

## LECTURE TWO

### Essential, Ministrative, and Incidental Things

One cannot, of course, get very far in any examination of Br. Luke's theology without knowing about his distinction of the essential, ministrative, and incidental things. Not only did these provide the structure and presuppositions for his theology, but he went so far as to assert that "all errors flow from misunderstanding of the difference between essential and ministrative things or from erroneous definition of their content or reciprocal action."<sup>113</sup> We need not, however, go into a lengthy exposition of those principles here, since Amédeo Molnár has provided a comprehensive and generally understandable account of the Brethren's theology as the closing chapter of Rican's *The History of the Unity of Brethren*. This remains the best treatment of the subject of which I am aware.

For our purposes here, suffice it to say that as expressed by Luke, the essentials are twofold: divine and human. Each of these has three parts or aspects. First, on the part of God, they are 1) the grace of God [the Father] who wills our salvation, 2) the saving work of God the Son in Christ, and 3) the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Second, on the part of humanity, they were 1) faith, 2) love, and 3) hope. Note that these essentials were never a list of specific doctrines, whether five, seven, eight, or a thousand, to which the Christian was expected to swear allegiance. Rather, they were objective attitudes and actions on the part of God to which humans by grace respond in a living relationship. Since the "human essentials" are a response, it follows that the "divine essentials" always come first and thus by

grace are the operative cause of the others.

The ministrative things are those which help humans to the essentials. They include Scripture, the Church and its servants, and the sacraments. This does not mean that Luke and the Brethren considered these things as unimportant. Indeed, they were the usual divinely appointed means decreed by God for persons to come to salvation. They are not, however, ends in themselves. They are tools — God's tools to be sure — but they must not be exalted as if they were the essentials.

Incidental things are specifics of church order and services, the type of bread used at communion, etc. If confusing the ministrative things with the essentials was a grave mistake, confusing incidentals with essentials was a tragedy of the highest order, as portions of the Christian Church over the centuries have proved time and time again.

So much for the basics. Now for some specifics. Of course, in the 150 or more works of Luke that are known to us, there is no lack of theological material for further consideration and no scarcity of topics which invite a closer look. For instance, as described by Molnár, in his commentary on the book of Revelation Luke in discussing chapter five says emphatically that the church is "mistaken if it wishes to travel the way of glory on this earth."<sup>114</sup> Instead, says Luke, the pattern or paradigm for the church on earth can be nothing other than the "lamb once slain" (beránek zabity). True, Christ does live in glory to intercede for us, but Christ is present in the church as the lamb whose death was the cause of our salvation. It is not his glory, but his "shameful death" which has brought us forgiveness. "God, however, by the foolishness of the cross established the way for Christians and

the church to follow.”<sup>115</sup>

Not only did this have much to say to the imperial church of the later middle ages, but it is also of value in reminding the church of the last decade of the twentieth century, enamored as it is of triumphalism, of its true nature and calling. In addition, Luke’s graphic depiction of Christ as the lamb who conquered precisely through death on the cross, and the admonition to follow him, can hardly help but call to mind the “Moravian seal” with its lamb carrying the banner of the cross, surrounded by the words: “Our Lamb has conquered; let us follow Him.” The *agnus dei* is, of course, an ancient Christian symbol, but all these details raise the question “Could this passage of Luke be the origin of the Unity’s use of this symbol and motto together?” Or is Luke here drawing on a symbol and usage already familiar to the Unity? Or is all this pure co-incidence? The possibilities are intriguing enough to hope that further study will provide more definite answers.

For this immediate study, however, other topics also provide food for thought for Christians today. Among the many possibilities, Luke’s concepts of Scripture and the church in particular are probably the most valuable for study and further consideration. Fortunately, Amédeo Molnár’s 1948 book (in Czech) on Br. Luke provides instructive summaries of these aspects of Luke’s theology in greater detail than has been available elsewhere. Other scholars’ work will be used to supplement Molnár’s accounts, but the results of his research will provide the outline and most of the substance for our consideration of Luke’s theology on Scripture and the church.

In addition, though Luke often wrote for theologians, his primary concern was to communicate the Gospel to the faithful in the Unity, and therefore a study of his catechism should provide insight into the manner in which he communicated his theological ideas to persons just learning the truths of the faith. Along this same line, except for his pastoral letters, Luke spoke most directly to the Unity’s lay members through his many hymns. As noted above, these are almost entirely unknown to English speakers today, but a look at several of them will help illustrate how Luke the theologian spoke to and identified with the flock committed to his care. Through listening to Luke himself, without disparaging the studies and observations of scholars, we may gain a closer and more personal acquaintance with and appreciation for Luke of Prague.

## Luke on Scripture

Luke’s view of Scripture was, of course, determined by his distinction of the essential and ministrative things.<sup>116</sup> Scripture is a ministrative thing. At first glance, it may seem amazing to some that the “formal principle” of the Reformation [*sola scriptura*] appears to occupy a secondary place in the theology of Luke. As we have seen, however, maintaining a proper distinction between the essential and ministrative things does not imply belittling of the ministratives.

Indeed, among the ministrative things Scripture has a special and unique place. The reading of the word comes before the administration of the sacraments, and in fact is the pre-requisite for them. Molnár notes a little later that Scripture (and its proclamation) is the only

ministrative thing which is absolutely necessary. The others can be, in a sense, provisional, since God can on occasion or for good cause dispense with them. [An obvious example for the Unity of Luke's day would be in the case of a believer who could not attend Holy Communion because of persecution]. Without the Scripture, though, one does not have God's objective declaration of salvation. As Luke says in *O gruntu viery (On the ground of faith)*: "Without the preaching of the holy reading no one recognizes the establishment of salvation nor comes into it from faith. [Therefore] we preach Scripture before all the sacraments, and with the sacraments, and after the sacraments so that first of all we may instruct people in the essence of faith and penance by the reading [i.e. Scripture]."<sup>117</sup>

Luke does, however, remind us that "the biblical word is not the immediate Word of God."<sup>118</sup> Jesus alone is the Word. And the word of truth lies in his sacrificial ministry for our salvation. "The human biblical word then is indeed only for testimony to the revelation of the Word of God, which in Christ — and only in Him — became flesh."<sup>119</sup> The biblical word is a true word, but it is only the echo and sign of what it proclaims. Christ is present in it, but he is present as proclamation. So much for those who would exalt Scripture almost to the point of idolatry. Here again, Luke worried about Luther's exaltation of Scripture, fearing that it might indeed lead some to just this sort of idolatry.

Luke also cautions that "it is necessary [on the one hand] carefully to distinguish 'between the external writing of the law, with ink on paper or parchment, and the external reading of it, and

[on the other hand] the internal truths contained in it."<sup>120</sup> The book can be destroyed by fire; the truth witnessed to within it is eternal.

