague remaining rather enigmatic.[27] Another major piece of evidence of contacts with the Lollards is the martyrdom of an Utraquist emissary to them, Pavel Kravař, in Scotland in 1433.[28] As noted, however, the Lollards had more in common with the radicals of the Bohemian Reformation than with mainstream Utraquism.[29]

The Middle Period, 1534–1558: Dismaying Phenomena of the Early English Reformation

When we advance a century later to the beginning of the English Reformation, the Utraquist Church of Bohemia had already existed for one hundred years. The opening stages of the English Reformation presented the Utraquist theologians in Bohemia with a rather confusing picture of constantly changing religious scenery. A departure from papal obedience under the Act of Supremacy (1534), stipulated a separation from Rome.

24 Jakoubek of Stříbro, *Dvě staročeská utrakvistická díla* [Two Old Czech Utraquist Works], ed. Mirek Čejka and Helena Krmíčková (Brno, 2009) 58–59. The editors trace Jakoubek's reference to Bede's, "Homiliae," *PL* 94, col. 74–75.

25 Jan Želivský, *Dochovaná kázání z roku 1419* [Extant Sermons from 1419], ed. Amedeo Molnár (Prague, 1953) 1: 223 and 282; cf. 270.

26 Ralph Hanna, "Dr. Peter Partridge and MS Digby 98," in *Text and controversy from Wyclif to Bale* (Turnhout, 2005) 42–47 and 58–59. See also William R. Cook, "John Wyclif and Hussite Theology, 1415–1436," *Church History* 42 (1973) 335–349; and R. R. Betts, "Peter Payne in England," in idem, *Essays in Czech History* (London, 1969), 236–46.

27 Anne Hudson, *Lollards and Their Books* (London, 1985) 31–42; eadem, *The Premature Reformation, Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988) 8 and 264–6. See also eadem, "*Opera omnia:* Wyclif's Works in England and in Bohemia," 55 and 66; and eadem, "II. From Oxford to Prague: The Writings of John Wyclif and His English Followers in Bohemia," in *Studies in the Transmission of Wyclif's Writings*, 642–657.

28 On Pavel Kravař, see Michael Van Dussen, *From England to Bohemia, Heresy and Communication in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2012) 67. See also John Knox, *The Works of John Knox, The History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1846) 1: xxv-xxix.

29 Anne Hudson, "Lollardy and Eschatology," in *Eschatologie und Hussitismus*, ed. Alexander Patschovsky and František Šmahel (Prague, 1996) 99–115, here 108.

This was followed by a partial reaffirmation of Roman practices under the Act of the Six Articles (1539), which accepted transubstantiation, opposed the lay chalice, and mandated auricular confession. Subsequently, the Lutheranizing leadership of Archbishop Thomas Cramer (1489–1556) led to a distinctly Protestant orientation under Edward VI (1547–1553), when the Six Articles were repealed (1547) and replaced by Cramer's Fourty-two Articles in 1552. Finally, a brief but virulent counter reformation followed under Queen Mary and Archbishop Reginald Pole (1500–1558) from1553 to 1558.[30]

Veneration of Thomas More and John Fisher

At the same time, the Utraquist Church was defining itself against Luther's teaching under the theologians Bohuslav Bilejovský (ca. 1480–1555) and Pavel Bydžovský (1496–1559). Opposing Luther's radical departures from medieval norms of theology and liturgy, their stance was unsympathetic to Henry VIII's and Cranmer's religious policies, especially their complete break with the papacy. The stance of these Utraquist theologians on ecclesiastical reform was closer to the humanistic Catholicism of Desiderius Erasmus (1469–1536) and his followers. Paradoxically, it also brought them into sympathy with the archenemies of Henry's and Cranmer's reforms – Thomas More (1478–1535) and Bishop John Fisher (1469–1535). The views of More and his fellow martyr John Fisher were, in fact, in harmony with, and partly under the influence of, Erasmus,[31] and they both belonged to the circle of his correspondents, usually called the Erasmians.[32]

It is therefore not entirely surprising that the Utraquist theologians should feel sympathetic to the two English martyrs, particularly because of their own endorsement of papalism, albeit minimalist. In More's and Fisher's liberal ecclesiology they could recognise a kindred spirit. More and Fisher, in fact, literally gave up their heads for the pope as the chief of the sacramental system in the Western Church, even though they wished to abolish his role as the monarch of an ecclesiastical state. In sum, More's and Fisher's liberal Catholicism resembled that of the Utraquists and explained Bydžovský's eulogy for them in his *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, his major treatise

30 For a recent summary of the tumultuous events that accompanied the English reformation, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (New York, 2004) 198–201, 255–58, and 280–86.

31 Ernest E. Reynolds, *Thomas More and Erasmus* (New York, 1965). On Erasmus' influence on Fisher, see James Kelsey McConica, "The English Reception of Erasmus," in *Erasmianism, Idea and Reality*, ed. M.E.H.N. Mout, H. Smolinsky, and J. Trapman (Amsterdam, 1997) 37–46.

