

Article

Utraquist Bohemia and the English Martyrs: An Uncommon Witness of Reform

Zdenek Vaclav David

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC 20004, USA; zdavid236@comcast.net

Abstract: The relationship between the Bohemian reform movements of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and the events associated with the traditionally-nominated Reformations of the sixteenth century has been a much understudied topic amongst historians and theologians. There are a number of points of entry for comparison and analysis. One overlooked text is Pavel Bydžovský's "Several Stories of English Martyrs (with Whom God Deigned to Decorate His Church Just Like the Heaven with Stars)" that was published in 1554. Bydžovský's treatise, which has not been examined in modern times, offers a remarkable opportunity as an illustration of the little studied or understood Utraquist theological and ecclesiological position. This is displayed by Bydžovský's sponsorship (especially that of Jan III, Popel z Lobkovic), his relationship to Catholicism and Lutheranism, and by his use of sources (especially, Venerable Bede, Reginald Pole, the Guildhall Report). Thus, the Bydžovský text is useful for the elaboration of the religious relationships that existed between Bohemia and England in the sixteenth century. The text further contributes an important witness to the theological and ecclesiastical via media represented by the Utraquist tradition between Rome on one hand and Wittenberg and Geneva on the other. This is most graphically displayed in what can only be characterized as a highly qualified allegiance to the papacy. This contribution to expanding knowledge around the definition and understanding of Reformation presents a full translation of Pavel Bydžovský's treatise on the English Martyrs and this is preceded by a contextual commentary that endeavors to more meaningfully bring a forgotten text into the cutting edge of scholarship.



Citation: David, Zdenek Vaclav. 2021. Utraquist Bohemia and the English Martyrs: An Uncommon Witness of Reform. *Religions* 12: 365. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12050365>

Academic Editor: Thomas A. Fudge

Received: 31 March 2021

Accepted: 13 May 2021

Published: 20 May 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Pavel Bydžovský; Utraquism; Thomas More; Reginald Pole; Venerable Bede; Henry VIII; Georg Witzel; John Fisher; Bohemian Reformation; Martin Luther; Richard Reynolds; papacy

1. Author, Patron, Motivation

The author, Pavel Bydžovský, who was born in 1496 in Nový Bydžov in Eastern Bohemia, and died in Prague in 1559. Previously he obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Prague. Ordained to the priesthood, he was appointed parson at the Utraquist Church of St. Giles in the Old Town of Prague in 1535. His opposition to Lutheran influences involved him in conflict with Jan Mystopol, the Administrator of the Utraquist Consistory since 1542. However, he reconciled with Mystopol, who by 1546 had abandoned his interest in Luther's teaching. Bydžovský was also supported by the prominent burgher of the Old Town, Sixt of Ottersdorf.

Bydžovský's theological and philosophical erudition was comparable to that of his colleague, Bohuslav Bílejovský, who directed the resistance against the Lutheran takeover of the Utraquist Consistory in 1541–1543. Bydžovský exhibited his learning through a substantial command of patristic literature (both Greek and Latin)¹. This also covered medieval doctors of the church, decisions of both ancient and medieval church councils, provisions of canon law (specifically the Decretum of Gratian)², and the classics of Utraquism, as well as Luther's and Melancthon's doctrines. During his service as a priest, particularly after the Lutheran challenge had subsided by 1544, he further served his Church by training future Utraquist clergy, helping to prepare theology students for examinations before the Consistory, prior to their departure for ordination in Italy. In a broader perspective, the

theological works of Bydžovský, together with Bílejovský's *Kronyka česká*, came to constitute a kind of benchmark at the midpoint of the historical development of the Utraquist Church. Both Bydžovský and Bílejovský would be, in fact, cited as authoritative Utraquist theologians in the confessional statements of the Utraquist Church in 1572 and 1575³.

1.1. Sponsorship

Bydžovský's treatise is dedicated to the Supreme Judge of the Kingdom of Bohemia, John the Elder of Lobkovice and in Zbiroh. Its publication was approved by unnamed Administrators of the Utraquist Consistory, and by Oldřich Dubansky of Dubany, the Captain of the Castle of Prague (presumably from the side of the Roman Church). The Administrators of the Utraquist Consistory were presumably Mystopol (1542–1555) and one of his predecessors either Jan Hortensius (1541) or Martin Klatovský (1539–1541)⁴ Oldřich Dubanský of Dubany was at the same time the Supreme Subchamberlain of the Land [nejvyšší zemský podkomoří] (1552–1569). He died in 1571. The approval of Bydžovský's treatise from both the Utraquist and the Roman sides reflected the equal status of the two religious denominations in the Kingdom of Bohemia, which, of course, were recognized under the Compactata of 1436 and reconfirmed by the Treaty of Kutná Hora of 1485.

Lobkovic remained loyal to the Roman Church, acting as a protector of the Jesuit College of Prague. During the Protestant anti-Habsburg uprising in 1547 he financially supported King Ferdinand I in his struggle against the Protestant estates in Germany, a struggle that culminated in the Schmalkaldic War of 1546–1547.

However, Lobkovic was a liberal Catholic, as well as dedicated follower of Erasmus. He translated, from Latin into Czech, Erasmus' treatise *A Book on How a Man Should Prepare for Death*. His attachment to Erasmian liberal Catholicism agreed with Bydžovský's tendency to endorse Roman theology, but not the authoritarian ecclesiology, in accord with the Utraquist via media.

1.2. Motivation

Bydžovský's treatise was published in 1554 during the period of a brief, but virulent, Counter Reformation in England conducted by Queen Mary and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald Pole (1553–1558). It might seem surprising that, even in the mid-sixteenth century, English religious events should arouse such a lively response on the part of a prominent Utraquist theologian. It is likely, however, that exactly at this time Britain again attracted special attention in Bohemia due to the Habsburg dynastic involvement in English affairs. This was highlighted by the marriage of Queen Mary in 1554 to King Philip II of Spain, nephew of the Bohemian King Ferdinand I. In addition, Mary was a daughter of Henry's first wife Catherine of Aragon (1485–1536) who was an aunt of Ferdinand I, as well as of his brother, the Emperor Charles V. Thus, the English Queen Mary, in her turn, was the first cousin of both Ferdinand I and Charles V. Important government officials of Bohemia, such as Lobkovic and Dubansky, would naturally welcome Bydžovský's information on matters touching on the highest reaches of the Habsburg dynasty and monarchy⁵.

2. Sources (Especially, Venerable Bede and Reginald Pole)

Turning next to the sources Bydžovský utilizes, it is significant to note that he starts his treatise with a lengthy discussion of the papal role in the foundation of the Church of England⁶. He centers his attention on the missionary zeal of Pope Gregory I the Great, who dispatched his emissary Augustine (later Archbishop of Canterbury) in A.D. 597 to convert the Anglo-Saxons⁷. In emphasizing the crucial role of Gregory the Great, Bydžovský relies on the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* by Venerable Bede (672/3–735), written in about 731⁸. He refers to his source as *Historia Gentis Anglorum* and quotes from it verbatim by book (liber) and by chapter (cap.). In Bydžovský's time Bede's history was available in several editions: The first one was from Strasbourg in 1475. There is also the record of a manuscript of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* in Prague⁹.

Bydžovský's choice of Bede as his authority was not accidental. Judging from the publication record up to mid-sixteenth century, Bede's writings were more popular on the Continent than in England in much the same manner as John Wyclif. Specifically in sixteenth-century Bohemia, the interest in Bede covered not only his Ecclesiastical History, but also his exegetical and homiletical works.

Beyond this, the knowledge of Bede's writings went back to the beginnings of the Bohemian Reformation. Thus, Jakoubek of Střibro referred to Bede in 1414 as an authority on lay communion *sub utraque*¹⁰. Above all, Jan Hus was particularly fond of citing Bede's exegetical writings in his own homiletical works. In his Czech language sermons, the references to Bede are exceeded only by those to Augustine and Jerome¹¹.

Bydžovský cites from Book II, Chapter 1 of Bede's *Historia*, which gives credit to Pope Gregory I for having converted the English nation from the "power of Satan to the faith of Christ" [*de potestate Satanae ad fidem Christi*]¹². He goes on citing from Bede's history episodes from the lives of famous English rulers' following Pope Gregory's intervention. He deals with the goodness of St. Oswald, King of Northumbria (c. 604–42), who was famous for his charity to the poor and pilgrims, quoting from Book 3, Chapter 6 of *Bede's History*.

Next, Bydžovský cites from Bede's *History*, Book 3, Chapter 18, the eulogy of another English ruler, Sigebert, King of the East Angles (c. 630–5), who was not only saintly, eventually preferring the life of heavenly warfare in the monastery to a secular one in the outside world, but also a lover of learning¹³. Further, Bydžovský lifts out of Book 3, Chapter 19, the story of a saintly man in the reign of King Sigebert, whose soul would leave the body during the night and join a company of angels, listening to their songs glorifying the holy men and "the God of gods" on Sion¹⁴.

2.1. Bydžovský's Critique of Henry's Policies: Reginald Pole's Invectives

In seeking the source of Bydžovský's harsh interpretation of Henry VIII's behavior, it is necessary to look beyond the chronicles concerning English affairs that were available in sixteenth-century Bohemia, such as the encyclopedist Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia*, as well as the histories of Johannes Carion and Johannes Sleidan¹⁵. The problem with these sources is their rather bland treatment of Henry VIII's behavior in the 1530s, concerning especially the burning issues of his marital problems, his execution of Fisher, More and the Carthusian monks, and his break with Rome. These conventional treatments lack the passion and the indignation of Bydžovský's narrative.