To be effective, however, a proclamation must be heard. As Luke says in *Bárka* (85a), the biblical word becomes actuality in the preaching of the church — which preaching, of course, is to be of nothing other than the biblical witness. Luke agreed with Luther on the importance of the preached word, but worried that Luther's stress on this could be misunderstood as if it had a magical effect. Typically, in accord with the Unity's longstanding stress on response and discipline, Luke avowed that mere reading of the Scripture was useless. Hearing it was what mattered, and by "hearing" he meant to hear and to obey. For this, of course, the leading of the Holy Spirit was necessary, but the goal remained to make the proclaimed truth of Scripture an actuality in the obedient life of believers.

As might be expected, Luke had no use either for those who claimed to follow Scripture (at least as they personally understood it) without regard for the church, nor for those (like Rome) whom he saw as trying to put the church above Scripture. His problem with the latter is obvious, and as Peschke observes,<sup>121</sup> those who want Scripture only and reject the other ministrative things are actually spurning the means provided by God himself for their help. Once again, Luke asserts that the Brethren take the middle ground and "follow both together."<sup>122</sup>

As for the canon and translation of Scripture, Luke was content with the Vulgate which had served the church for centuries. He was not impressed by the burgeoning interest of

humanism to go back to Hebrew and Greek sources. As Molnár says: "...his predominating interest in the spiritual essence of the Christian witness did not show a full appreciation for the theological significance of a return *ad fontes*."<sup>123</sup> This is a rather circumloquacious way of saying what Molnár goes on to say more plainly: Luke expresses "a rancorous distaste for education in the biblical tongues."<sup>124</sup> Luke frankly thought that Czech and a little German and Latin were plenty for anyone to know. This does not mean that he was unconcerned about accuracy of biblical translations into the vernacular. Indeed, he expresses great concern for this in the Unity's 1525 translation of the New Testament. It is from the accepted Latin version, however, that he is working. In addition, he voiced great mistrust "of newcomers" (*nováku*) who had recently learned a little Greek and Hebrew and then belittled the Vulgate which had served so well for so long.

Neither did Luke like involved hermeneutics in interpreting Scripture. He preferred to keep as closely as possible to the faith as expressed in the Apostles Creed and the interpretation of the early church, "'according to the real work' and needs of the moment."<sup>125</sup> Indeed, for those who are concerned with a 'fundamentalist' biblical literalism, Molnár's summary of Luke's practice is instructive: "He always paid attention to the time, the person, the places, and the motives of the biblical narratives and history."<sup>126</sup>

Thus, in his view of Scripture, Luke provided the Unity with a balanced approach which placed great value upon the biblical witness, but never forgot what it was that Scripture witnesses to: to God's essential saving work and humanity's

obedient and faithful response. Without going too far in either direction, he held to the timeless truth of Scripture, always remembering that it spoke from a definite time and place to persons living in another definite time and place. As such, his positions on Scripture (perhaps leaving out his opinions on the study of biblical languages) are ones the church today can hear with profit.

One may hear an echo of Luke's view of Scripture in the revision made by the 1995 Unity Synod of the Moravian Church to the statement on "God's Word and Doctrine" in its official statement of faith, *The Ground of the Unity*. The statement as adopted in 1957 could be interpreted as giving Scripture a lofty position indeed: "The Holy Scriptures of both the Old and New Testament are and abide the only source and rule of faith, doctrine, and life of the *Unitas Fratrum*." This had the possibility of being interpreted in a way that gave Scripture excessive weight in all matters whatsoever, of making it an "essential" in fact. Though Luke's name was not the driving force in the discussions that led to a change, the resulting paragraph, which focuses more on what it is that Scripture witnesses to, is completely in line with his principles: "The Triune God as revealed in the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments is the only source of our life and salvation; and this Scripture is the sole standard of the doctrine and faith of the *Unitas Fratrum* and therefore shapes our life."<sup>127</sup>

## **Luke on the Church**

Few have had more regard for or given more attention to the church than Luke of Prague. For all this, he never forgot that the church on earth

is one of the ministrative things, and already in *Bárka* (67,a) he said that in the Creed the Holy Spirit had inspired its authors to place the church following the essential things.<sup>128</sup>

It is true that in the essential/ministrative scheme of his theology. Luke does at times speak of an essential church. By this, in the sense of Wyclif and Hus, he is referring to the “assembly of all the elect.” This church is past, present, and future. Earthly sight cannot discern this church, but this does not mean it is invisible; it is seen by faith and hope in its various members. Luke is careful to say that when the creed speaks of “believing in the church,” this is in a different sense from believing in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As Molnár says, “the essential church is nothing other than the collection (soubor) of those who have real participation in the essential matters of the Christian faith.”<sup>129</sup> It is because of its linkage to the essentials that the church in this sense can be called “essential.” This is the ideal church in which only the saved are gathered. This is the church as the Bride of Christ.

This does not mean that the ideal church does not have time and place. It exists in time and place, but it goes beyond any one time and place. At the same time, no one denomination or group or part of the church can claim to be the essential church.

We may note here that Luke’s scholastic background caused him to postulate also the existence of an “essential church of the damned” to counter-balance the essential church of the elect. That need not detain us further here.

The ministrative church exists to lead a person into the essential church. It is placed on

earth to serve. As Molnár observes: “It is not, then, an end in itself, does not have truth itself in itself, does not even have effect in its own devices. It is a concrete church in whose womb the Christian lives his creaturely communal life.”<sup>130</sup>

Like the essential church, the ministrative church is past, present, and future, but unlike the essential church, it is always of mixed character. In *O puvodu cirkvé* (*On the origin of the church*) Luke follows Petr Chelcicky (and others) in comparing it to a net cast into the sea which gathers both good and bad fish. Yet, in it God’s grace, Christ’s merit, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are given witness in the sacraments (and in the proclamation of Scriptural truth).

Molnár also stresses the importance of the communal nature (koinonia) of the church in Luke’s thought. Indeed, in Luke’s conception, the universality of the church is as important as the salvation of the individual. “The life of faith cannot be lived in solitude. The communion of saints shakes a person loose from personal isolationism.”<sup>131</sup> (The need for other Christians which had led Luke to seek out the Unity in the first place was for him not just a personal preference, but a matter of theological principle.) Luke himself stresses that it was the Unity which had helped him to salvation more than personal reading of the Scripture could have done. Scripture is crucial, but only in Christian fellowship can one effectively enter into Scripture.<sup>132</sup> Molnár continues: “Luke, then, reduces the communal nature of the Christian profession to joint common listening to the tidings of Scripture, joined with common binding of selves to obedience.”<sup>133</sup>

Being a ministrative, the church cannot have the essentials in its power to give or withhold them at will, but it is within this fellowship that God has chosen to dispense the means of grace. In theory, Luke says, if one had perfect faith, one might dispense with the visible church, but reality being what it is, even in such a case the church would be “useful.” In reality, the church is necessary. (O nadeje, 1502).