32 On Erasmianism, see Cornel is Augustijn, "Verba valent usu: was ist Erasmianismus?" in *Erasmianism*, 5–14.

dealing with the religious history of England.[33] Similarly, another prominent Utraquist author, Simon Ennius Klatovský, expressed a warm appreciation for More in the introduction to his own translation of Robert Barnes's *Kronyky*, a collection of biographies of the popes.[34]

Bydžovský's Reliance on the Venerable Bede and Cardinal Pole

In view of the Venerable Bede's popularity in late medieval Bohemia, it is not surprising that Bydžovský would turn to Bede in his *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum* to support the case for limiting papal power. To bolster the idea of the papal foundation of the English Church he chose to rely on the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, written by Bede around 731.[35] Following Bede's account, Bydžovský highlighted the missionary zeal of Gregory the Great in dispatching his emissary Augustine (later Archbishop of Canterbury) in 597 CE to convert the Anglo-Saxons and establish an ecclesiastical organization for them.[36] More unexpectedly, however, it is almost certain that Bydžovský relied on a treatise of Reginald Pole, a prominent figure in the brief Marian counter reformation in England, for his excoriation of the radically antipapal character of the English Reformation under Henry VIII in *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*. The Bohemian connection was strengthened by the support Pole was given by the Habsburg dynasty, especially by Emperor Charles V, who wished to redress Henry's injury to his aunt Queen Catherine and her daughter Mary.[37]

Moreover, despite his role under Queen Mary, Pole was actually an adherent of Catholic humanism of the Erasmian type.[38] During his exile in Italy he had been attracted to the group of Italian *spirituali,* including Cardinal Gasparo Contarini and the poet Victoria Colonna, who sought a liberalization of the institutional church.[39] Pole also saw much that was correct in Luther's theory of salvation, and he belonged among Erasmus's correspondents. Had he not missed being elected pope by a single vote in 1549, the

33 Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exomare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est* (Prague, 1554), f. B2r-B3v. On More's and Fisher's opposition to the late medieval ecclesiastical *Befehlsstaat,* see Brendan Bradshaw, "The Controversial Sir Thomas More," *JEH* 36 (1985), 535–569. More, in particular, has been called a "papal minimalist" in John Guy, *Thomas More* (London, 2000), 201.

34 Robert Barnes, *Kronyky, A životů sepsání nejvrchnějších Biskupů Římských jináč Papežů*, ed. and trans. S.E. Klatovský (Nuremberg, 1565) f. 195v.

35 The Venerable Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 2 vv. (London and New York, 1930).

36 On Augustine of Canterbury see, for instance, *DNB* 1: 727–729.

37 "Pole, Reginald," *DNB* 16: 36.

38 David, *Finding* 294–295.

39 Francesco Gai, *L'attesa del concilio, Vittoria Colonna e Reginald Pole nel movimento degli "spirituali"* (Rome, 1997).

Council of Trent might have exuded more the spirit of Vatican II than that of Vatican I.[40]

As Bydžovský did in his treatise, Pole sharply attacked Henry for his claim to the status of the supreme head of the church in his *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione*. Pole addressed Henry directly: "With the ruin of your kingdom, with the slaughter and murder of the very best men…you had made a clear path for yourself to the title of supreme head of the Church in England. Nothing more ignominious could ever have been imagined than this pretentious title."[41] Like Bydžovský, Pole attributed animal passions to Henry. Discussing what epitaph the king might deserve on his tomb, he suggested that of Sardanapalus, the legendary last king of Assyria: "I had done those things that satiated my passionate desires." According to Aristotle, this "might better have been inscribed on the tomb of a cow rather than upon the tomb of a king."[42] In addition, for Pole as for Bydžovský, the martyrdom of More and Fisher is the central theme.[43]

Finally, this survey of English influences on the thought of the Bohemian Reformation during the turbulent phase of the English Reformation in the mid-sixteenth century should note that Bohemian interest in Bede included not only his *Ecclesiastical History*, but also his exegetical and homiletical works. In particular, Bydžovský's colleague Bohuslav Bílejovský, in his *Bohemian Chronicle* (1537), referred to Bede's discussion of the Gospel according to Luke in the context of affirming the seven sacraments. Bede's commentaries on the New Testament were available in his *Opera*, published in Paris in 1521, of which the second volume covered the gospels.[44]

40 Thomas F. Mayer, "'Heretics be not in all things heretics': Cardinal Pole, His Circle, and the Potential for Toleration," in *Beyond the Persecuting Society*, *Toleration before the Enlightenment*, ed. John Laursen and Cary Nederman (Philadelphia, 1998) 107–124. For Pole's correspondence with Erasmus, see Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence of Erasmus* (Toronto, 1974–1999) 11:314–317.

41 Reginald Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church* (Westminster, MD, 1965) 288, see also 39 and 209. Cf. Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v-A3r, A3v; for reference to "Suffenus," see f. D2r.

42 Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church,* 288. Cf. Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A3r.

43 For instance, Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church,* 38 and 259–263; Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. B2r-B3v. On the relationship between Bydžovský and Pole, see also Zdeněk V. David, "Utraquism and the Elizabethan Anglicanism, an Imperfect Parallel: Bydžovský on Erastianism," *BRRP* 10 (2015), 327–346, especially 337–341.

44 Bohuslav Bílejovský, *Kronyka cýrkevní*, ed. Josef Dittrich (Prague, 1816) 99; The Venerable Bede, *Opera Exegetica*, ed. D. Hurst (Turnhout, 1960). See also *DNB* 2: 103; and David, *Finding*, 15.