The most likely source of Bydžovský's invectives and harsh treatment of Henry's attitudes and actions was another book, almost certainly available in Bohemia and published in plenty of time for Bydžovský to use in the mid-1550s. It was Reginald Pole's *In Defense of the Unity of the Church* (*Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione, libri quatuor*). Two editions of this work were published in Rome in 1536 and 1539 respectively¹⁶. Pole (1500–1558) was supported by the Habsburg dynasty, especially by Emperor Charles V, who wished to redress Henry's injury to his aunt Queen Catherine and her daughter Mary¹⁷. Pole was a distant relative of Henry. The book signaled his formal break with the King, when he sought refuge in Rome and was named a Cardinal by Pope Paul III in December 1536.

Like Bydžovský in his treatise, Pole in his *In Defense of the Unity of the Church*, sharply attacks Henry on his claim to the status of the Supreme Head of the Church. Pole addresses Henry, "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".¹⁸ Like Bydžovský, Pole attributes animal passions to Henry. The martyrdom of More and Fisher is the central theme for Pole as it is for Bydžovský¹⁹. In addition Pole, like Bydžovský, conspicuously features the Carthusians as the most prominent victims of Henry's next to More and Fisher²⁰.

2.2. Description of More's Trial²¹

The description of More's trial by Bydžovský coincides with Pole's account in certain details. These include the stress on the length and intricate character of the articles of accusation; and More's comment that the charges were so numerous that he could not recall most of them²². In response, the King's advocate (i.e., Thomas Audley, the Chancellor) construes More's silence as a crime²³. More objects that his silence indicated an approval rather than an opposition to the law. Although both Bydžovský and Pole wrote in Latin, they both insert the English word "Giltie" into the Latin text, when quoting the jury's verdict²⁴.

2.3. Method of Execution

Even more tellingly, however, Pole highlights the martyrdom of Reginaldus monachus, Richard Reynolds (c. 1487–1535), a Bridgettine monk²⁵, to whom Bydžovský devotes an entire section of his treatise²⁶. Both extoll Reynolds's remarkable erudition.

Finally, perhaps the most revealing parallel is the virtually identical description of the standard triple stage executions, inflicted on Henry's victims. First, the victims were hung, but taken down before they suffocated. Second, their sexual organs and their hearts were cut out and burned in the fire. Third, their heads were cut off, their bodies quartered and these remains were placed above gates and into other public places in the city of London. Both authors emphasize that, as an added cruelty, these proceedings were done in sequence so that the next victim in line could observe the sufferings of the preceding one.

2.4. Witness from Silence

There is also a negative feature—a missing piece of narrative—which connects Bydžovský with Pole. Neither of them develops the parallels between Henry as Herod, and Anne Boleyn as Herodias/Salome, featuring Fisher in the role of John the Baptist. This parallel was relished particularly by sixteenth-century English recusant writers.

There is yet another notable missing piece of the narrative that—through the testimony from silence—points to Pole's book as the source of Bydžovský's account. While Pole describes in gory details the process of the three-stage execution, applied particularly to the Carthusian monks, he notably does not inform the reader that Fisher and More were spared such grisly proceedings, and the two—by a special royal dispensation—were simply beheaded²⁷. This qualifying information is also absent in Bydžovský's account.

2.5. The Epitaph and Canon Law

This leaves us to account for the source of the text of an epitaph for Thomas More, cited by Bydžovský, and for his use of the canon law in discussing Henry's marital complications. The epitaph, "Tabula affixa ad sepulchrum Thomae Mori", constitutes another separate section of Bydžovský's treatise²⁸. It turns out to be a verbatim reproduction of the Inscription, which More had included in a letter to Erasmus. Bydžovský presumably had access to the text of the Epitaph in the Swiss (or Frobenius) edition of Erasmus' letters, in which Bydžovský's compatriot, Zikmund Hrubý of Jelení (Gelenius, 1497–1554) participated²⁹.

As for his references to the canon law in relation to marriage, in the treatise under review³⁰, Bydžovský could safely rely on his earlier knowledge of this field. He had previously employed the canon in his arguments in 1541 to document that infant communion had enjoyed a traditional acceptance, specifically in the Western Church, into the second millennium of Christianity.

He had displayed formidable knowledge of canon law on another occasion in 1543, adducing at least twelve Distinctiones and Causae from the Decretum of Gratian, particularly those defining the respective status of the bishops and the priests and those bearing on the proper consecrations of the eucharist. Thus, unlike Luther—who had denounced this type of ecclesiastical legislation as "summa injuria tyrannis"—Bydžovský had no qualms

about resorting to arguments from the canon law³¹. In this he also followed in the tradition of the Bohemian Reformation. According to Jiří Kejř, Jan Hus, in particular, had referred in his writings to the Decretum of Gratian more often than to any other source except the Scripture³².

3. Bydžovský's Utraquism the Papacy, the English Martyrs, Luther, and Witzel

3.1. Papal Minimalism

Finally, let us assess Bydžovský's Utraquism as reflected in his treatise.

First there is what may be called his "Papal Minimalism". While questioning Rome's authority in ecclesiastical governance, particularly its zest for micromanagement, and Rome's claims to absolute infallibility in biblical interpretation, the Utraquists evidently acknowledged the Roman See as the fountainhead of priestly power, at least as far as Western Christendom was concerned.

Bydžovský's acceptance of the papacy and of the apostolic succession is reflected in the section of his treatise, titled "About Cruel Slaughter of Others for Testimony to Truth". He quotes the Prior of the Carthusian Monastery in London as stating prior to his execution: "First, it is necessary to know that Our Lord JESUS CHRIST granted his deputies spiritual power through his Gospel statement: 'And to you I give the keys to the Kingdom of God,' and no-one of the teachers of the Church has ever maintained that these words were addressed to anybody else other than St. Peter, from whom this power is transmitted to other Apostles and subsequently to the Popes and the Bishops. How then can the King interpret these words to mean that He Himself would be the Supreme Head and the Primate of the English Church?!"³³

3.2. Martyrdom of John Fisher and Thomas More

Then there comes the martyrdom of John Fisher and Thomas More. It is not entirely unexpected that—because of their own endorsement of papalism, albeit minimalist—the Utraquist theologians should feel sympathetic to the two English martyrs, More and Fisher, in whose liberal ecclesiology they could recognize kindred reformist spirits. More and Fisher, in fact, literally gave up their heads for the pope as the chief of the sacramental system in the Western Church, while they wished to abolish his role as the monarch of an ecclesiastical state. This helps to explain why Bydžovský assigned such a prominent place to the two English martyrs in his treatise under review here.

3.3. Rejection of Luther

Then there is the rejection of Martin Luther. Despite Bydžovský's relatively frequent and rather surprising praise of Luther and Melancton in the 1540s—almost always in contrast to the stances of the Unity of Brethren—it does become clear, on deeper probing in his works, that he indeed rejected the basic framework of Lutheran doctrines, whenever they differed from the tenets of traditional mainline Utraquism. He dedicated a pamphlet to refuting the views of "New Believers" (nowowercy), presumably Czech Lutherans, who opposed the religious requirement of good works³⁴. In his writings of the 1540s, Bydžovský (David 1999) seemed to avoid the term "Lutheran", but in the treatise under review here he does speak of Lutherans or of New Evangelicals (Quos novos Euangelicastro [intelligo Luteranos])³⁵. Finally, he appears to refer to Luther as "as some hypocritical Bachelor".³⁶

3.4. Endorsement of Witzel's Role

Finally, there comes the endorsement of Witzel's role. In his treatise, Bydžovský indicates that his ultimate choice for the correct course of church renewal in Central Europe was to follow Georg Witzel (1501–1573), and he recommends the latter to the Lutherans³⁷. Witzel, an ordained Roman priest, married and served as Lutheran minister in Saxony in the 1520s. Rejoining the Roman Church as a married lay preacher after the Augsburg Confession in 1530, and living mainly in Dresden, Berlin, and Mainz, Witzel proposed a remaking of the Roman Church in a way that to some extent resembled the

Bohemian Reformation, including a liberal ecclesiology (based on patristics and eschewing scholastic formulae), lay communion sub utraque, vernacular liturgy, and de-emphasis on the veneration of saints³⁸. Having visited Bohemia in the early 1540s, he gained the favor of Ferdinand I (and subsequently that of Maximilian II)³⁹.

In any case in the treatise under review here, Bydžovský exhorts any Evangelicals or Lutherans (Euangelicastro, intelligo Luteranos) who might be in Bohemia, to listen to Witzel's voice⁴⁰.