The ministrative church is manifested in visible assemblies (ve viditelných shromážděních) of Christian people throughout the world.<sup>134</sup> The church is one, but it is composed of many “unities” (jednoty) — what we might call denominations today. Thus the Brethren, the Utraquists, the Romans, etc. are all part of the one true church of Christ, so long as they have their foundation in the truths proclaimed in the Apostles Creed and the essential and ministrative truths of the faith. Even the Brethren are not in themselves alone the one holy universal church outside which no one can be saved. Molnár observes that no theologian could find a better explanation of Christian ecumenicity.<sup>135</sup>

In regard to the Roman church, Luke is not impressed by its claims to be the only church established for salvation. The Roman church is one of the “unities” (a status which some later reformers were not willing to allow it), but it should not, indeed cannot, appropriate to itself the exclusive right to catholicity. As Luke himself says in the *Ceská Apologia* (302): “The Roman church is not universal, so that outside it God would not have any membership or salvation.”<sup>136</sup>

This naturally leads to a consideration of corruption within the church. As was true of

the essential church, the ministrative church has its antithetical church of the devil which tries to undermine and lead astray the true church (in all its “unities”). This is not confined to just one or several times and places, and therefore the reform of the church is a concern which must apply to all Christians. As Luke says in *O obnovení církve*: “The renewing of the church not only *ought* to be, but *must* be.”<sup>137</sup> The reformation of the church is, of course, God’s work, but it is also the work of Christians. And this work consists first in getting rid of what the church itself, not God, has tried to make essential. On the other hand, as we have seen above, the church can hold on to usages which have proven helpful in the past, even though they are not essential. They become harmful only when one confuses them with the essentials.

In accord with his view of the universal church, Luke can look back with favor on the earlier Waldensians, and even to many in the Roman church, such as Bernard of Clairvaux, who had worked for reform. Given the tendency of later scholars to see the Unity only as a precursor of Luther, it is ironic that Luke sees earlier reformers as precursors of the Czech reform movement, and particularly of the Unity, in which God has been pleased to reveal the basis of a true church. Indeed, Luke justifies the existence of the Unity on the ground that it is an “authentic and legitimate” renewal of the Christian church.<sup>138</sup> Closer to home, he sees one purpose of the Unity to be that of recalling the Utraquist church from its half-way measures to its original reforming heritage. Again, this does not mean that the Unity is perfect. Rather, as Molnár observes: “According to Brother Luke the church is always to be reformed (semper reformanda). It is always necessary anew to examine whether it is

in accord with the measuring stick of the essential and ministrative Christian truths, found in holy Scripture and the apostolic confession of faith.”<sup>139</sup> As such, the reform of the church is a process which will continue to the end of time.

We should also note here that while Luke and the Unity were very concerned about the moral life of Christians, ultimately for him the renewal of the church was not primarily a reform of morals. Molnár emphatically states that people are wrong to think that the Unity was very interested in moral reform, but not much concerned with dogmatic considerations of the biblical message. Indeed, he states, morals and dedication of life are only a consequence [albeit a necessary one] of “determined theological conviction.” As he says: “The attention devoted to all of life, for which the Brethren and Luke with them are well known, is only a consequence of a determined theological conviction, which is not undogmatic because it is also ‘practical.’”<sup>140</sup>

Luke did not give a definition of theology in his voluminous writings, but it is clear that he saw its purpose to be the renewal of the church by pointing to the essential and ministrative things in their proper relationship to each other. Just as Scripture proclaims God’s revelation, but is not in itself the full content of that revelation, so theology is to attempt to elucidate further the ramifications of that proclamation. The task of the theologian thus falls into the ministrative sphere, and the theologians must remember that “theology, which is a human attempt at interpreting revelation, cannot contain [that revelation] in all its fulness.”<sup>141</sup> Just as the church can never claim to have reached perfect reformation, so theology can never proclaim

that it has reached its goal. It was in this sense, as Molnár correctly observes, that Luke submitted his theological work to the Unity, “not as to a Catholic imprimatur, but rather this was an expression of the fact that the theologian is of the church and for the church.”<sup>142</sup> This too is a lesson from which some modern theologians might profit.

One interesting aside may also be noted here, particularly in our twentieth century “secular” society. For Luke there is no distinction between secular and religious history. Since everyone on earth is ultimately answerable to God (and will finally belong to the church of God or to that of the devil), all history is ultimately church history.<sup>143</sup>

### **Luke and the Catechism**

It was certainly to be expected that a group like the Unity, which laid such stress upon disciplined living and obedience to God, would provide amply for the instruction of their younger generations in important matters of the faith.<sup>144</sup> Such was indeed the case, and it appears that in the first decades of the Unity older Hussite catechisms for children were used either directly or with slight modifications.<sup>145</sup> The Hussite catechism of Roudnice is one example of these. For forty years or so these Hussite catechisms probably circulated in handwritten form. Typically, it was Brother Luke who refined these various precursors and brought the resulting catechism out in the high technology of the day, that is, in print. So far as we can tell, this was in 1501 or 1502.<sup>146</sup>

Earlier scholars noted the similarities of Luke’s catechism to the *Enterrogaciones ménors*

of the Italian Waldensians and assumed that Luke based his work on this source. It has since been reasonably established that, on the contrary, the Waldensians depended on Luke's catechism and others of his works, as well as their own specific sources.<sup>147</sup> Given Luke's view of the Waldensians after his Italian trip, it is surely unlikely that he slavishly depended on their theological formulations, not to mention his own adherence to materials directly from the Hussite catechism of Roudnice.

Unfortunately, Luke's catechism in its original version is no longer extant. Fortunately, it is preserved in slightly modified form as the first part of his *Otazky trojí* (*Three sorts of questions*) of 1523. This work contains the catechism for children (*Detinské otazky*) as well as his catechism for older youths and his catechism for candidates for the priesthood.<sup>148</sup> The full text of the children's catechism provided by Molnár is taken from this edition.<sup>149</sup>

Two further notes on the intended audience of Br. Luke's catechism: As its title suggests, it is indeed meant to aid in the doctrinal instruction of children. Müller observes, however, that it was also at times used for the instruction of older persons who were preparing for membership in the Unity. In this sense, he says, the word "children" in the title did not refer to physical immaturity, but in the sense of I John 2: 12 etc., it also referred to those who were children in a spiritual sense.<sup>150</sup>

In addition, a cursory look at the questions and answers themselves reveals that many of them are short and simple, as would be expected in a work for young children. Other answers, however, such as those on honoring the saints (nos. 53

and 58 e.g.) and on the Holy Communion (nos. 60ff.), go on for so long and are so involved that one is led to wonder if they were directed rather at the parents and instructors of the children, who were then to communicate this material to the children in whatever ways and in as much detail as were appropriate for them. This supposition is confirmed by Rícan in his remarks on the catechism.<sup>151</sup>

We should also note that also c. 1521 Luke's catechism was translated into German and also printed in 1523 for the benefit of those members of the Unity who used that language. In this form it also circulated in Germany and would have been the version seen by Martin Luther.<sup>152</sup>

I wish I could say that I am the first person to devote any considerable attention in English to Brother Luke's catechism. In fact, however, Edmund de Schweinitz provided some remarks and a translation of it in the *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society* in 1869.<sup>153</sup> By now that in itself qualifies as an historical event, so the catechism merits another look. In addition, de Schweinitz was working not from the Czech, but from the old German translation. This, then, will be a first English look at Br. Luke's original.