Misunderstanding: Utraquism and Anglicanism, 1563–1620

It was only after the Elizabethan Settlement in 1563 that the English or Anglican Church at last embarked on the religious *via media* that the mainline Utraquist Church of Bohemia had pursued since the 1420s. In England, this involved the repeal of Queen Mary's counter-reformatory legislation, on the one hand, and the restoration of Henry's Act of Supremacy in 1558, on the other. The process was crowned by the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1563. The main architects of this settlement were the theologian John Jewel (d. 1571), and the Archbishop Matthew Parker (d. 1575), who were followed by the Archbishop John Whitgift (d. 1604) and the theologian Richard Hooker (d. 1600). Hooker offered an ultimate justification of the Anglican establishment in his multivolume *Ecclesiastical Polity*.[45]

From 1563 until the suppression of the Utraquist Church in 1620, the two churches shared not only the grim view of what they considered the failings of the Roman Church, but also the implied hope of its ability to be salvaged. On the issue of the authority of the church fathers, unless a writer clearly contradicted statements from Scripture, both supported the authenticity of the received corpus of both patristic and scholastic literature. Like the Utraquists, the Anglicans recognised their own continuity with the medieval church, as it existed prior to the imposition of the papal monarchism. Another similarity between Utraquism and Anglicanism was the moderation in theological discourse that can be attributed to their centrist theological positions. In addition, Utraquists and Anglicans both eschewed the ideal of moral perfectionism or rigorism, and as a result they encountered harsh criticism from the religious radicals among their compatriots, the Unity of the Brethren and the Puritans.[46] Because of this shared *via media* between the Utraquists and the Anglican Church during the period from 1563 until 1620, it appears paradoxical that the two churches had little contact or even mutual knowledge of one another, although relations between Bohemia and England substantially increased in the period culminating in the Bohemian Uprising of 1618.

The Czech Radicals' Imagined English Reformation

Except for the translation of John Jewel's *Apologia*,[47] interest in English religious thought in Bohemia seemed focused on emergent Puritan trends,

45 MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 289 and 382–389. On Parker as the founder of the Anglican *via media*, see "Parker, Matthew," *DNB* 15:257. On Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, see "Whitgift, John," *DNB* 21: 134.

46 Zdeněk V. David, "Bohemian and English Reformations Compared," in *Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America*, ed. Zdeněk V. David and Petro Nungovitch (New York, 2008) 7–16.

47 The Czech translation of Jewel's 1562 text appeared as: John Jewel, *Apologia, to jest: Dostatečná Obrana Víry a Náboženství Cýrkví Englických* (Prague, 1619).

which appealed to the Lutherans and the Brethren. This was in part the result of availability. While continental Protestants had only limited interest in the authentic Anglicans, they favored English nonconformists and even printed or reprinted their writings in places like Geneva. The Continental dissemination of this literature facilitated its effect on Bohemia's Lutherans. While the Czech Lutherans conscientiously subscribed to the tenets of the Augsburg Confession, as well as to the teachings of Luther and Melanchton, their theological apologetics and devotional literature tended to deviate from this standard and to rely on English nonconformist authors to a considerable degree.

The use of English nonconformist sources was exemplified in the treatise *Kšaftu Večeře Páně* (1613) by the Czech Lutheran, Zacharyáš Bruncvík, who relied on the works of Laurence Humphrey (1527–1590), a Marian exile, for an explication of Wyclif,.[48] Significantly, Humphrey's Protestant leanings had led him to clash with conservatives in the English Church such as Archbishop Parker and John Jewel, particularly over the highly symbolic and emotionally charged issue of liturgical vestments.[49] Otherwise, Bruncvík cited from Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* on Wyclif, drawing from a list of fifteen notable Lollards gathered in a publication he called *Catalogus testium veritatis*, and again from Humphrey (on the burning of Wyclif's books in Prague in 1410). The Lollard inventory included figures familiar from the early stages of the Bohemian Reformation, such as Richard Wyche, John Oldcastle and Peter Payne.[50] Bruncvík displayed an even broader knowledge of English religious radicalism in his *Zrcadlo Kacířství* [Mirror of Heresy] from 1614. In this text, he relied largely on English sources (in Latin) to demonstrate that mainline Protestantism either had not embraced ancient and early medieval heresies, as charged by the Roman Church, or it had filtered their teachings to maintain only those that were orthodox. The Czech Lutheran also referred to the Oxonian Puritan, Robert Abbot, and even to James I's *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* (1609), on the issues of the Antichrist and false prophets.[51]

48 Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Testamenti nostri Iesu Christi pia et fida assertio. To jest: Kšaftu Večeře Páně svatá Starožitnost, Pobožná posloupnost, dlouhověká až právě do dne soudného trvanlivost: V níž z nařízení Kristového, z učení evangelistského a apoštolského, z doktorů a sněmů osvícených, z kanonu a práv duchovních, z historií církevních, a nejvíce našich českých, etc. Náboženství naše podobojí pravé Katolické, Křesťanské a Starožitné, mocné, patrné a bez falše, od času Krista Pána, až do našeho věku, posloupně se dokazuje a dovodí* (Prague, 1613) 113. He refers to Laurentius Humfredus, *Contra Edmundi Campiani rationes*, evidently citing from Laurence Humphrey, *Iesuitismi*, 2 vv. (London, 1582–1584).

49 See "Humphrey, Laurence," *DNB* 10: 246. See also: John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–1689* (Houndmills and New York, 1998) 52.