3.5. Conclusions

By the middle of the sixteenth century, the Utraquist/Hussite tradition in Bohemia represented an alternative expression of Christian faith and religious practice situated between Rome on one hand and Wittenberg/Geneva on the other. This circumstance has parallels with the development of the Church of England after the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559. Bydžovský's treatise sheds light on that nexus. It is regrettable that we know nothing about the distribution of the text, its readership, or the influence it may have had. The apparent anti-Luther sentiment in the text reflects the broader objections to Luther's theology embraced within the Utraquist tradition. Among the 'new enemies of God' who had been 'seduced from the faith', mentioned in the text, must be numbered the followers of Luther. Bydžovský appears to suggest that the Utraquists desired to see some replication of the English faithfulness in Bohemia and there is scope for exploring further the relationship with the English reforms in general and more specifically with the work of Thomas More and John Fisher. [note]

The hagiographical details we find in the text reflect the sources Bydžovský drew upon and it does not appear that he interrogated these critically but took over from them both the essence and ethos latent within those sources. The stories related by Bydžovský could be understood as warnings to the Utraquist Church in Bohemia to the extent that these tales were taken from the Venerable Bede whom the Utraquist traditionally respected. The roots of this regard can be detected in the writings of Jan Hus and later in the work of various Hussites/Utraquists. [note] It is striking that the sharpness of Bydžovský's condemnation of Henry VIII suggests a new element in Czech writings on English history and politics. However, it would be a mistake to assume parallels between More and Fisher, for example, and Jan Hus and other Czech martyrs. More and Fisher were victims of secular wrath for denying Henry's ecclesiastical claims. By contrast, Hus was executed for questioning papal authority, maintaining an ecclesiology that was determined to be subversive, and for his strident criticism of perceived immorality within the late medieval church. [note] The significance of the horrific physical desecration of some of the victims mentioned in the text may be understood as specific methods of execution that reflected Henry's exceptional wrath while his successor, "Bloody Mary", reverted to burning heretics which had long been the penalty for religious and theological disobedience and contumacy, applying both to persons and books. [note]

Thus Bydžovský's treatise not only sheds important light on the religious relationships between Bohemia and England in the mid-sixteenth century. The work also provides a solid testimony to the Utraquist theological and ecclesiastical via media between the Scylla of Rome and the Charybdis of Wittenberg (and Geneva).

4. Translation of Bydžovský's Treatise

4.1. A1—*Recto*

[Pavel Bydžovský (Smetana)]
 Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum
 (quibus Deus suam Ecclesiam exornare sicut
 syderibus Coelum dignatus est) tum pia
 tum digna lectu quae nunquam
 antea in Boemia fuit
 excusa.

Cum consensus D. Administratorum partis utriusque
Et generosi Domini Vladariei Dubansky z Duban
Capitanei arcis Pragensis

[Pavel Bydžovský (Smetana)]
Several Stories of English Martyrs
(with Whom God Deigned to Decorate His Church
Just Like the Heaven with Stars) both Pious
And Worthy Reading Which, However,
Hitherto Was Never in Bohemia
Printed.

With the Permission of the Lords Administrators of the Party Subutraque
And of the High-Born Lord Udalrich Dubansky of Dubany,
the Captain of the Castle of Prague ⁴¹

4.2. A1—Verso

[MAGNIFICO AC
GENEROSO DOMINO DOMINO
Ioanni Seniori à Lobkowic et
in Zbiroh su-
premo Regni Boemiae iudici, Sacrae Regiae
Maiestatis à consiliis Domino suo
Semper obseruandissimo: Sacer-
dos Paulus Bydzouinus Pa-
rochus Ecclesiae Diui Galli
In antiqua Praga
S.P.D.]

To the Magnificent and
Highborn Lord, the Lord
John the Elder of Lobkovice and in Zbiroh ⁴²,
The Supreme Judge of the Kingdom of Bohemia,
always most observant to counsel
the Sacred Royal Majesty, his Lord:
Priest Paul Bydžovský,
Parson of the Church of Saint Galus
In the Old Town of Prague:
Sends His Greetings.

The entire universal holy church once, and for a long time, lavished praise on that most glorious Britain, partly for its faith and holy religion, partly also because of the highly vigilant bishops and pious kings. And that, especially from that three/four times happy time, when they were led from the power of Satan to the faith in Christ by the merit of the most holy Gregory, that is that servicing and visible head of the holy Church militant, wherefore, with a great rejoicing of the heart, they mutually talked together (as it is distinctly written in Chapter 1 of the Ecclesiastical History of the Nation of Angles) saying this: "He (St. Gregory) made out of our nation, hitherto subject to idols, the Church of Christ, so that by right we may call him an Apostle. And even, if he were not an Apostle for others, nevertheless for us he is one, because in the Lord we are a sign of his Apostolate". ⁴³

4.3. A2—Recto

This nation in that time recognized for the merits of its leaders on the field of the holy testament, then, it is said, that after Gregory this nation not only had monks in apologetic theology, as well as outstanding standard-bearers, whose writings are distinguished by a great clarity, but also by pious and God-fearing kings of the same firm and sincere faith.

Lest I seem to you, reader, excessively dilatory with narrating the piety of very many others, I will leave out those very many others and discuss only four of them. Therefore I will mention Oswald, Siegbrecht and add Anne and Penda to them.

About Oswald and his God-fearing piety, Venerable Bede in the sixth chapter of the third book (of his Ecclesiastical History of the Nation of Angles) writes that he was always humble, good, and generous toward pilgrims and the poor. Once, it is said that, during the holy day of Easter, he sat down with the Bishop to dinner and, opposite him, a silver plate full of royal delicacies was placed on the table. At that very moment, when they readied to extend arms for the blessing of the bread, suddenly the royal servant, commissioned to care for the poor, entered the room and announced to the king that many poor people, having arrived from all sides, were sitting in the squares, and he needed some alms for them. Oswald immediately ordered the food prepared for him to be brought over to the hungry ones, and even went on to shatter the silver dish and ordered that the fragments be distributed among the people. When this was seen by the Bishop, who sat next to him, he so rejoiced over such a deed of Christian charity, that he seized the king's right arm and said: "May this arm never grow old!" We read in the same place that this blessing was fulfilled⁴⁴. In the same book, somewhat further in Chapter 14, that later in a happier generation on the intercession of King Oswald a destructive plague was exorcised.

4.4. A2—*Verso*

In the third book of the already mentioned Ecclesiastical History the eighteenth chapter narrates how the good and pious King Sigberecht founded a school for the education of boys with the help of Bishop Felix, whom he had invited from Canterbury to secure them teachers and masters according to the custom of Canterbury.

This King fell so deeply in love with the heavenly kingdom that, toward the end of his life—having forsaking the matters of government and entrusting them to his relative Ecgrith (who even earlier had in part administered the same realm)—he entered a monastery that he had earlier established for himself, and there, having received the tonsure, he sought to fight rather for the eternal kingdom⁴⁵. The author of our History notes, in the nineteenth chapter of the same book, about King Anna that he was far more noble in spirit than in body, and that, from the evening vespers until the morning cock's crow, being out of the body, he gazed at the angelic hosts, and with his ears listened to their blessed lauds. However, he became accustomed to also pass on what he heard openly sound among others, that is, that the Saints will go on from virtue to virtue and again that, on Sion, the God of gods would be seen⁴⁶. Nevertheless, to now additionally ornament by truth what I have earlier written, I shall pass on to King Penda. The latter (as we read in Chapter 21) not only permitted the nobles and the sick, who had rejected the filth of idols, to be purified through the mediation of priests by the spring of faith, but also tolerated that in his kingdom, among the people of Mercia, the word of God would be announced to those who wished to listen. Indeed, he had very little respect and looked down upon people whom he noticed were nourished by the faith of Christ, but did not perform the acts of faith, and said that those were pitiful and worthy of contempt who were unable to be obedient to the God in whom they believe⁴⁷.

But woe, sad days arrived. Sorrowful nightly awakenings came, when the King of England, by the name of Henry VIII, having shed almost all decency, drowned

4.5. A3—*Recto*

In the waters of the Forgetting (Leithe), the sacred vestiges of his above mentioned precursors—whom he ought to have followed with a great joy in his heart—he abandoned the orthodox faith, the Christian truth and obedience, and the Holy Gospels, as well as the rites of the Holy Church, which are three or four times stronger and more precious than pure gold. From all these, he drastically withdrew (by "two octaves" [disdiapason]).

Thus, he deprived himself and his subjects of the marrow of the true Gospel of God. With a great enjoyment, he sucked up [sumpsit] the Gospel of this world and the devil

from the golden chalice of that Apocalyptic Beast, imbibing—with great merriment of his spirit, also inert to all sobriety—up to the unseemly signs of intoxication. By these “gospels”, human and diabolical, he not only elevated his ambition, flattering himself more than Suffenus (that Catullianus), and decided that he would be proclaimed under JESUS CHRIST, the supreme head of the English Church, but he also pitifully embraced a repulsive carnality, which places human beings not only on the level with sheep, but also on that of billy goats and of the most brutal of brute animals, and he delighted in virtually all immoralities (Pole 1965).

From these evils and abominations (through just admonitions), that tenacious man of holy memory, the imitator of the most blessed John the Baptist, John the Bishop of Rochester, tried in vain to divert him. It was as though he tried to sow in rocks or to split stone by hand. Undoubtedly, it would have been easier to teach a crawfish to move forward than to call Henry back from the most pernicious radiance and from the worst pride.

Indeed, this man of distorted face, in whose character the various vices combined, in his untamable fury, he held at all costs onto his perversions and having repudiated Lady Catherine, his first wife, during her lifetime, he decided to arrange in A.D. 1534 and celebrate with some Ann, whom he brought from elsewhere, his second marriage.

4.6. A3—Verso

To whom, in these acts of stupefaction, two remarkable, best, and greatest men of God opposed him; of whom the first was a bishop instructed in many-faceted erudition and most religious, addicted to heavenly contemplation, and dedicated to what [in a broad sense (so to say) anointed] the least yielding above-mentioned bishop of Rochester; of whom the other man was the most cultivated and sparkingly radiated with impeccable manners, by the name of Thomas More, who was [extitit] Chancellor in the temporal British kingdom, which is the next dignity after the King; entirely from the fear of God, they agreed to protest—one speaking, the other in true silence. They acted righteously, because the King carried on despicable work, which was entirely improper and against the divine law, as well as in conflict with the sacred canon law, namely.