We may also note that in the version printed in the *Transactions*, the numbering of the questions gets off following no. 20 because of a misprint, and this makes a comparison of the two versions a little confusing. By and large, the two versions agree, and given the sometimes major disagreements of the Brethren's Czech and German confessions of faith, this is so to a surprising degree. At times the German may split a question and its fuller explanation, and in the article on bowing before the sacrament the

expressions used differ in more than phrasing, though the substance is in agreement. One might indeed do a master's thesis on the extent and significance of the variations that exist between the two versions — but not today.

Let us now have a closer look at Br. Luke's Czech catechism for children with a general overview and a consideration of some details. The catechism as Br. Luke has constructed it consists of 75 questions and answers. As might be expected, it begins with simple and basic things, such as:

1. Who are you? A creature of God, reasoning and mortal.
2. Why did the Lord God make you? That I might know him, worship him, and love him and have his grace to be saved.

As noted above, the answers to other questions, such as the honor due the saints, are more complex and can go on for a page or more:

58. With what honor then is it not proper to honor them? With the sovereign name, fitting for God himself and the Lamb. As it is not fitting to pray to them for grace and for help, to beg them for intercession, not to place hope in them for giving good or preserving from evil; to call the Virgin Mary one's only hope and mediator, intercessor, and most gracious of mothers, or to sigh to her or to rely on these things for merit. This external honor and bowing and service it is not fitting to do, as to consecrate them for veneration, to devote oneself to them in service and to offer oneself, and to make churches and altars and other things in their name, or to take oaths in their name, or to make promises, go on pilgrimages, make fasts, etc.

Luke includes such basic catechismal usuals as the Apostles Creed (question 10), the Ten Commandments (question 17), the Beatitudes (question 30), and the Lord's Prayer (question 45). Interestingly, Bishop de Schweinitz in his footnote to the question on the Beatitudes mentions that the second and third Beatitudes are reversed in Luke's catechism, but does not say why.<sup>154</sup> The answer is simple: Luke, as always, was using the Vulgate for his Scripture quotes, and these two Beatitudes are reversed in that source.

We have seen that the concept of grace played a great role in Br. Luke's theology, and that for all his stress on human obedient response, he insisted that this response was possible only because of God's prior gracious redeeming activity. We would therefore expect this idea to find a place in Luke's catechism, and such is indeed the case at the very onset. In question two as the concluding part of the answer to why God made us, the catechism states: "and have his grace to be saved." In effect, then, Luke is positing grace as the basis of all the details which will follow. Having laid that foundation, however, the body of the catechism itself does not restate this theme with the frequency and emphasis one might have expected. It is not until question 32 that grace is explicitly mentioned again. In response to this question about how many sorts of eternal life there are, the answer says: "Two. One here in grace and in sharing in the Lord Jesus, to whom the faithful come in the spirit through faith. And the second life eternal is in glory in the future..." In question 44 God is called "gracious Father," and in question 53 it is said of the saints that they are "elect of God from grace..." Grace is mentioned again in question 69, but here it is hope "in the

covenant of faith of the law of grace of the New Testament” that is being discussed. The next question (no. 70) cautions that those who rely on God’s grace “without entering it in participation in the Spirit and without penance and propriety of life” are resting on a false hope. Thus, while grace remains the basis, in the catechism itself Luke spends much more time and space on how one is to obey God’s commandments and avoid wrongdoing (e.g. questions 26-28) than he does on the grace which is the basis for this. Typical is question 74, which asks what one has to do to enter into the Unity of the faithful. The answer speaks of submission and obedience and receiving instruction, admonition, warning and punishment [in the church], “and in diligent obedience to the commandments of God and practice fitting for true servants.”

The other core concept of Luke’s theology is of course the distinction of the essential and ministrative things. These matters do appear with prominence in the catechism. Indeed, in answer to question 3, which asks “On what do you depend for your salvation,” the answer is “on the three basic virtues,” which the next question goes on to name as “faith, love, and hope.” Questions 6-14 further define faith and its aspects, and questions 15-17 develop the idea that one who has faith in God will obey God’s commandments. The next questions introduce the idea that one obeys out of love, first for God, and then for one’s neighbor. This then leads to a consideration of Christ, God’s greatest expression of love. It is no surprise that this soon turns into questions on how one obeys the commandments of Christ, which in turn go on to speak of the Holy Spirit giving gifts of faith, love, and hope, that one may indeed have true hope and assurance of eternal

life (questions 31-33 etc.) Thus the essentials from the human response aspect receive great attention in the catechism. The essentials from the divine perspective are of course covered in several questions which speak of God’s gracious will, the saving work of Christ, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. All of this is not explicitly brought together until question 67, however, which asks: “Where is hope and in whom is it true?” The answer is: “In God powerfully, in the merit of Christ, and in the Holy Spirit and his gifts....” The basic framework of Luke’s theology of the essentials is quite clear here, but again surprisingly, while he spends a good deal of space detailing the reverence not proper to give to the saints and sacrament (and other ministratives), the explicit warning about confusing the ministratives with the essentials is not given great voice.

At times in studying the catechism we may echo the sentiment of Luther about Luke: he is not always as clear in his expression as I would wish him to be. Still, the basic ideas of his theology are there, and it is no surprise, given the nature of the work and the Unity’s penchant for giving instruction for obedient living to its members, that it focuses more on practice than it does on theological theory. The theology is the basis for all the rest. The expression and emphasis may differ, but the essence is one.