50 Bruncvík, *Kšaftu Večeře Páně,* 115; see also 113 (with reference to Foxe) and 122 (with reference to Humphrey).

51 Zacharyáš Bruncvík, *Pravitatis et impletatis haereticae pia et fida ostensio. To jest: Zrcadlo Kacířství: Do něhož kdo zdravě nahlídne, Allegata, u Doktorů Církve vykázaná, přeběhne, pozná, že my Katolíci pod obojí nevinně, a bez náležitého vší Svaté Říše vyslyšání od některých se kaceřujeme* (Prague, 1614) f. A8r, C2r, D4v, and D6v.

Bruncvík repeatedly cited another Puritan, William Whitaker, as well as his old favorite Humphrey, on the nature of the church and its religious rituals. The special relevance of these writers to Bohemia stemmed from their polemical sallies at Edmund Campion's *Rationes decem*. As will be explained, Campion had spent seven years at Jesuit colleges in Brno and Prague from 1573 until 1580,[52] and his important work, *Rationes decem*, appeared twice in Czech translation early in the seventeenth century.[53] While Laurence Humphrey criticised Campion in his *Iesuitismi*, William Whitaker published his *Ad decem rationes Edmundi Campiani Jesuite, quibus fretus certamen Anglicanae ecclesiae ministris obtulit in causa fidei, responsio* (London, 1581).[54] Nevertheless, Bruncvík resorted most frequently to the puritanically inclined Matthew Sutcliffe and to the churchman Bishop Thomas Morton for their wide-ranging inventory of real or putative past deviations from the true Christian faith.[55] He featured Morton's anti-Roman polemic, *Apologia Catholica* (1606), as one of his main sources on the title page of his *Zrcadlo Kacířství*.[56] It was typical of the radical leanings of his English sources that Humphrey, Morton, Sutcliffe, and Whitaker, according to him, all vouched for Calvin's Christian orthodoxy.[57]

More generally, Czech Lutherans showed a lively interest in the devotional works of the Puritan William Perkins (1558–1602), among them the lengthy

52 David, *Finding* 280–282.

53 The Czech translation of *Decem rationes* appeared in two editions as Edmund Campion, *Spis krátký Edmunda Kampiana Societatis Jesu, Theologa a Mučedlníka Božího, ktrý ne tak dávno pro víru S. Katolickau smrt ukrutnau podstaupil: Vznešeným Doktorům a Mistrům učení Oxonienského a Kantabrigienského podaný* (Prague, 1601); and as Edmund Campion, *Wšech Pikartských, Luteryánských, i jináč zrotilých Prevytkantů, Hostides. To jest: Deset podstatných příčin, kterýchž jistotau, velebný kněz , a zmužilosrdnatý Mučedlník Edmund Kampian, z Tovaryšstva jména Ježíšova pohnut jsa, vše víry Ržímské Odpůrce, k zjevnému před Englickau Královnau, o Víru potýkání, pobídl; Jim se pak z brlochu na světlo vyjíti nechtělo* (Olomouc, 1602).

54 On this controversy, see also Thomas M. McCoog, "'Playing the Champion': The Role of Disputation in the Jesuit Mission," in *Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog (Woodbridge, 1996) 119–140, here 133–134.

55 He relied on the following of Matthew Sutcliffe's works: *De Catholica, Orthodoxa, et vera Christi Ecclesia* (London, 1592); *De Monachis, eorum Institutis et Moribus* (London, 1600); and *De Missa Papistica, variisque Synagogae Rom. Circa Eucharistiae Sacramentum Erroribus et Coruptelis* (London, 1603). See Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství*, f. A7v, B5v, and B7v. In *Zrcadlo Kacířství*, Bruncvík has 49 references to Sutcliffe, 41 to Thomas Morton, 35 to Whitaker, and 17 to Humphrey.

56 Thomas Morton, *Apologiae Catholicae, in qua paradoxa, haereses, blasphemiae, scelera, quae Jesuitae et Pontificii alii Protestantibus impingunt, fere omnia, ex ipsorum Pontificiorum testimoniis apertis diluuntur*, 2 vv. (London, 1606). "Morton, Thomas," *DNB* 13: 1061 cites the opinion of Morton as "belonging to that class of episcopal divines who differed in nothing considerable from the rest of the reformed churches except in church government." On the Calvinist links of Bishop Morton, see also Alexandra Walsham, "*Vox Piscis; or the Book-Fish*: Providence and the Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline Cambridge," *English Historical Review* 114 (1999) 574–606, here 592.

57 Bruncvík, *Zrcadlo Kacířství*, f. C4r.

Anatomia conscientiae, which appeared in Prague in Czech translations by Jiří Oekonomus of Chrudim, Jan Regius of Žatec, and Simeon Valecius of Louny between 1610 and 1620.[58] Czech Lutherans also shared the outrage of the English nonconformists over the Gunpowder Plot of 1604–1605, while Abraham Scultetus, preaching in honour of Frederick of Palatinate's coronation as Bohemian King on 24 October 1619, praised Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, who in repentance burned his right hand with which he had signed a statement approving of the Roman mass.[59]