Cause 31, questio 1, Chapter 11 of the Law of Gratian, beginning with the words: Quo virginibus etc. states that “at the beginning, one rib was transformed into one wife. And there will be furthermore two in one body;” let us note that it is not said “three or four;” nor “not two, but many”. Similarly, Cause 34, Questio 2, Chapter 4 states that: “If anyone fled from an unavoidable necessity into another duchy or province, and his strong and able wife does not want to follow him because of love of parents or her concerns. The same woman, all the time, while her husband, whom she had not followed, is alive, always remains married”. Similarly in the same place, in the passage beginning with the words “Ego dixi etc”; there is written “He may not dismiss his wife and bring in another; here the act is alike for a woman and a man”.

For that reason the King, enraged like a tiger, abandoned all rationality and plunged headfirst, exactly as a ship without any guiding ropes, at his opponents. Detaining them in prison for long periods of time, then finally pulling them out [to cause their spiritual rebirth through?] for a shameful death, partly because they had argued with him concerning his transgressions, partly because of the previously mentioned cheap adulteress. When the above-mentioned men persevered in the holy faith and defended it having in mind the dictum of Jude.

4.7. A4—Recto

The Apostle that the holy faith is only once given to the saints by God, the King had the holy men (of whom England probably was not worthy) killed. They were abominably hanged, and still living, when taken down and cruelly quartered. Enclosed by Cimmerian darkness, and not remembering the saying of Diogenes that Nemesis lay in wait at the feet,

he commanded that others, not a few, have their lives snuffed out in a variety of ways in a mounting wave of ferocity [Colophonia].

The victims inspired and confirmed by the Holy Ghost, when approaching their fabulous denouement (“catastrophe”), commended their souls to God so that they may be redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ. One of them asked the surrounding multitude to pray for him in this life. He promised himself to intercede for them in the other life. Thus, more clearly than the noon time sun, it is narrated by the history of the martyrs of our age—at one time pious, at another dignified. They deserve to be situated in the Temple of Apollo for the sake of posterity’s perpetual memory.

Indeed, our most illustrious [hodie] Teacher (leader), Jesus Christ, instituted from synagogues many Lord’s priests to whom, as preachers, he deigned to entrust the words of life and nourishment of the soul. He was also pleased to stipulate that special receptacles should contain bread, destined to be distributed to the little ones (children) at the appropriate time.

The King thus retained, for himself and his subjects, the sowers of the bad seed and the suppressors of holiness, who—under the pretext of preaching the Gospel—twist the Word of God which, constantly by their drivel, they tear out by root from the hearts of the faithful, and plant instead their destructive dogmas.

Therefore, in the Anglican Church there was literally fulfilled the statement from the 4th Chapter of the Lamentations of Jeremiah “the infants begged for bread and nobody broke it for them” (4.4). (Infants or “the little ones” here mean Christ’s small fold, in which there are many souls hungering for the Word of the Lord.).

4.8. A4—Verso

It was because true preachers and priests were expelled, leaving and carrying with them the Word of life. They might have surely said to the godless king and his counselors: “We were supposed to preach the Word of God to you. However, because you are refusing it, and find yourselves unworthy of eternal life, we are turning to other nations”. This matter was then better (than by this narration) spread by rumor-mongering, above which there is nothing more rapid in the world. I have not brought this matter fully to light, because it was publicized earlier. It is also because enough readers will be found, who are bored by long hagiographies and read only the beginning. Therefore, I have decided to narrate concisely so that the faithful Christian might learn through what torments and for what reasons some brave and tenacious martyrs of our generation glorified God, according to the injunction of the Holy Gospel: “Amen, amen I tell you: when you were younger, you girded yourself and went where you wanted; when you grow old, you will raise your hands, and another one will gird you and lead you where you do not want”. He said that to indicate by what death he would glorify God. Thus that Christians, gazing at the blessed end of these Divine witnesses, not only remembered them, but also followed them. Just as once St. Paul, God-bearer, encourage the faithful: “Remember your leaders, who spoke to you the Word of God, notice carefully what the outcome of their lives was, and imitate their faith. Keep in mind, how they completed their lives, and follow them in faith!” [Heb. 13.7] That enables the steady lovers of the ancient and correct faith to recognize what many Lutherans and new Evangelicals are attempting to elicit, from a stinking abyss, various long time ago condemned heresies, outside (or beyond) the Catholic faith; not to yield to anyone, and always to attain only their own triumph, in times of anxiety promising to correct everything.

4.9. B1—Recto

Yet despite that remaining the same as before, defending divorce and bigamy; they justify this kind of pandering, disdaining the firm and holy explications, which had been accepted by the Holy Mother, the universal Church, and which were elaborated by outstanding Teachers enriched by the Holy Spirit.

These new Evangelicals (understand Lutherans) are admonished by Georg Witzel in his sermon of the First Easter Sunday in these words: “Be careful—outside the Ark (of Noah; a figure of the Church)—there is nothing but annihilation. Therefore, reconcile with the Church, make a confession, repent your heresy, and render an appropriate fruit of penance. The Church, which is entrusted with the keys of unbinding and binding, is a dove, and She shall receive you. If you do not do so, you will remain forever bound by the ropes of hell between heaven and earth. Why do you confide so pitifully in some hypocritical Bachelor [possibly Luther but more likely a local opponent of Witzel’s] and, despite your own erudition, you do not grasp what the Apostle says, namely, that if even an angel came from heaven and preached another Gospel, than that which is accepted in this world and which has been accepted in glory, he would be anathematized, as it is written in the Epistles to the Galatians (1.8) and to 1 Timothy (1.3). In brief, the Church has received the Gospel, and her keys are for binding and unbinding, etc.

Oh, if only these destroyers of the Gospels—if any can be found in Bohemia—were willing to accept the admonition of the mentioned Witzel, and transfer it into their hearts, as well as correct their lives, in order to read with their own eyes the story of the English martyrs. This (story) I dedicate specifically to you, my Magnificent and most Dignified Lord in the radiance of the Christmas holidays.

One reason is that I have heard from several noblemen that you persist, in every second, unshakably in the holy faith, and the report of this has spread far and wide as if from the Oracle of Delphi.

4.10. B1—*Verso*

Then also [I wish] that faithful Christians be inspired to read most willingly this treatise, which is published under the exceedingly great name of your Magnificence; that they would diligently protect themselves against the new enemies of God and not permit themselves to be seduced from the faith and the holy truth, nor from the most holy mysteries of the Lord’s Supper (in which Jesus Christ, the true God and Man, permanently lives in his invisible substance, and to whom as such, the faithful pray, him implore, honor, and receive him). Also I wish that the faithful Christians preserve themselves in the sincerity of the holy faith and the praiseworthy ecclesiastical traditions, held since the ancient times, remembering the statement of the Holy Spirit: “Do not transgress the old limits, which your fathers had established”. Therefore, most generous Lord, I implore you zealously to deign to receive this treatise from me, not perhaps as from a Master of Arts or a Bachelor, but from a simple and inexperienced priest (who so to say has barely read Aesop’s Tales). Deign to do so in the spirit in which I have dedicated the treatise to your Reverence, and deign to grant me your recognition.

And I, as long as I can breathe, will pray for you, to the Highest One, that He may keep you and your illustrious family for a long time in good health.

May it be, May it be.

4.11. B2—*Recto*

CAPTIVITY AND MARTYRDOM OF P. JOHN Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester because of the King’s second marriage and a schismatic constitution.

The reverend Father D. John, Bishop of Rochester, while residing in pastoral care of the sheep entrusted to him, observed nightly vigils above his sheep, here in sanctity of life and austerity, there administering the sacraments, here assiduously teaching by voice and also in writing. In brief, he acted as a true bishop for many years, remarkably munificent to the poor, and kind in studies. Thus then, like a morning star in the middle of a mist, and like the full moon in our days, and like the shining sun, so he shone in God’s temple, and dispelled errors and darkness by the splendor of his sanctity and erudition.

Such a truly distinguished man, who, in his days, pleased God, and was found just. Then urged by his conscience—both in words and in writings, opposed—in the first place—the second marriage which the King (having repudiated and set aside Lady Catherine, his first wife) decided to celebrate with an Ann, as a bigamist, in the year AD 1534. In the second place, [because] he firmly opposed the new decree of the entire royal council or Parliament, which schismatically and rashly ruled that all—under the penalty of losing throats and estates—had to consider the King immediately after Christ as the highest in both spiritual and secular matters.

4.12. B2—*Verso*

And that any other ecclesiastical supremacy [outside this royal one] was denied.

[Father Fisher] constantly opposed the schismatic impudence, and therefore was arrested by the agents of public authority, and was for many days kept a prisoner in the Castle or Tower of London. From there, he was taken on 16 June 1535 and brought before the Court in Westminster, accompanied by many armed bailiffs—part of the way they traveled with the prisoner on the Thames, and another part of the way he was carried on a horse. He could not go on foot because of his bodily weakness, which, aside from an advanced age, was aggravated by the hardships of imprisonment. Moreover, he himself had seriously weakened his health through fasts, nocturnal waking, study, work, and tears. Although the result was not unknown to him, nevertheless he did not seem perturbed, but he appeared at the tribunal with a calm, even a merry, face. When questioned about the objectionable articles, he responded, above all, in a Catholic way, in harmony with the responses of Thomas More and the other martyrs—about whom more detail later—and to the degree that all the adversaries marveled at the conformity of the responses, not knowing they were led by a single spirit of truth, that through all of them spoke one truth. Therefore, according to the customs of the country, he was taken to a jury of twelve men (delegated to pronounce whether he merited death, who opposed the decrees of the Parliament) and was convicted to a horrible and appalling punishment, according to the previous decision of the King. Just as shortly before, Carthusian monks were hanged, quartered, and eviscerated. However, the fact that, in the end, Fisher was meted a milder punishment than the one threatening him according to the sentence of the judges, was attributed to their worry that—as an old man with an exhausted body—he might accidentally die a natural death, if they dragged him like the others in a convicts' cart such a long tract of way.