## **Theology and Luke’s Hymns**

We come now to what promises to be one of the more valuable and hopefully enjoyable parts of this study of Luke the theologian: his hymns. In so much of his writing Luke was addressing the congregation as spiritual administrator. In his hymns he takes his place among the members of

the community as they sing the truths of the faith together. As Molnár observes in “Luc de Prague édifiant la communauté,” Luke was writing here as a member of the church, and his hymns bear the mark of the collective community: “These are hymns of the communion of saints.”<sup>155</sup> This reveals a different aspect of Luke. As Molnár also says, “The very fact of having composed hymns shows how much, despite his pronounced intellectualism, Luke was also thinking with his heart.”<sup>156</sup>

Luke in his hymns expresses astonishment at the grace and love of God which caused God to send the Son to be born on earth. The incarnation is one of his major themes, and this is joined directly with speaking of Christ’s suffering on the cross, for that was the purpose for which he became incarnate. Here again, it is in this respect that the church on earth is to follow its Lord. We find in Luke’s hymns a definite Christ-centeredness, and Molnár notes that even in singing of the creation, Luke never forgets to mention the incarnation of its creator, for this he says, is the “pivot of Luke’s piety.”<sup>157</sup>

Luke wrote many hymns, and scholars generally say that eleven of the pieces in the 1501 hymnal are by him. We recall that the claim of this to be the first hymnal of the Unity is dubious, and Molnár notes that in structure the collection is quite different from later productions in which we have better assurance that Luke was involved as an editor. He also states that the hymns attributed to Luke in the 1501 hymnal also appear in a collection made by Václav Mirínský in 1492. The main significance of this observation is that it thus appears that Luke began to write his hymns soon after he joined the Unity in 1481. His hymns,

then, may have been some of his first theological works (though he himself said Bárka was), but how widely they were used before Luke rose to prominence in the Unity we do not know.

A large number of Luke’s hymns appeared in the hymnals of the old Unity. For instance, in the hymnal of 1618, a copy of which is in the collection of the Moravian Music Foundation, though authors are not given in the printed text, notes in the handwriting of the period attribute pieces to Luke throughout the first half of the collection (the handwritten notes stop after that). References to Luke (and others) which we have been able to check appear accurate, so this source seems fairly reliable.

Luke, not surprisingly, remains a popular author in modern Czech hymnals. The 1954 hymnal of the Jednota bratrská (renewed Moravian Church) lists eleven hymns by him. The 1978 hymnal of the Czech Evangelical Brethren’s Church contains fourteen of his works. Outside the Czech lands his hymns are not so well represented. For instance, in the 1967 hymnal of the Continental Province of the Moravian Church (Evangelische Brüdergemein) there are only two hymns attributed to Luke.

In the English speaking lands, the 1912 hymnal of the British Province of the Moravian Church had one hymn of Luke. This same hymn was also the only one by Luke in the 1923 American Moravian hymnal, and since this is also one of the two Luke hymns in the German Moravian hymnal, I suppose this makes it a candidate for the “most popular” of Luke’s hymns in translation. Unfortunately, it happens to be a burial hymn, which means it would not be a

frequently used one in main Sunday services. Both the German and English translations are based on Michael Weisse's 1531 German version. Both the American and British books used Catharine Winkworth's 1858 translation:

Now lay we calmly in the grave  
This form, whereof no doubt we have  
That it shall rise again that day  
In glorious triumph o'er decay.

His trials and his griefs are past;  
A blessed end is his at last;  
He bore Christ's yoke, and did his will;  
And though he died he liveth still.

And so to earth again we trust  
What came from dust, and turns to dust,  
And from the dust shall surely rise  
When the last trumpet fills the skies.

Then let us leave him to his rest,  
And homeward turn, for he is blest,  
And we must well our souls prepare,  
When death shall come, to meet him there.

His soul is living now in God,  
Whose grace his pardon hath bestowed,  
Who through his Son redeemed him here  
From bondage unto sin and fear.

So help us, Christ, our Hope in loss;  
Thou hast redeemed us by thy cross  
From endless death and misery;  
We praise, we bless, we worship thee.

In the 1975 hymnal of the British Province of the Moravian Church this hymn no longer appears, but there is a recast version of J.C.

Jacobi's 1732 translation of Michael Weisse's 1531 German version ("Christus, der uns selig macht") of Luke's hymn "Moudrost boha otce prawda," which in itself was his Czech adaptation of the 14th century Latin "Patris sapientia veritas divina." This is an eight stanza account of Christ's arrest, torture, trial and crucifixion. It speaks with feeling of Christ's willing suffering for us, and the last stanza is typical of the Brethren's constant concern: May we ever weigh the cause/ Of thy death and suffering./ And hearts set to keep thy laws/ Bring as a thank-offering.

The American Moravian hymnal of 1969 did not contain any of Luke's hymns. The 1995 *Moravian Book of Worship* has but one. Fortunately, this is Jaroslav Vajda's fine translation of "Kristus prikklad pokory," which appears in English as "Christ, the model of the meek." Note too that this is translated from the Czech, and not from a German intermediary as was the case in the other English language Moravian hymnals.

In this translation (*MBW* no. 336) it may be seen that Luke has provided a simple yet touching account of Christ's incarnation and suffering. Here Luke does not engage in convoluted theological systems, but builds his hymn through poignant scenes from the life of Christ. Effectively contrasted are the glory to which the eternal Son is entitled and the extreme poverty and rejection which he willingly endured for our salvation. Christ is indeed the model of meekness in every stage of his life, from his manger bed, flight into Egypt, and daily toil, to his humiliation and death on the cross. All this he did for the flock committed to him, and he continues to care for and guide this flock to eternity. In continuity with

the rest of Luke's theology, there is indeed "faith's reward" for the faithful at the end, but it comes not in striving for glory, but rather in following the narrow and humble way shown and lived by Christ himself.

## Conclusions

It is ironic that Luke, city born and educated, was precisely the sort of person the "old Guard" in the last decades of the 15<sup>th</sup> century wanted to keep out of the Unity. Instead, he ended up leading it in new directions its founders could not imagine. It was Br. Luke whose efforts and influence played such a key role in allowing the Unity to become a "jednota," a denomination, within the holy catholic [not Roman only] church, rather than a self-rendering sect such as some other Hussite factions had become. At the same time, he asserted its own theological and disciplinary principles so that the Unity did not waste its strength in hepeless efforts to accommodate everyone, as the Czech Utraquist establishment too often did. This independence itself brought new dangers, for to the Romans the Unity was still anathema, to Luther it was still too focused on works, and to the Reformed it was still too open to usages of the past.

It is not going too far to say that although Br. Gregory laid the foundations of the Unity, Br. Luke was the architect who built the church upon them. All this being so, it is still necessary to remember that Br. Luke did not do this alone, but had the support and at times the guidance of the Brn. Prokop, Klenovsky, Krasonicky, and others. One can never forget that the theological process of the Unity was collegial in nature. Indeed, one

surprising strength of the Unity was that it had no Luther or Calvin which it canonized as the interpreter of Scriptural truth.

Luke and the Unity were convinced that theology, as a human attempt to explain the things of God, could never be complete or static. One hopes that the theological process is actively assisted by the Holy Spirit, but it remains a human, not a divine, production. In this speaks the voice of Luke. The Unity explicitly declared that it was not forever bound by the theological expressions of Gregory, nor by those of Luke (though they returned to him in part), and it was thus spared the necessity of trying to make later and clearer understandings conform to an incomplete measuring stick of the past.

Luke did not invent this concept, but he refined it and provided it room to work. We cannot stress too highly again that in the Unity Luke found not the safe haven of ready-made answers to all questions, but rather a community of grace in which those questions could be profitably framed and explored. This is fully in accord with Luke's reminding the church on earth that it is not a triumphal procession singing its choruses of praise in glory, but rather the company of those who humbly follow the Lamb once slain!