English Radicals Imaging the Bohemian Reformation

The English interest in Bohemia seemed to mirror the Bohemian focus on English religious radicalism. It centered on Taboritism and tended to (mis) perceive Hus and Jerome as proto-Protestants. The appreciation of Utraquism as a *via media* seems to have been lost.[60] Henry VIII had already considered Luther another Hus, speaking of a worm that metamorphosed into the dragon of the Bohemian sect.[61] The Unity of Brethren and other Bohemian radicals with international connections also tended to display a misleadingly radical visage of the Bohemian Reformation in their contacts with England. Thus a Bohemian disciple of Luther, Ulrich Velenus, upset John Fisher in 1521 by denying Peter's residence in Rome. Writing a book against the "impudent" Bohemian, Fisher granted him, by singling him out, a distinction which he otherwise bestowed only on the foreign theologians Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Luther, and Johann Oecolampadius.[62]

58 William Perkins, *Anatomia conscientiae. Aneb pobožné rozbírání a vysvžtlení svědomí lidského*, trans. Jan Regius, (Prague, 1620); William Perkins, *O opuštění Božím*, trans. Jiřík Oeconomus, (Prague, 1610); William Perkins, *Traktát trojí krátký, ku potěšení zarmoucených kajících lidí*, trans. Simeon Valecius (Prague, 1613); William Perkins, *Traktát velmi platný a užitečný*, trans. Simeon Valecius (Prague, 1616).

59 Jiřík Dykastus (Miřkovský), *Postylla: nebo Kázání krátká na evangelia svatá* (Prague, 1612) 1: 25; Abraham Scultetus, *Vysvětlení žalmu XX v Valdsaxu* (Prague, 1619) f. E1r-E2r.

60 Concerning such misjudgments see Zdeněk V. David, "The Strange Fate of Czech Utraquism: The Second Century, 1517–1621," *JEH* 46 (1995) 646.

61 For this quotations, see: Gustav Kawerau, *Hieronymus Emser, Ein Lebensbild aus der Reformationsgeschichte* (Halle, 1898) 41.

62 Edward Surtz, *The Works and Days of John Fisher, An Introduction to the Position of St. John Fischer (1469–1535), Bishop of Rochester, in the English Renaissance and Reformation* (Cambridge MA, 1967) 8–9. The original text was published as: Ulrichus Velenus [Oldřich Velenský of Mnichov?], *In hoc libello grauissimis, certissimisque, & in sacra scriptura fundatis rationibus uarijs probatur, Apostolarum Petrum Romae non uenisse, neque illicit passum, proinde satis friuole, & temere Romanus Pontifex se Petri successorem inactat, & nominat* (Basel, 1520); a German translation which was probably published in Augsburg in 1521 as *In disem Büchlin wirt in mancherlay tapffern bestendigen und in der Scrifft gegründeten Ursachen klärlich bewert, das der hailig Apostel Petrus gen Rom nicht komen noch alda den*

Later on, more radical confessional statements were more frequently translated and circulated outside Bohemia. While a Utraquist Confession appeared in one Latin translation in 1539,[63] the quasi-Lutheran Bohemian Confession of 1575 enjoyed three German (1584, 1609, and 1610) translations and two Latin ones (1614 and 1619).[64] Outside observers probably viewed the latter document as a reflection of the real religious situation in Bohemia, rather than as a flawed attempt at an ex post facto Lutheranization of an essentially high church Utraquism. Confessional statements by the Unity of Brethren, published in Latin in 1511, 1538, and 1573, attracted even more attention.[65] This is attested, among others, by the inclusion of the 1573 Confession into the prestigious international compendium, *Harmonia confessionum fidei, Orthodoxarum, et Reformatorum Ecclesiarum* (Geneva, 1581). Ironically, even Richard Hooker can be used as an illustration of this distortion. Instead of recognizing the Utraquists as kindred theological champions of the *via media*, the one reference to the "Bohemians" in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* lumps them together with the Lutherans, particularly the Saxons, citing from the Bohemian Confession on the rites of repentance.[66]

In addition, the enthusiastic embrace of Hus and the Bohemian martyrs by the martyrologist John Foxe (1516–1587) could not but contribute to an unwarranted radicalization of Bohemian Utraquism's image. He assigned Hus a stellar role in his *Actes and monuments*, the first English version of which was published in 1563. Chiefly under the influence of Foxe, later Puritans

Tod gelitten. On these texts, see A. J. Lamping, *Ulrichus Velenus (Oldřich Velenský) and his Treatise against the Papacy* (Leiden, 1976) 152–157.

63 *Artykulowe a snessenij Knězstva pod obogij Spuosobau: Leta Bozijho MDXXXIX*. A copy of this text is held as *Articuli Conciliabuli sub utraque specie communicantium* (n.p., 1539) in Vienna as ÖNB 24 M 56.

64 Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse, Její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Prague, 1912) 672–681.

65 Jaroslav Bidlo, "O Konfessi bratrské z r. 1573," *Sborník prací historických k šedesátým narozeninám Jaroslava Golla*, ed. Jaroslav Bidlo et al. (Prague, 1906) 246–278; and Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren, A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia* (Bethlehem, PA, 1992) 100.