4.13. B3—*Recto*

Thus, after having accepted the sentence of such a terrible deaths, our dear Rochester, when the bailiffs in large number led him back to prison, in the moment when they reached the exit, he turned toward them with a merry and serene face, and said: "I give you many thanks, my good men, for your service of accompanying me from here and back to here". One would have thought that perhaps he was returning from a party of merry and sweet things, to that degree the color of his face was happier, in fact, by his body's posture, as far as it was possible, he was expressing a kind of gaiety that made it obvious to everybody that this saint, so close to his harbor, with his whole heart, aimed at that blessed peace. And death did not allow a long period of waiting.

On June 21, he was brought to the plain, which the English popularly call the hill top of the Tower. Here, with his face not only unperturbed but evidently vivid, he briefly addressed the people. At first, he wished well to the King and his realm. Afterwards he entrusted himself to DIVINE mercy through a prayer more warm and aspiring rather than voluminous. In no time, he knelt down, and on his fine, exhausted neck, he accepted the blow of the executioner's axe. In England, properly speaking, the condemned are not beheaded with a sword, but their heads are separated with an axe, after they have knelt at the block. Everyone can certainly and easily imagine with what a great sorrow of the spirit this scene was viewed by those, whose hearts held true piety, and who realized that the spirit of Christ was active in this pastor. It is said that when the severed head of the

Bishop of Rochester was, according to the custom, exhibited on the London Bridge, it not only refused to submit to decomposition, but even appeared yet more beautiful and by its appearance as a head of a still living man. When the news of this spread among the people, the head was taken down and hidden. And because there was a concern that the same thing might happen to the head of Thomas More, before it was exhibited, it was cooked in boiling water so that it might appear as horrible as possible.

4.14. B3—*Verso*

Oh, woe, how a just one dies and nobody properly notices it in the heart. Oh woe, how a holy teacher of the Church, a preacher of the Lord, defender of the Faith, a true pastor, who lays down his soul for his sheep, is subject to a long imprisonment, and whom, because of a vulgar adulteress, the King himself eventually lets be executed for his crimes. (Oh woe), how he is shamefully murdered, when he cares about the unity of faith and of the Church, when he refuses to blush before the people for Christ and his sermons!

ABOUT LORD THOMAS More's Captivity, Con- fiscation of Property, and the Ultimate Punishment because of His Confession Of the Truth

Thomas More, formerly the Chancellor of the British Kingdom (who foresaw the approach of this cruel catastrophe so that he would not be forced to cause innocent people what he himself had experienced), voluntarily gave up the Chancellor's office, which was the highest dignity after the King. When, from only a sheer fear of God, he opposed the second marriage of the King, he was deprived of all his property and sentenced to life imprisonment. On 1 July 1535, he was, however, taken out of the London Fortress (Tower) and brought before the magistrates and judges designated by the King. The accused walked a long way, leaning on a cane because his body had been weakened by a serious illness in prison. However, he did not show any disturbance through the expression of his face.

4.15. B4 *Recto*

First of all, the articles of the criminal acts (of which he was accused) were read. Then the accused was addressed by the Chancellor who succeeded More⁴⁸ and by Duke of Norfolk (Howard 1995; see also John 1955) "Oh, More, you can see, that according to the accusation, you have seriously offended His Royal Majesty. Even so we believe that he is so benign and clement so that—if you show repentance and correct your rash opinion, which you have so stubbornly held—you will be easily freed from the accusation and easily forgiven". More responded thus: "Venerable gentlemen, I am grateful to you that you are so kind to me. However, I beg the best and greatest God for only one thing: that, with his help, I may have the strength to persist in this just opinion of mine even unto death. As for the accusations, to which I am to respond, I worry whether I have sufficient presence of mind, memory, and words, because I am challenged not only by the verbosity and extent of the articles of accusation, but also by the long stay in prison, as well as illness and physical weakness, which torments me". At this point, on the initiative of the judge, they brought him an armchair, and when he sat down, he continued his speech thus:

"As for the first part of the indictment, according to which in the dispute about the King's second marriage—so that I might the more manifest my hatred of him—I have persistently resisted His Most Serene Majesty, I can only say what I have stated before, namely, that I did so on the urgency of my conscience. Namely, I did not wish, or even could, hide the truth from my ruler. If I had done so—especially in such an important matter, on which the ruler's honor and the peace of the kingdom depended—I would have been, indeed, the one which is now accused—malevolent, perfidious, a traitor. For that crime (if it can be so called) I have been most severely punished.

4.16. B4—Verso

When all my property was confiscated and seized by the state, and when I was sentenced to lifelong imprisonment, in which I have already been detained for fifteen months. This, however, I will skip and talk only about substantial matters. You maintain that I deserve the punishment, which the law imposes by its own statute, and was approved by the Royal Council at its latest session during my imprisonment, because with an evil intent, I maliciously and perfidiously harmed the reputation, honor, and dignity of His Royal Highness, that was granted him with a unanimous agreement of all by the mentioned statute, that is, that by this statute the King was proclaimed the Supreme Head of the English Church under JESUS CHRIST. And, above all, you are accusing me that I did not deign to answer the King's Secretary and to the Venerable Council of His Highness when asked what my opinion was about this decree. I responded that I am already dead for this world, and such matters no longer excite me; that I only meditate on the passions of Our Lord JESUS CHRIST. Now, I can only respond to this that, because of such a silence, it is not possible to sentence me to death. Neither your statute, nor any law in the world, are able to impose on anybody a death sentence for silence, but only for speech or perpetrated action. Only GOD judges hidden matter".

Here the royal Prosecutor began to speak and said the following: "The silence signified a certain judgment and a hidden expression of some kind of evil opinion against this statute, because every sincere and faithful subject of the King, if he were questioned about the given statute, would have to answer without any dissimulation that the Royal decree was good, just, and holy". More then responded: "Of course, if it is true, what is established by the common law, that silence signifies agreement, then my silence.

4.17. C1—Recto

Approved rather than opposed your decree. And when you say that every faithful subject is obliged to respond, if asked, that the Royal decree is good, then here I respond that a subject of good faith is more obliged to God, his conscience, and his soul than to any kind of matter in this world, especially if such a conscience, such as mine, does not intend any insult or insurrection against his Lord. I can assure you that I did not reveal to any mortal man my conscience in this matter.

Now I proceed to the second point of the indictment, according to which I conspired against the mentioned statute or decree by writing eight letters to the Bishop of Rochester in which I incited against this edict. I really would very much wish that those letters would be read here. However, because you maintain that the Bishop had burnt them, I shall myself remind you of some of their arguments. In some of them, I wrote about private matters, as required by our old acquaintance and friendship; one contained a response to his own letter, in which he asked, how I would respond in prison, if I were interrogated concerning the mentioned decree. I answered him by saying that I had relieved my conscience and upheld my reason; and I urged him to act similarly. Thus, I expressed myself in my letter—may God be merciful to me. Therefore, because of this letter, I cannot be condemned to death according to your decree or edict.

Now we proceed to the third article of the indictment, according to which, during the interrogation in the Senate, I stated that your decree resembles a double-edged sword, because, who observes it, risks the salvation of his soul, and who opposes it, loses his life; and in the same way, according to you, the Bishop of Rochester responded, from which follows.

4.18. C1—Verso

That we had conspired, because both of us responded in the same way. To this, I answer that I did not say it simply, but rather conditionally. Indeed, if a statute resembled a double-edged sword, how could any one of the people protect himself and not get hurt by either of the sharp edges? It is not known to me how the Bishop of Rochester answered, and it is possible that he responded in the same way. If his answer coincided with mine, it

did not stem from a conspiracy, but from the similarity of characters and learning. In short, I assure you that I never said anything against your decree from ill will. It is, of course, possible that much was twisted in order to arouse hatred against me in His Royal Majesty”.

Thereafter, the royal magistrate convoked twelve men, as it was customary, who were handed the articles of accusation so that they might consult among themselves and judge whether More was culpable with ill intent against the royal decree. They caucused by themselves for a quarter of an hour, then they returned to the Lords and the judges and declared “Gylthi”, which means that he was guilty and deserving of death. The Chancellor immediately pronounced the verdict according to the formula of the mentioned decree.

After that happened, Thomas More began to talk: “Since I was thus sentenced to death (God knows whether lawfully or not), in order to relieve my conscience, I will tell you freely what I think about your decree. First, I wish to state beforehand that I have been concerned with this problem for seven years. Up to now, however, I could not find, in any one of the teachers recognized by the Church, written that a layman—or as it is said a secular person—could be the head of the spiritual or ecclesiastical estate”. Here the Chancellor interrupted More’s speech.

4.19. C2—*Recto*

“Mr. More, do you perhaps think that you are wiser and have a better conscience than all the bishops, all the nobility, and in general, the entire kingdom?” To this, More responded: “Mr. Chancellor, for any one bishop, who maintains your opinion, I can easily find one hundred of them [on my side], and indeed among those who had become saints; instead of your one council (God knows what kind of a council it is), I have supporting me all the ecumenical councils, which have taken place during the past one thousand years; and instead of one kingdom, I can cite France and all the other kingdoms of the Christian world”.