As we have seen, Luke had much of value to say to the church in the areas of Scripture and the church. In the main, however, it is the process, not so much the specific formulations, of Luke that we might follow today — not his medieval scholasticism, but his respect for traditional wisdom while resolutely confronting head-on the theological questions of the present age.

His was also a pastoral theology when it needed to be. For instance, Luther may have been right about the number of sacraments being two, not seven, but Luke in this instance may have been willing to forego the rigors of scholarship in a scholastic manner in order to give comfort to souls, particularly to those who had left the Roman church, but needed assurance that the familiar means of grace were indeed still operative. It may seem ironic too that Luke had led the rejection of works righteousness in the 1490s, but in discussions with Luther he raised the dangers of faith without works. His concern, as always, was that the flock committed to his care receive proper guidance and help in living the lives to which they were called in faith, love, and hope.

Indeed, for Luke, grace is always paramount in this. Doing good works depends on grace, and unlike Roman theology, he did not see virtue as a power of our human will. Refusing to do good works is, however, our choice, and the sort of faith that is associated with this refusal is trying to build salvation on false hope. Neither course was acceptable. Similarly, the sacraments are not magic charms for salvation, nor are they merely empty symbols. They are rather manifestations of grace which we, again by grace, may receive.

Luke traveled more perhaps than any other member of the Jednota bratrská before Comenius (Komensky). Through his reading he traveled intellectually farther still. Yet his far-ranging experience (physical, mental, and spiritual) always led him home to the Unity, bringing what good he could find from abroad and cherishing and enriching the good he knew at home. The faith which he and members of the Unity shared had been tested by years of persecution and internal

examination. Those who are amazed that he dared to disagree with Luther on theology and discipline should bear these facts in mind.

We lament that Br. Luke was not a better literary stylist, but the theological legacy he nourished and passed on was a solid one. It surfaces today, as in the 1995 revision to the Moravian Church *Ground of the Unity*, and in the prayers of intercession in the Advent 1 liturgy of the 1995 *Moravian Book of Worship* (the latter of which were consciously based on his concept of the essentials). As we have seen, his theological perspective is one that the church today could examine more fully with benefit. Luke deserves it, and the church today needs it.

#### **(endnotes)**

<sup>1</sup> A.G. Dickens and John Tonkin (with Kenneth Powell), *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985) p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Josef Smolik, "Martin Luther and Luke of Prague," *Communio Viatorum* XXVII (1984); and F.M. Bartos, "L'Unité des Frères Tchèques et les Réformateurs," *Communio Viatorum* XXI (1978). The latter was written several years (in 1956 in fact) before its publication.

<sup>3</sup> Jarold K. Zeman, *The Hussite Movement and Reformation in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia (1350-1650): A Bibliographic Study Guide*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Michigan Slavic Publications, 1977).

<sup>4</sup> Marianka S. Fousek, "The Perfectionism of the Early *Unitas Fratrum*," *Church History* 30 (1961): 396-413; Milos Strupl's "The Confessional Theology of the *Unitas Fratrum*." *Church History* 33 (1964): 279-293.

<sup>5</sup> Joseph Theo. Müller, *Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder*, 3 vols. (Herrnhut: Missionsbuchhandlung, 1922-1931). Volume I of this appeared in a Czech translation by F.M. Bartos, *Dejiny Jednoty Bratrské* (Prague: Nákladem Jednoty Bratrské, 1923); Erhard Peschke, *Die Theologie der Böhmisches Brüder in ihrer Frühzeit, Vol. I: Das Abendmahl, Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart, 1935); Edmund de Schweinitz, *The History of the Church Known as the Unitas Fratrum or The Unity of the Brethren, Founded by the followers of John Hus, the Bohemian Reformer and Martyr*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publications Office, 1901); Rudolf Rican, *The History of the Unity of the Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, tr. Daniel C. Crews (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Church, 1992). Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* (The Hague [‘s-Gravenhag]: Mouton, 1957).

<sup>6</sup> Zemen, *The Anabaptists and the Czech Brethren in Moravia 1526-1628: A Study of Origins and Contacts* (The Hague: Mouton, 1969), 200, n. 101.

<sup>7</sup> Molnár, *Bratr Lukas, Bohoslovec Jednoty* (Prague: Kalich, 1948), hereafter cited as BL.

<sup>8</sup> Müller, I:238; Brock, 105, says he was born “shortly before 1460.”

<sup>9</sup> Rican, 49.

<sup>10</sup> Molnár, “Etudes et conversion de Luc de Prague,” *Communio Viatorum* 3 (1960), 255.

<sup>11</sup> Brock, 106.

<sup>12</sup> Molnár, *Communio Viatorum* 3 (1960), 257; BL, 10; Müller, I, 238; Rican, 255; Rican, 50. The Czech (*Dejiny*, p. 59) reads: “Konecne Buh své má vzdy nekde, a by jich nebylo, musili

bychom zahynouti.”

<sup>13</sup> Molnár BL, p. 11ff. See also Rican, p. 50.

<sup>14</sup> Brock, 106.

<sup>15</sup> Müller, I, 238. See also Brock, p. 107.

Molnár, *Communio Viatorum* 3 (1960), 259, speculates that Luke may have heard something of the Brethren before this, but in a negative sense.

<sup>16</sup> Brock, 106.

<sup>17</sup> Molnár BL, p. 13f.: “Kdoz hledá pokladu skrytého jako stanu archy na hore... nalezá. (from *O obnoveni*, 35b-36a.).

<sup>18</sup> Brock, p. 111, notes that Luke’s *O obnoveni církve svaté* is the primary source for learning of these disputes. For extracts of this work see Jaroslav Goll, *Chelcicky a Jednota v XV století*, ed. Kamil Krofta (Prague: Nákladem Historického Klubu, 1916), pp. 198-205.

<sup>19</sup> De Schweinitz, 173.

<sup>20</sup> See also Brock, 242.

<sup>21</sup> Brock, 229.

<sup>22</sup> Brock, 113, notes that even at this stage Kostka had not been forced to give up all his responsibilities and perquisites of nobility.

<sup>23</sup> Brock, 142.

<sup>24</sup> De Schweinitz, 176.

<sup>25</sup> Müller, I:249.

<sup>26</sup> Fousek, 400, 405 f.

<sup>27</sup> Müller, I:251.

<sup>28</sup> Actually, Luke’s very first work of which we know (from an account by his friend Vavrinec) was written for Jews he met in Constantinople. But this was a private writing, and Luke saw himself as totally in the service of the Unity, so he can refer to *Barka* as his first work. See Molnár BL, 107 f. For more on *Barka* see Molnár, *Communio Viatorum* 4 (1961), 194-99.

<sup>29</sup> Rican, 64.