66 Richard Hooker, *The Folger Edition of the Works,* 3:46–47; see also 6: 265–66, 855. Bohemian Confession is cited from *Harmonia confessionum fidei, Orthodoxarum, et Reformatorum Ecclesiarum,* ed. Salnar de Castres (Geneva, 1581), chapter 5.8 "Ex Bohemia Confessione," 143; contained also in *An Harmony of the confessions of the faith of the christian and reformed churches*, ed. J. F. Salvart (Cambridge, 1586) 219. A second and last edition of this trans. appeared in London in 1643, see *The Harmony of Confessions, Exhibiting the Faith of the Churches of Christ Reformed*, trans. and ed. Peter Hall (London, 1842) ix. On the history of the original compilation, ibid., xi-xvii. The text of the Bohemian Confession was also included in *Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum Fidei* (Aurel, 1612), see *ibid*., xviii, and "Confessio Bohemica Prior," and "Confessio Bohemica Posterior" in *Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum*, ed. H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig, 1840) ibid., xx–xxi. – The famous Jacques B. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, also seems to have considered it authoritative; see his *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes* (Paris, 1821) 1:13.

appropriated Hus so convincingly that Anglican polemicists habitually included him and Jerome of Prague in the company of proto-Protestants, along with the Albigensians, the Waldensians, the Taborites, and Wyclif.[67] Alexandra Walsham points out that a similar fate met the moderate John Frith, who has been characterised as "the forerunner of the liberal element in later Anglican thought," yet under Foxe's influence was transformed into "a confessional mascot" of radical Puritans.[68]

Though the new Anglican bishops gradually shifted to staunch support of the Elizabethan *via media* promoted by Archbishop Parker, some of them, especially Edmund Grindal (d. 1583), and to lesser extent John Jewel (d. 1571) – who had brought Calvinist sympathies back from their German exile during Queen Mary's reign – tended to support Foxe's religious and historical views.[69] Even more in Foxe's favor was the desire of the English church and state to combat the inroads and the claims of the Roman Church. In fact, the English government and the anti-Puritan bishops were willing to tolerate or even unleash Puritan propaganda when it suited their purposes. As a case in point, during the Campion affair, Puritan writers were free to generate particularly stern propaganda against the Jesuits. This involved not only Laurence Humphrey and William Whitaker, but also William Charke and Walter Travers.[70] Above all, Foxe himself was chosen by Grindal to preach a Good Friday Sermon at St. Paul's Cross "On Christ Crucified," following the papal bull excommunicating the queen in 1570.[71] As a mark of high favor for Foxe's historical views, the new edition of his *Acts and Monuments* (1570) was ordered to be placed in all cathedrals, and many parish churches acquired it to be placed alongside the English Bible.[72]

English Catholics and the Bohemian Reformation

Moreover, the advocates for the Roman Church played an important role in depicting the Bohemian religious reformers as extreme radicals, thus contributing to the distorted image of the Utraquist Church. English Catholic theologians in the second half of the sixteenth century, like the determined critic of Elizabethan Anglicanism, Thomas Stapleton, joined in the

67 See John Foxe, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs, The Acts and Monuments of the Church*, ed, John Cumming (London, 1875) 1:823–945.

68 Walsham, "*Vox Piscis*," 601–602.

69 "Foxe, John," *DNB* 7:585.

70 See Peter Lake and Michael Questier, "Puritans, Papists, and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context," *Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000) 587–627, here 624–625.

71 "Grindal, Edmund," *DNB* 8: 705.

72 James Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book* (London, 1940) 147.

denunciation of the Bohemians' heresy, linking it with the influence of Wyclif.[73]

Let us, however, focus on the most distinguished of these critics, the Jesuit Edmund Campion. Sent to Bohemia from Rome, where he had entered the Jesuit order in 1573, Campion spent a year in Brno at the novitiate; he then taught at the Jesuit College of St. Clement in Prague for six years, first rhetoric, then philosophy.[74] While in Prague, Campion was in touch with Archbishop Brus, who would occasionally consult him on administering the religious communiy *sub una*, who were a minority in Bohemia in a similar proportion to the Catholics in England. He ordained Campion to the priesthood at the beginning of September 1578. After the ceremony, Brus is said to have declared: "All kinds of evil invaded Bohemia because of Wyclif, an Englishman; now the Lord has furnished us with another Englishman who would heal the wounds inflicted on the Bohemians by Wyclif."[75] During Campion's last Easter in Bohemia in 1579, Brus chose him as a preacher in St. Vitus's Cathedral for Maundy Thursday.[76] Less than a year later, in early March 1580, Campion left Prague via Rome for a mission to England, where he met his death, hanged as a traitor at Tyburn on 1 December 1581.[77]

Campion returned to the 1518–21 view of the Roman Curia, voiced by Eck and Aleandro, that linked Hus organically with the Protestant Reformation. At this early stage, Roman polemicists tended to denounce the relatively moderate Hus more severely than the later authentic Protestant Reformers. Thus Luther's opponent, Johannes Cochlaeus, would refer to Hus in 1549 as worse than the pagans, the Turks, the Tartars, or the Jews. Hus was also called the king of hell's general, with Luther and Calvin as his officers. Indeed, it appears that the curia in the late sixteenth century viewed Bohemia as the fountainhead of the entire Protestant Reformation.[78] Campion similarly argued that the spiritual ancestry of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin was to

73 Stapleton wrote this in a 1565 "Letter to Queen Elizabeth," that has been published in The Venerable Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Philip Hereford (London, 1935) xl-xli.

74 Antonín Rejzek, *Blahoslavený Edmund Kampián, kněz Tovaryšstva Ježíšova, pro sv. víru mučeník ve vlasti své* (Brno, 1889) 92–103.