Here the Duke of Norfolk interrupted him: “Oh More, now your malevolence has become clearly manifest”. To this, More responded: “I am not led to speak this way by malevolence, but I am forced to do so by the need to ease my conscience—my witness is God, who alone sees into human hearts. Beside that, I still wish to add that your decree was issued improperly because, in your professional capacity, and with full knowledge of the matter, you had sworn not to do anything against the Church, which through the universal Christian authority is united, integral, and indivisible. And you yourselves have no authority—without the agreement of the rest of Christendom—to promulgate a law, or to establish a council, against Christian unity and concord. Nevertheless, I am not unaware why you have sentenced me to death—it is because I never wanted to consent in the matter of the King’s new matrimony. However, I entertain a great hope into God’s goodness that, just as we read, how St. Paul persecuted the proto-martyr Stephen, and yet they are now together in heaven, then we, who are discordant in this world, shall be in the same manner, concordant in the life of the future age and united in perfect love. Relying on this hope, I implore God to save you and the King, and to deign to give Him good counselors.

4.20. C2—*Verso*

When then, after the end of the trial, More was led back into the jail, before he reached the Tower, one of his daughters, named Margaret, pushed her way to him through the crowd of armed guards, inflamed by an immense yearning for her father, disregarding the public character of the place and the circumstances, she threw herself around his neck, and with pitiful crying, she gave testimony to her extreme grief. When she thus, for a certain time, detained him, and while she was unable to speak because of her sorrow, the father—having asked permission from the guards—consoled her thus: “Oh Margaret, be strong in spirit, and do not torment yourself anymore. Thus God has decided. For a long time already, you know the secret of my heart”. When, afterwards, the father was led away another ten or twelve steps, she again ran up and threw herself into his arms. More then said, without tears, and with a calm expression in his face: “Good-bye, and pray to God for

the salvation of my soul". Let everyone judge for himself by what an acuteness of piety More's heart was pierced.

Afterwards, on July 7, he was beheaded on the large plain in front of the royal palace. Before his head was cut off, he spoke briefly, asking the surrounding crowd to pray for him in this life, as he would intercede for them in the other world. Beside that he ardently exhorted them that they should pray to God so that he may give the King good counselors and a benevolent mind. Openly, he then professed that he was dying as a faithful servant of the King, but above all, as a servant of Almighty God.

A TABLET AFFIXED
To the Tomb
of Thomas More ⁴⁹

4.21. C3—*Recto*

Thomas More was born in London in a commoner, but honest family. He was educated in the sciences and as a youth he dealt with judicial causes for several years. Afterwards, he practiced law in his own town, and then he was called to serve in the royal court by the invincible King Henry VIII (who, as the only one among the rulers, was rightfully called "defender of the faith", which he confirmed both by his sword and by his pen). He was elected into the Parliament; and the King raised him into the noble estate. Then the King named him, in succession, the First Proquaestor⁵⁰ Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; and finally Lord Chancellor of all England. Thus enjoying Henry's unusual favor; in the meantime More was also elected Speaker of the House of Commons. In addition, he served several times as a royal ambassador in various places. Finally, he became companion and colleague to the head of the diplomatic legation, Cuthbert Tunstall, who was then Bishop of London, and later Bishop of Durham.

The world hardly has today a man more erudite, or more prudent, or better. There, [in his diplomatic career], he happily saw the reconstruction of agreements among the highest rulers of the Christian world, together with a return of the long desired peace, and as ambassador, he tried to have the heavens affirm this peace and make it everlasting. During his entire career as an official, he endeavored not to provide an impulse for complaints against the King, not to be antagonistic to the nobles, or unsympathetic to the people, but instead to be furious with thieves, murderers, and heretics.

His father, Sir John More, was invited by the King to join the judicial organ, which is called Court of the Royal Bench. He was a cultivated, mild, innocent, affable, and merciful, as well as honest and just man. Although already advanced in years, he still enjoyed physical vitality for his age. After observing that his life had permitted him to see his son become Lord Chancellor of England, he judged that he had stayed on earth long enough and, without hesitation, he migrated into heaven. The son then, after the death of his father.

4.22. C3—*Verso*

(With whom during his own life, he was always compared and usually called More, Junior, to which he became accustomed and saw himself in that relationship), in grief for the deceased, and seeing that he himself already had four children and eleven grandchildren, he began to age in his spirit. The subjective feeling was joined also by worsening of breathing, as a sign of assailing senescence. Thus he gave up his offices, being satiated by secular affairs—for which he had yearned almost from his youth—so that he might have for himself several free years of life, during which (while gradually abandoning worldly matter) he could devote himself to meditation about immortality.

At the end, that is, 6 July 1535, he lost his head in defense of justice and blissfully migrated to CHRIST, as it was narrated in greater detail above.

ABOUT REGINALD (Reynolds 1967)
THE THEOLOGIAN'S MARTYRDOM,
His Defense, and Death Sentence

Because of His Fidelity to the Church

In the major Palace of Westminster on 15 April 1535, a gathering of Lords, Dignitaries of England, and other judges decided to hear the defense of certain clerics and laymen, accused of having spoken and written against His Royal Majesty, and induced them to settle the accounts.

4.23. C4—*Recto*

As the first among them, the Lord Chancellor thus interrogated the doctor of theology, a man of angelic appearance and filled with the Holy Spirit from the Abbey of Sion of the Order of St. Brigit: “Why do you alone wish to proudly and stubbornly insist on your opinion, which is contrary to the promulgation of the Parliament, that is, with the opinion of such significant Lords and Bishops and perhaps of all the nobles of the entire Kingdom?” To that, the same doctor gave this answer: “Originally, I had decided to emulate the example of Our Lord JESUS CHRIST when he was placed in the court before Herod and did not answer anything. However, since you are forcing me, and, in order to give satisfaction to my conscience and of those standing here, I state that our opinion as a matter of conviction and of true voices, would be superior to yours.

As more substantial and much richer on testimony. After all, against the several individuals whom you lead in from the Parliament of just one kingdom, my side is supported by the entire Christian world, and in addition to it those who are from England—I will not say all, because a smaller part of those are on your side. Even if a majority of our kingdom would voice disagreement with my opinion, then it would not do so out of conviction, but by an external pretense, out of fear for their functions and titles, and in hope of gaining thereby the King’s favor”.

When he was ordered by the Royal Secretary to reveal—under the threat of incurring punishment under the rigor of the law—who were those whom he had just mentioned, he responded: “They are all the good people in this country”. Further then, he added to his first answer: “As far as the testimony of deceased ancestors is concerned, I have on my side the ecumenical councils, all the teachers of the Church, as many as there were during the past one thousand and five hundred years.

4.24. C4—*Verso*

Among them, especially those truly saintly—Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory. And I am certain that His Most Serene Majesty—once he learns the real state of affairs—will become exceedingly angry with the bishops who had given Him such an advice”. Afterwards, he was ordered not to speak extraneously, but only to answer what evidently would aggravate his cause. For what reason had he so malevolently dared—against the dignity of the King and the Kingdom—to counsel so many to resist the opinion of the King and the Parliament.

He responded thus: “I will answer you first. If I stood before God’s judgment seat, it would be clear that I have never through malice declared to any living person my opinion against the King, or against any other living person. However, when I could not resist, I confided my opinion in confession so I could relieve my conscience. It is true that I was deeply saddened after I found His Most Serene Majesty in such an error, but I have never expressed my opinion anywhere else than where I have just explained. And even if I would not have already then expressed my opinion, I would have done so now, because I am thus duty-bound to God and to my conscience, and in such matters, I cannot lawfully offend my Sovereign, nor anybody else”.

Thereupon, silence was imposed on him.

And he said: “inasmuch as you do not wish that I spoke any further, judge me according to your law”. When, subsequently, he heard from a jury of twelve men that he was sentenced to death, he said with great courage: “This is a worldly judgment”. Then he humbly begged the judges to allow him two or three more days of life so that he might die with a prepared conscience, as was proper for a good and religious.

4.25. D1—*Recto*

Christian. They responded to him that it depended entirely on the goodness of the King, and if he wished to grant that; the matter was not in the competence of the judges. To this, he said: “I believe to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living”.

ABOUT CRUEL
SLAUGHTER OF OTHERS
For Testimony to Truth

The Prior of the Carthusian Monastery in London approached the Almoner of the King, Doctor Latmet, and yet another Doctor, and stated that he wished to say three things in order to relieve his conscience: “First, it is necessary to know that Our Lord JESUS CHRIST granted his deputies spiritual power through his Gospel statement: ‘And to you I give the keys to the Kingdom of God,’ and no-one of the teachers of the Church has ever maintained that these words were addressed to anybody else other than St. Peter, from whom this power is transmitted to other Apostles and subsequently, to the Popes and the Bishops. How then can the King interpret these words to mean that He Himself would be the Supreme Head and the Primate of the English Church?!” On hearing this, the Royal Secretary retorted: “Thus, you want that the King became a priest?” and he prohibited the Prior to speak anything further.

Afterwards, a jury of twelve men pronounced the verdict of death. Its execution was ordered for 4 May 1535 in the following manner: At first, they drove four monks, among whom there was the above- mentioned doctor, along with one secular priest among them.