<sup>30</sup> Müller, I:251 f., Molnár *BL*, p. 12.

<sup>31</sup> Molnár *BL*, p. 18: “pro presvedceni o koinonické povaze krestanského poznani vyprosoval vysledkum sveho bohosloveckého mysleni souhlas Jednoty.”

<sup>32</sup> Brock, 148.

<sup>33</sup> Brock, 146; Müller, I:256; Brock, 147 n. 42 ;and Molnár in his “Luc de Prague devant la crise de l’Unité des années 1490” in *Communio Viatorum* 4 (1961), 223 n. 11 explicitly disagree over the interpretation of the Czech verb “vyzdvihnutí,” i.e. whether the Rychnov synod “re-established” or “abolished” the Brandys synod’s statement. They agree that the threat of division was there in any case.

<sup>34</sup> Bartos, 177; Müller I:271.

<sup>35</sup> Strupl, 283.

<sup>36</sup>Rican, 68.

<sup>37</sup>Molnár *BL*, p. 14: “Zduraznuje tu vytrvale neprekotnost a nesevolnost bratrského pocinu k nemuz doslo z naprotého nezbytí, z nouze spasení” (from *O pricinách oddelení*, 1496).

<sup>38</sup>Brock, 178. says that part of the reason for Luke’s going to Rome was concern over the influence of “pagan humanist tendencies.” See also Molnár, *Communio Viatorum* 5 (1962), 28.

<sup>39</sup>Rican, 70; *Dejiny*, p. 80: “nenasel nez stolice a stoly penezomencu a prodavace holubic, ovcí etc. a obrokov, prebend, odpustkuv a krátce vseho.” See also Müller, I:273 f.

<sup>40</sup> Rican, p. 70. *Dejiny*, p. 81: ““neni proc k nim jítí, ale spravdlivejší by bylo, aby oni k jiným chodili.”

<sup>41</sup> Molnár *BL*, p. 12: “Zklamání z techto vyprav nenarusilo jeho víru v jednu církev obecnou.”

<sup>42</sup> Molnár, “Luc de Prague, édifiant la communauté,” *Communio Viatorum* 5 (1962),

189.

<sup>43</sup> Müller, I:277 f.

<sup>44</sup> Müller, I:295, 298 f. Molnár *BL*, 16. See also de Schweinitz, 182.

<sup>45</sup> Lissa Folio 6, Book 12, p. 3, film 354, trans. Andrew Slaby. Moravian Archives, Bethlehem.

<sup>46</sup> The feast of St. Lucy the Virgin was December 13.

<sup>47</sup> Lissa Folio 5, Book 11, p. 196, film 351, trans. Andrew Slaby. Moravian Archives, Bethlehem.

<sup>48</sup> Rican, 75.

<sup>49</sup> Br. Prokop apparently receded in prominence at about this time. He died in 1507. Rican, 75.

<sup>50</sup> Rican, 103 f. See also Müller, I:296.

<sup>51</sup> Rican, 91.

<sup>52</sup> De Schweinitz, 183.

<sup>53</sup> De Schweinitz, 184 f.

<sup>54</sup> Rican, 92 f.

<sup>55</sup> Lissa Folio 6, Books 13, p. 196ff. and 14, p. 7-15, films 31-33. Slaby translation.

<sup>56</sup> Rican, p. 95 ff.

<sup>57</sup> De Schweinitz, 197 f.; Rican, 101. For more details and a slightly more positive view of Suda’s actions see Molnár, “Pasteur dans le tormento,” *Communio Viatorum* 6 (1963), 282f.

<sup>58</sup> Brock, 207.

<sup>59</sup> De Schweinitz, 198.

<sup>60</sup> De Schweinitz, 228, places his death in 1517, but both Müller I:390 and Rican , 102 agree that it was actually 1518.

<sup>61</sup> Müller, I, 395. See his note 285 for explanation of his dating of this trip then.

<sup>62</sup> De Schweinitz, 230.

<sup>63</sup> De Schweinitz, 229-231; Rican, 106 f.; Molnár, “The Brethren’s Theology,” in Rican, 417.

<sup>64</sup> Müller, I:396. There is some disagreement over the amount of knowledge concerning the

Bohemian reformation which was circulating in Germany before the Lutheran reformation. De Schweinitz (p. 231f. ) says not much notice was taken of it, but F.M. Bartos, 36 says that the writings of the Unitas Fratrum were “buzzing” there.

<sup>65</sup> De Schweinitz, 233.

<sup>66</sup> Rican, 57, 111.

<sup>67</sup> Rican, 113.

<sup>68</sup> Rican, 114.

<sup>69</sup> De Schweinitz, 236. Rican, p. 116, agrees.

<sup>70</sup> De Schweinitz, p. 236, though see also Rican, 111f., 118. See also Molnár, “The Brethren’s Theology,” in Rican, 393.

<sup>71</sup> Bartos, 39.

<sup>72</sup> De Schweinitz, 238 f.

<sup>73</sup> Rican, 120.

<sup>74</sup> De Schweinitz, 239. For a detailed account, see Jarold Zeman, *The Anabaptists and the Czech Moravian Brethren in Moravia 1526-1628*, especially pp. 207-210.

<sup>75</sup> De Schweinitz, 239.

<sup>76</sup> Rican, 120.

<sup>77</sup> *BL*, 5: “v kvet nevsedního puvabu.” More soberly, though just as appreciatively, Molnár cites F.M. Dobiáš’ *Učení Jednoty bratrské o večeri Páne (The Teaching of the Unity of Brethren Concerning the Lord’s Supper)* as saying that Luke is the best theologian of the Czech reformation in general.

<sup>78</sup> *BL*, p. 6: “Lukás je nejvíce systemisujícím myslitelem české reformace.”

<sup>79</sup> Müller, I:458. 462.

<sup>80</sup> *BL*, 6.

<sup>81</sup> Müller, I:456. See 535-577 for his topical and chronoglogical listing of Luke’s works.

<sup>82</sup> Müller, I:457.

<sup>83</sup> Molnár *BL*, 5-7.

<sup>84</sup> Bartos, 32:.

<sup>85</sup> Molnár *BL*, 7.

<sup>86</sup> Rican, 67; de Schweinitz, 178.

<sup>87</sup> Rican, 123.

<sup>88</sup> Rican, 123.

<sup>89</sup> Molnár *BL*, 18.

<sup>90</sup> *BL*, 16.

<sup>91</sup> Molnár *BL*, 50. See also Strupl, 285.

<sup>92</sup> Molnár *BL*, 52.

<sup>93</sup> Molnár *BL*, 50-54.

<sup>94</sup> Molnár *BL*, 54: “Bylo spíše nástrojem, jehož nedokonalosti se pokoušel vysvetlit, co v srdci chapál tak dobre: ze totiz Kristus je prítomen v cirkvi a ve vericím...”