75 Cited in Alison Shell, "'We are made a spectacle:' Campion's Dramas," in *The Reckoned Expense*, 103–118, 112. See also Rejzek, *Blahoslavený Edmund Kampián*, 150; and Edmund Campion, *Spis krátký Edmunda Kampiana Societatis Jesu, Theologa a Mučedlníka Božího, který ne tak dávno pro víru S. Katolickau smrt ukrutnau podstaupil: Vznešeným Doktorům a Mistrům učení Oxonienského a Kantabrigienského podaný* (Prague, 1601) f. C10r.

76 Rejzek, *Blahoslavený Edmund Kampián*, 169.

77 Rezjek, *Blahoslavený Edmund Kampián*, 191–97.

78 Such a view is expressed in: Johannes Cochlaeus, *Historiae Hussitarum libri duodecim* (Mainz, 1549) 94. See also Arnošt Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře, zejména německé* (Prague, 1917–1924) 1: 172–174; and Jindřich Ondřej Hoffman, *Zrcadlo náboženství* (Prague, 1642) f. A2v. For nuncio Camillo Caetano's view of Bohemia as where the Protestant "evil took its beginning", see Karel Stloukal, *Papežská politika a císařský dvůr pražský na předělu XVI. a XVII. věku* [Papal Politics and Prague's Imperial Court between the 16th and 17th Centuries] (Prague, 1925) 156.

be sought in Hus and in Wyclif. Thus, Hus's credentials were not qualitatively different from those of earlier heretics, like Arius, Iovian, Vigilantius, Heldvidius, the Iconoclasts, Berangarius, Valdensians, and Lorhard, from whom Luther, Zwingli and Calvin also "borrowed or begged certain poisonous parts of their own heretical teachings."[79]

English Roman Catholics perpetuated the preception of Hus as a heretic into the seventeenth century, of by appropriating earlier denunciations. Richard Bristow (d. 1581), director of the seminary at Rheims, went so far as to maintain that Hus, as well as Wyclif, exceeded even the standard Protestants in their heresies, particularly when they denied sinful individuals' right to hold either secular or ecclesiastical offices. He cited German Protestants in making this case, as Luther had once distanced himself from Hus: "Non recte faciunt, qui me Husitam vocant," and Melanchthon had accused Wyclif of many errors.[80] Robert Parsons (1546–1610), a Jesuit missionary and controversialist, also linked Hus with Wyclif on the issue of denying the right to rule to those sovereigns who were in sin. Moreover, he stressed that this doctrine had been condemned by the Council of Constance as heretical.[81] The views of the two English recusants were echoed by the French Roman Catholic, Florimond de Remond (1540–1602), a lawyer and historian, who denounced Hus in his *Histoire de la naissance, progrès et décadence de l'herésie de ce siècle* (Paris, 1605) as a pupil of Wyclif and a heretic who was justly put to death in Constance.[82]

It is relevant to note that, as in the case of Utraquism, the skewed image of Anglicanism as an outright heretical movement was also partly due to the propagandists for the Roman Church. In this connection Richard Montagu argued in his *Gag for the New Gospel? No: A New Gag for the Old Goose* (1624) that Catholics were charging the Church of England with doctrines "raked together out of the lay-stalls of deepest Puritanisme, as much opposing the Church of *England*, as the Church of *Rome*."[83]

Mutual Misperception

As a result of the mutual misunderstanding, Anthony Milton relates a poignant episode, which – albeit dating from the post-1620 period – evidently

79 Campion, *Spis krátký Edmunda Kampiana Societatis Jesu*, f. C4r-v.

80 Richard Bristow, *A briefe treatise of diverse plaine and sure ways* (1574), ed. DM Rogers (Ilkley, 1974) 162.

81 Robert Parsons, *A treatise of three conversions* (1603–1604), 3 vv., ed. DM Rogers (Ilkley, 1976) 1:98.

82 Kraus, *Husitství v literatuře zejména německé*, 1:241; Florimond de Remond, *Husitského v Čechách kacířství počátku, zrůstu, a pádu vejtah* (Prague, 1777) 35–36 and 44–45.

83 Emphasis original. See Richard Montagu, *A Gagg for the New Gospell? No, a New Gagg for an Old Goose* (London, 1624) f. *2v. See also Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603–1689*, 81.

reflected a long-term Anglican viewpoint. An almanac published in London for 1631 by William Beale replaced several medieval saints in the Prayer Book Calendar with Foxe's Lollard Martyrs, Wyclif, Savonarola, as well as Hus and Jerome of Prague. The Anglican critic John Pockington condemned the work as "a calendar… wherein the Holy Martyrs and Confessors of Jesus Christ… are rased out, and Traitors, Murderers, Rebels, and Hereticks set in their roome."[84] The relatively insular character of Anglicanism – contrasted with the more international orientation of Puritanism – also may partly explain the problem of obtaining accurate information about mainline Utraquism. There was a definite tension between internationalism and localism in early modern English religious history.[85] Moreover, Bohemia's religious affairs had to compete for English attention in the early seventeenth century with other parts of Europe, such as Poland.[86]

The image of the Protestant character of Bohemia in the sixteenth century persisted in English literature into modern times. Thus a British traveler in Bohemia in 1837, George R. Gleig, commented that in 1564–1620 large proportions of the people became "avowedly Protestant, and some adopted the Augsburg Confession as their standard of belief – others, the opinions of Calvin." And yet, Gleig was aware of the existence of the Utraquists, since he mentioned that prior to 1564 [sic], the Compactata "protected the Utraquists alone."[87]