4.26. D1—*Verso*

Because another—younger one—received a reprieve)⁵¹ from the Tower of London, across the entire town, and to their place of execution, a distance one whole French mile from the city. There—without any consideration of priestly or religious order and vestments—without [clerical] degradation, they were hung in their vestments on the gallows by some kind of thick hawser so that they would not choke. Immediately afterwards, they were taken down—still living. Next, they cut off their sexual organs and threw them into the fire, the executioner then extracted their hearts, which he pierced and also cremated in the fire. Afterwards, their heads were cut off, their bodies quartered, and these parts were then placed above the gates and other public places of the said city [London]. So that it might be even more terrible, they proceeded in sequence so that the next in line could observe the torments of the preceding one, before he himself expired. Despite all this, I can attest that, for a long time, I have not seen anyone who would accept death with such an equanimity, persevering until in the end, consumed by death. Because, as in their mind they had never been swayed in any manner from the way of the truth, so neither by a pallor of face, nor by trepidation of words, nor by any bodily gesture did they show a fear of death. Strengthened by the spirit of truth, for which they were undergoing the agony of death, they remained as joyful as they had been when intact and healthy.

However, they exhorted the dignitaries and all the onlookers to persevere in good lives, to serve the King faithfully in all things, and obey him in all things except in those that were against the will of God and of the Church. They protested that they never were disobedient to the King, except in those things that were repugnant to the Holy Gospels and the Catholic Church. Thus, they accept death not only patiently, but also very gladly. Moreover, they added that they recognized how great a grace they attained from God, that is, that he deigned them to die for the truth and for proclaiming.

4.27. D2—*Recto*

The Evangelical and Catholic doctrine, namely, that the King was not supreme in spiritual matters, nor the Primate and the head of the English Church. The rest of us, seeing, reading or hearing about this, let us give thanks to God for investing with the spirit of courage and with the zeal of love many of his friends who shed their blood for

testimony to the truth in England. To them belong the Bishop of Rochester, Thomas More, many Carthusians, and all the other brave ones from other [monastic] orders, whose heads and members were, after death, affixed on stakes. They preach to us what faith and what love we should have for Christ and for the Church, and show us, at the same time, by their example, that they had done so. Namely, it so happened that they had attained a much greater glory by their hanging and being speared than if they had been buried with gold and precious stones. Indeed, from those who transited into eternity, we learn their persistence, we eulogize it, and we interpret it to the world. And thereby let others also realize that the people dwelling in this world need not to fear those who can destroy the body, but rather the ones who have the power to cast both the body and the soul into hell.

VARIOUS SAYINGS

EXPLANATION

Suffenus was a completely tasteless poet, sarcastically commenting on the inadequacies of others. Therefore, it became common to call those who please themselves with inanities, “Suffenuses”.

Colophonia ferocity. Insolent ones, who show ferocious scorn and oppress people of a more humble fortune. Consumed with arrogance and pride.

Cimmerias tenebras, so are called many unintelligibilities, or clouded spirits.

4.28. D2—Verso

Nemesis: it is assumed that goddess Nemesis is an avenger of insolence and arrogance.

Catastrophe is a part of a plot; any kind of resolution (outcome) of a story is customarily called catastrophe.

Hodigus leader [correctly in Greek: hodégos], it means leader, teacher.

Hermenia is interpretation (translation, explication)

Battologia, can mean for us loquacity (blathering)

Cacospermologus that is a bad sower of words (windbag)

Laconismus that is concise, succinct speech.

Phronesis that is prudence (self-confidence).

Whatever has merits, give thanks to the one who preceded you.

God crowns nothing in us except his gifts.

Produced in Prague, Ioannes Cantor.

In the Year 1554

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Notes

¹ Pseudo-Dionysius, *Theologia vivificans. Cibus solidus. Dionysii coelestis hierarchia. Ecclesiastica hierarchia. Divina nomina. Mystica theologia. Undecim epistolae. Ignatii undecim epistolae. Polycarpi epistola una*, ed. Jacques Le Fèvre d'Étaples (In alma Parisiorum academia, Per Henricū Stephanū, 1515); see Pavel Bydžovský, *Děť átka a nevíňátka hned po přijetí křtu sv. Tělo a Krev Boží, že přijímají mají* (Prague: Bartoloměj Netolický, 1541), f. B2r.

² Bydžovský, *Děť átka a nevíňátka*, f. B4r.

³ Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfesse: Její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Prague: Česká akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění, 1912), 188, n. 2.

⁴ Václav V. Tomek, “O církevní správě strany pod obojí v Čechách od r. 1415 až 1622” *Časopis českého muzea* 22 (1848), 463–68.

⁵ Zdeněk V. David, “Utraquism and the Elizabethan Anglicanism, an Imperfect Parallel: Bydžovský on Erastianism”, *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*. Vol. 10, published under the auspices of Collegium Europaeum [Papers from the X. International

Symposium on Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice, held in Prague, 22–25 June 2012], eds. Zdeněk V. David and David R. Holeton. *Filosofický Časopis*: Special issue, no. 2 (2015), 335.

Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est (Prague: J. Cantor, 1554). On Augustine of Canterbury see, for instance, DNB 1: 727–29.

A modern bilingual edition is available in Bede, The Venerable, Saint, 673–735, *Baedae Opera historica*, with an English translation by J. E. King. (London: W. Heinemann Ltd.; New York, G. P. Putnam's sons, 1930).

Prague, St. Vitus Chapter 27 (Archiv IX (1847), 474), listed in Max L. Laistner, *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1943), 101. I wish to thank Gergely Kovacs for calling my attention to the record of this manuscript.

Jakoubek ze Stříbra, *Dvě staročeská utrakvistická díla*, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, Filozofická fakulta, Spisy, no. 379, eds. Mirek Čejka and Helena Krmíčková (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2009), 58–59. The editors trace Jakoubek's reference to Beda Venerabilis, "Homiliae", in Jacques P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus/Patrologia Latina*, 94 (Paris, 1844–), 94, col. 74–75.

In Hus's *Česká nedělní postilla* and *Česká sváteční kázání* the number of references to Bede equals those to Bernard of Clairvaux and Gregory the Great, and exceeds those to Ambrose, Anselm, Aquinas, Chrysostom, Remigius, or Origen; see *Opera omnia Magistri Iohannis Hus* (Prague, Academy of Sciences, 1975–1995), vols. 2–3. See Bede, the Venerable, *Homilies on the Gospels*, vol. 1, Cistercian Studies Series, 110, trans. Lawrence T. Martin and David Hurst (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1991). See also 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 Petr Hlaváček, ed. *O felix Bohemia! Studie k dějinám české reformace. K počtě Davida R. Holetona*, *Europeana Pragensia* 5. Prague: Collegium Europaeum, 2013, 59–80.

Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est* (Prague: J. Cantor, 1554), f. A1v; cited verbatim from Bede, see Bede, The Venerable, Saint, 673–735, *Baedae Opera historica*, with an English trans. by J. E. King, 2 v.. (London: W. Heinemann Ltd.; New York, G. P. Putnam's sons, 1930), 1: 184.

"[Sigbert] set up a school in the which boys should be instructed in letters, by the help of bishop Felix, whom he had gotten from Kent, and who appointed them masters and teachers after the manner of the men of Kent. And so deeply was the king a lover of the heavenly kingdom, that leaving at the last the affairs of his realm and entrusting them to his kinsman Egric, who also before held part of the same kingdom, he entered to a monastery which he had made for himself, where being shoren in he labored rather to make war for the everlasting kingdom". The Latin text, identical in Bydžovský and Bede, is as follows: "[Sighbert] instituisse Scholam in qua Pueri literis erudirentur iuuante se Episcopo Foelice, quem de Cantua acceperat: eisque Pedagogos ac Magistros iuxta morem Cantuariorum praebente. Tantumque ille Rex coelestis regni amator factus est, ut ad ultimum relictis regni negociis et cognato suo Egrice commendatis: qui et antea partem eiusdem regni tenebat: intraret monasterium, quod sibi fecerat: atque accepta sibi tonsura pro eterno magis regno militare curaret, haec ibi". Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v; and Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1: 412.

"... and from evening until cockcrow being out of the body he was thought worthy to behold the sight of the angelical company, and to hear their blessed thanksgivings. Further, he was wont to tell that among other things he openly heard them sing: 'Holy men shall go from virtue to virtue'. And again: 'The God of gods shall be seen in Sion'. The Latin text, identical in Bydžovský and Bede, is as follows: "... fuisse, et a Vespera usque ad gallicantum corpore exutum. Angelorum agminum atque aspectus intueri et auribus percipere laudes beatas, meruisse scribit. Referre autem erat solitus, quod aperte eas inter alias resonare audiret, scilicet, ibunt Sancti de virtute in virtutem, et iterum, Videbitur DEVS Deorum in Syon". Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A2v; and Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, 1: 418.

Josef Hejnic and Jan Martínek, eds., *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě od konce 15. do začátku 17. století* [Manual of Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia from Late Fifteenth to the Early Seventeenth Centuries], 5 vv. (Prague, 1966–1982), 1: 245. See Sebastian Münster, *Cosmographia*, Beschreibung aller Lender (Basel: Gedruckt durch Henrichum Petri, 1544); Johannes Carion, *Chronica durch Magistru Johan Carion, vleissig zusammen gezogen, mehiglich nützlich zu lesen* (Gedruckt zu Wittemberg: Durch Georgen Rhaw, [1532]); Johannes Sleidan, *De statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo V, caesare commentariorum libri XXVI* (Strassburg: Erben des Edelin Rihel, 1555).