An analogous misperception seemed to have characterised the Utraquist view of Anglicanism as a more radical phenomenon than it really was. While the Lutherans honoured Thomas Cranmer and the Marian martyrs, the Utraquists, as mentioned earlier, went in the opposite direction to celebrate Thomas More and John Fisher, as evident from the writings of Pavel Bydžovský and Šimon Ennius Klatovský. Henry VIII's full break with the papacy – compared with the Utraquists' merely partial one – undoubtedly played a role here. As noted earlier, ironically, the two English martyrs who lost their heads for the pope were themselves severe critics of the late medieval papal monarchy. While upholding the sacramental papacy, they actually shared the Utraquists' aversion to heavy-handed, quasi-governmental papal jurisdiction.[88] There were other misapprehensions based on exaggerated no-

84 Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (New York, 1995) 314; see also 89, 293, 301–306.

85 See the editors' introductory essay in: *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c.1850*, ed. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (New York, 1998) 3–33, especially 12–15.

86 See Michal J. Rozbicki, "Between East-Central Europe and Britain: Reformation and Science as Vehicles of Intellectual Communication in the Mid-Seventeenth Century," *East European Quarterly* 30 (1997), 401–419.

87 George R. Gleig, *Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary, Visited in 1837* (London, 1839) 2: 322.

88 Bradshaw, "The Controversial Sir Thomas More," 563–564, and the works he cites. Cf. Brian Gogan, *The Common Corps of Christendom, Ecclesiological Themes in the Writings of Sir Thomas More* (Leiden, 1982); and Surtz, *The Works and Days of John Fisher*.

tions of the English Reformation's radicalism. Thus, in a letter to Rudolf II of 3 July 1599, Archbishop Berka compared England to Heidelberg as a hotbed of Calvinism.[89]

In contrast to the Unity of Brethren and the Puritans, the Utraquists and the Anglicans evidently lacked sufficient incentives to learn more about each other. Although never explicitly repudiating Christian ecumenicism or catholicity, a distinct national insularity seemed to lead the Utraquists, as the Anglicans, largely to surrender the field of international contacts to their fully reformed compatriots.[90]

Deconstructing Utraquism and Anglicanism

While sharing a common religious *via media*, Utraquism and Anglicanism came to share a negative image in both early-modern and modern historiography. Initially, their intermediate position brought them into conflict with the chief protagonists emerging from the Reformation era (both post-Tridentine Catholicism and fully reformed Protestantism). Subsequently and more importantly, their failure to undergo a "lawful" transformation from Catholicism to full-fledged Protestantism (as a prelude to an eventual secularism) appeared to violate the proper course of historical development, as interpreted in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. This view had no use for intermediate religious positions that defied that pattern of "progress."[91]

As a result, modern historiography has been reluctant to recognise the authenticity, or even the very existence, of the religious middle way. In the Bohemian case, this process gave birth to a concept of the largely Lutheran Neo-Utraquism and required a disassembly of Utraquism by positing its "other" as an "Old Utraquism." The latter has been portrayed as virtually indistinguishable from Catholicism and often presented as a subterfuge, designed to stave off the impact of the Protestant Reformation.[92] The Church of England was subject to a similar questioning of its integrity in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Some historians saw the *Ecclesia Anglicana* as an incoherent assemblage of crypto-Puritans and

89 This letter has been published in: *Sněmy české od léta 1526 až po naši dobu* (Prague, 1897) 9: 682–683.

90 Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* (New York, 1990) 99.

91 In his idiosyncratic (but deeply influential) standpoint, František Palacký held that in the course of historical development the providential design depended on the antithetical interactions between biblicist Protestantism and unreformed Catholicism, each embodying one of the essential poles of the Christian faith: reason and authority. For an expression of this view, see František Palacký, *Obrana husitství*, ed. František M. Bartoš (Prague, 1926) 33–34.

92 This view has been classically expressed in: Hrejsa, *Česká konfese*, 4; and idem, "Luterství, kalvinismus a podobojí na Moravě před Bílou horou [Lutheranism, Calvinism and Utraquism in Moravia before the White Mountain]," *ČČH 44* (1938) 296–326 and 474–485, here 483–485.

crypto-Catholics, and the existence of true Anglicans or proto-Anglicans was questioned. Thus Arthur G. Dickens has similarly minimised the role of real Anglicans or proto-Anglicans in Elizabethan England in favour of the relative extremes of Puritanism and Roman Catholicism: "Parker and Jewell were in very real sense forerunners of the 'balanced' Anglicanism of Hooker, yet even so the vast majority of Elizabethan Englishmen were either Roman Catholics or Anglican Puritans."[93] Patrick Collinson chimed in by noting of the Elizabethan Settlement: "It is not easy to identify very many Anglicans who were positively attached to those features of the church that distinguished it from other churches of the Reformation."[94]

The assertions that in the late sixteenth century there were no real Utraquists, only Lutherans ("Neo-Utraquists") and Romanists ("Old Utraquists") in Bohemia, has thus found a parallel in English historiography, and a process of historiographic bisection has appeared as the professional hazard of those traveling on the middle road, flanked by Rome and the German Reformation.[95]

93 Arthur G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (University Park, PA, 1991) 368.

94 Patrick Collinson, "Puritans," *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (New York, 1996) 3: 364–370, here 366.

95 For additional discussion of the relationship between Utraquism and Anglicanism, see David, *Finding*, 342–346.