Pole, Reginald [Reginaldi Poli Cardinalis Britanni], *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione, libri quatuor*. Rome: Apud Antonium Bladum, c.1536; Pole, Reginald, *Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione libri 4*. Romae: n.p., 1539. Henry, angered by the book, allegedly retaliated by executing Pole's mother, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury. Christopher Highley, "'A Pestilent and Seditious Book': Nicholas Sander's Schismatis Anglicani and Catholic Histories of the Reformation", in *The uses of history in early modern England*, ed. Paulina Kewes. San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, c2006, 155. A modern English translation was published as Reginald Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church*, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965.

"Pole Reginald", DNB, 16:36.

Reginald Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church*, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965, 288, see also 39, 209.

For instance, Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church*, 38, 259–63.

Pole, *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church*, 204, and Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. D2r.

- 21 Thomas More's Trial by Jury: A Procedural and Legal Review with a Collection of Documents, eds. Henry Ansgar Kelly, Louis W. Karlin, and Gerard B. Wegemer. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2011, 196–209. Also Reginald Pole, Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965), 217–27; Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum* (Prague: J. Cantor 1554), f. B3v–C2v.
- 22 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. Br-r; Reginald Pole, Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965), 218; Thomas More's Trial by Jury: A Procedural and Legal Review with a Collection of Documents, eds. Henry Ansgar Kelly, Louis W. Karlin, and Gerard B. Wegemer. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2011, 197–98.
- 23 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. Br-v; Reginald Pole, Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965), 218–20; Thomas More's Trial by Jury: A Procedural and Legal Review with a Collection of Documents, eds. Henry Ansgar Kelly, Louis W. Karlin, and Gerard B. Wegemer. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2011, 197–98.
- 24 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. Br-v; C1-v. Reginald Pole, Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church, transl. Joseph G. Dwyer. (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965), 219–20; Thomas More's Trial by Jury: A Procedural and Legal Review with a Collection of Documents, eds. Henry Ansgar Kelly, Louis W. Karlin, and Gerard B. Wegemer. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2011, 199–201. Bydžovský also cites the verdict in his Latin text as "Gylthi", idem, *Historiae*, C1-v.
- 25 "Behold the Bridgettine Order!... I cannot do this without calling by name upon one whom I knew intimately. His name was Reynolds". Pole, 253, see also 292no.9. See also "Reynolds, Richard", DNB, 16: 953–54; "Reynolds, Richard, Bl", New Catholic Encyclopedia, 17 vols. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967–1979), 12: 455–56.
- 26 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. C3v.
- 27 On More and Fisher being spared the type of execution designed for traitors, see Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors*, 362–63; Jasper Ridley, *Henry VIII* (New York, 1985), 247–49. A Statute of November 1534 declared that "the King was Supreme Head of the Church of England", and another Act defined as treason: "to deny any of the King's titles". Ridley, *Henry VIII*, 244.
- 28 Pavel Bydžovský, "Tabula affixa ad sepulcrum Thomae Mori", *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est. Prague: J. Cantor, 1554, C2v–C3v.
- 29 Zikmund Hrubý of Jelení (Gelenius, 1497–1554) in 1523 left for Basel, where he worked as editor in the publishing house of Frobenius; see Malá československá encyklopedie [Small Czechoslovak Encyclopedia], 6 vols. (Prague, 1984–1987), 2: 859.
- 30 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A3v.
- 31 Zikmund Winter, *O životě na vysokých školách pražských: kulturní obraz XV. A XVI. Století* [On the Life in the University Schools of Prague: A Cultural Image of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries] (Prague: Matice česká, 1899), 357. While Luther rejected classical canon law. The Anglican Church retained its substance after eliminating the elements of papal centralization, see Gerald Bray, ed., *The Anglican Canons, 1529–1947* (Woodbridge, 1998); MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 327, 351, 377, 449; see also James H. Provost, "Canon Law", *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York, 1987), 3:70; *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, ed. Erwin L. Lueker rev. ed. (St. Louis, 1975), 133. Bydžovský's and other Utraquist theologians' view of canon law may be assumed to have come close to that of Erasmus, see Wilhelm Maurer, "Erasmus und das Kanonische Recht", in *Vierhundertfünfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation, 1517–1967 (Festschrift für Franz Lau zum 50. Geburtstag)*. (Göttingen, 1967), 222–232. See also on the bearing of canon law on ecclesiology Takashi Shogimen, "The Relationship between Theology and Canon Law: Another Context of Political Thought in the Early Fourteenth Century", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60 (1999), 417–431.
- 32 Jiří Kejř, "Jan Hus jako právní myslitel [Jan Hus as a Legal Theorist]", in Jan Hus mezi epochami, národy a konfesemi [Jan Hus among Epochs, Nations, and Confessions], Jan B. Lášek, ed. (Prague, 1995), 197.
- 33 Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est (Prague: J. Cantor, 1554), f. D1-recto.
- 34 "Sprawen jsem, že by jeden Kazatel z Nowowěrcůw kázati mel, proč jest Krystus se postil moha bez toho býti, a nic jiného w tom nespůsobil, nežli swár mezy Lidmi". See Bydžovský, *Spis o Postu*, lv. 51r–54v (53r–56v), in *Knížky o přijímání Těla a Krve*, f. 51r (53r). Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Washington, D.C.: Wilson Center Press; and Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 117.
- 35 "[N]ovos Evangelicastro (intelligo Luteranos)..". Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est (Prague: J. Cantor, 1554), f. B1r; see also A4v. Pavel Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, quibus Deus suam ecclesiam exornare sicut syderibus coelum dignatus est (Prague: J. Cantor, 1554), f. B1-recto
- 36 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. A 4—verso.
- 37 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. B1-recto.
- 38 "Witzel", New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967–1974), 14: 984–85; "Witzel", *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 43: 658–59.
- 39 Winfried Trusen, *Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche: Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957), 22–26; Barbara Henze, *Aus Liebe zur Kirche Reform: die Bemühungen Georg Witzels (1501–1573) um die Kircheneinheit* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 23 (visit to Bohemia).

- 40 Bydžovský, *Historiae aliquot Anglorum martyrum*, f. B1—recto.
- 41 Oldřich Dubanský of Dubany was at the same time the Supreme Subchamberlain of the Land [nejvyšší zemský podkomoří] (1552–1569). He died in 1571.
- 42 On Jan III. Popel z Lobkovic, see Pavel Juřík, Lobkowiczové. Popel jsem a popel budu (Prague: Euromedia Group—Knižní klub, 2017), 30–31; Stanislav Kasík, Petr Mašek, Marie Mžýková, Lobkowiczové: dějiny a genealogie rodu (České Budějovice: Veduta, 2002), 30–31, 109, 216.
- 43 Bede, *Baedae Opera historica*, trans. by J. E. King (London: W. Heinemann Ltd.; New York, G. P. Putnam's sons, 1930), 2 vols, 1:185.
- 44 Bede, *Opera historica*, 2: 353.
- 45 Bede, *Opera historica*, 2: 413.
- 46 Bede, *Opera historica*, 2: 419.
- 47 Bede, *Opera historica*, 2: 433.
- 48 Thomas Audley (1488–1544), DNB, 1: 723–726. See also John L. Campbell, “Life of Chancellor Audley”, in idem, *The Lives of Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England* (London: John Murray, 1846), vol. 1, 599–639; “Audley, Thomas”, *Biographia Britannica*, ed. Andrew Kippis, 5 vols., reprint 2d ed. London, 1778–1793 (Hildesheim and New York: Olms, 1974), vol. 1, 352–58.
- 49 Text of the epitaph is in Harpsfield, Nicholas, 1519–1575, *The life and death of Sr Thomas Moore, knight, sometymes lord high chancellor of England*, written in the tyme of Queene Marie by Nicholas Harpsfield, L.D., and now edited from eight manuscripts, with collations, textual notes, etc., by Elsie Vaughan Hitchcock with an introduction on the continuity of English prose from Alfred to More and his school, a life of Harpsfield, and historical notes, by R.W. Chambers and with appendices, including the Rastell fragments, chiefly concerning Fisher; the news letter to Paris, describing the trial and death of More; More's indictment; and More's epitaph (London, Published for the Early English Text Society by H. Milford (Oxford: University Press, 1932), 279–81, see also reference to the epitaph, *ibid.*, 60–61.
- 50 I.e., Deputy Guardian of the Royal Treasury.
- 51 “They were John Houghton, Robert Lawrence, and Augustine Webster, the Priors of the Charter Houses of London, of Beaulieu in Nottinghamshire, and the Isle of Axholme in Lincolnshire; Richard Reynolds, a monk of Sion, near Brentford in Middlesex, who was famous for his learning; and the two priests, John Haile and a very young man, John Ferne”. Jasper Ridley, *Henry VIII* (New York: Viking, 1985), 244.

References

- David, Zdeněk V. 1999. Utraquists, Lutherans, and the Bohemian Confession of 1575. *Church History* 68: 294–336. [CrossRef]
- Howard, Thomas, II. 1995. *Earl of Surrey and third Duke of Norfolk (1473–1554)*. DNB 10:64–67. Chichester: Phillimore.
- John, M. Robinson. 1955. *The Dukes of Norfolk*. Chichester: Phillimore, pp. 23–41.
- Pole, Reginald. 1965. *Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church*. Translated by Joseph G. Dwyer. Westminster: Newman Press, pp. 39, 209, 288.
- Reynolds, Richard. 1967. (c.1487–1535) *Bridgettine Monk*. DNB, 16:953–954; New Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: McGraw-Hill, vol. 16, pp. 953–954.