<sup>95</sup> Rican, 163 f.

<sup>96</sup> Müller, I:463.

<sup>97</sup> Molnár *BL*, 6: “velmi nesvetlá a neprijemná.”

<sup>98</sup> Müller, I:457 f.

<sup>99</sup> Brock, 288.

<sup>100</sup> Molnár *BL*, 6.

<sup>101</sup> Smolik, 247.

<sup>102</sup> Smolík, 247. Brock, 237, notes that Luke was a great promoter of popular education, but did not favor Latin for all.

<sup>103</sup> *BL*, 6.

<sup>104</sup> E.g. Molnár *BL*, 36, 39, 43. See also Strupl, 283.

<sup>105</sup> Molnár *BL*, 6.

<sup>106</sup> Molnár *BL*, 28: “...ctnost nadeje spocívá práve v zoufalství nad lidskými možnostmi. ‘Nebo ne na nás myslí Buoh ustavuje nadeji, ale nás mysl ustavuje v nadeji skrze úmluvu svou.’”

<sup>107</sup> Müller, I:466.

<sup>108</sup> Bartos, 37.

<sup>109</sup> *BL*, 8.

<sup>110</sup> “‘v dobe Lukasove rozvinul se [nábozensky život Jednoty] nejzdarnejí v samostatny

reformacní typ.” Cited in Molnár *BL*, 8.

<sup>111</sup> Bartos, 31. See also Brock, 206.

<sup>112</sup> Rican, 121. *Dejiny*, 132: “Summou nikdá muze takového v Jednote nebylo. Dej nám a stádcí svému Pán Buh mnoho tak verných a pilných, ucených a nedadoucích se premoci muzu.”

<sup>113</sup> Molnár, “The Brethren’s Theology,” in Rican, 406.

<sup>114</sup> *BL*, p. 57: “Je proto pochybené, chce-li jít církev cestou slávy uz na této zemi.”

<sup>115</sup> *BL*, p. 57: “Buh vsak práve bláznovstvím kríze určil krestanum a církvi cestu k následování.”

<sup>116</sup> Unless otherwise noted, materials for Luke’s view of Scripture are from Molnár *BL*, pp. 81-85. See also Müller, I:462-464 for a complementary account.

<sup>117</sup> *BL*, 82 f.: “Bez kázanie ctenie svatého zadny zriegeného spasenie nepozná ani jeho z viery duojde. [Proto] kazeme ctenie prede vsemi svátostmi i pri svátostech i po svátostech, abychom najprv lid v podstate viery a pokanie ctením vzdelávali.”

<sup>118</sup> *BL*, 82: “Prítom vsak, není biblické slovo bezprostředním slovem Božím.”

<sup>119</sup> *BL*, 82: “Biblické slovo lidské je tedy vlastne jenom svedectvím o zjevení slova Božího, které se v Kristu — a pouze v nem — stalo telem.”

<sup>120</sup> *BL*, 82: “Je treba peclive rozlisovati ‘mezi zevnitřím písmem zakona, cernidlem, papírem neb pergaménem a ctenami zevnotřními a mezi vnitřní pravdou v tom zavrenou.” (Luke said this in a work addressed to Vavrinec Krasonicky in 1519.)

<sup>121</sup> Peschke, 143 ff.

<sup>122</sup> *BL*, p. 84: “obojího následovali spolu...” (To Vavrinec, 1519).

<sup>123</sup> *BL*, p. 84: “...i jeho prevládající zájem

o duchovní podstatu krestanské zvesti nedocenoval theologicky vyznam návratu *ad fontes*.”

<sup>124</sup> *BL*, p. 84: “nevrazilou nechut k jazykovému vzdelání biblicistickému.”

<sup>125</sup> *BL*, p. 85: “podle skutečné práce a potreby chvíle.” (in *Odpoved na spis prazsky*, 1519).

<sup>126</sup> *BL*, p. 85: “Dbal vzdy casu, osoby, místa i příčiny biblického vyprávění a deje.” (*Zpravy knezké*, 9). See also Müller, I:462.

<sup>127</sup> *Church Order of the Unitas Fratrum*, 1995, p. 14.

<sup>128</sup> Unless otherwise noted, details of Luke’s ecclesiology are from Molnár’s excellent summary in *BL*, 72-80. Additional material from *BL* 11-18 will be footnoted separately. See also Müller, I:459-462 for a complementary account.

<sup>129</sup> *BL*, 73: “Podstatná církev není nic jiného nez soubor tech kdo mají skutecnou účastnost podstatných věcí krestanské víry.”

<sup>130</sup> *BL*, 74: “Není tedy sama sobe cílem, nemá pravdu sama v sobe, ano nemá ani pusobivost z vlastních prostredku. Je konkrétní církvi, v jejímz lune zije Krestan svuj bytostne obecenstevní zivot.”

<sup>131</sup> *BL*, p. 75: “Zivot víry nemuze byti zit v osamelosti. Obecenství svatých vytrhuje cloveka ze sobecké izolovanosti.”

<sup>132</sup> *BL*, p. 12.

<sup>133</sup> *BL*, p. 13: “Koinonickou povahu krestanského poznání zredukoval tedy Lukás na spolecne, obecenstevní naslouchání zvesti Písma, spojené se sourucivym zavázáním se k poslusnosti.”

<sup>134</sup> *BL*, p. 75.

<sup>135</sup> *BL*, p. 75.

<sup>136</sup> *BL*, 76. “Církev rímská není obecná, by Buh

krome ní nemel ouduo a spasencuo.”

<sup>137</sup> *BL*, 78. “Obnovení církve netoliko melo, ale z potreby byti muselo.”

<sup>138</sup> *BL*, 15. “autentickým a legitimním.”

<sup>139</sup> *BL*, 80. “Podle Bratra Lukáše je církev semper reformanda. Jest treba vzdy znovu zkoumati, vyhovuje-li merítku podstatnych i sluzebnych pravd krestanskych, dosvedcenych v Pisme svatém a v apostolském vyznání víry.”

<sup>140</sup> *BL*, 16 f. “Pozornost venovaná vsednímu zivotu, jíz se Bratří a Lukás s nimi vyznacovali, je teprve dusledkem urcitého theologického presvedcení, jez není adogmatické proto, ze je také ‘praktické.’”

<sup>141</sup> *BL*, 17. “Bohosloví, jsouc lidskym pokusem o interpretaci zjevení, nemuze je obsáhnouti v plnosti.”

<sup>142</sup> *BL*, 18. “Neslo tu o katolické imprimatur, nybrz spíše o vyjádření, ze bohosloví je z církve a pro církev....”

<sup>143</sup> See *BL*, 76 f.

<sup>144</sup> See Müller, I:297.

<sup>145</sup> *BL*, 115.

<sup>146</sup> Müller, I:297.

<sup>147</sup> *BL*, 118; Müller, I:297 f. For an earlier view, see Gerhard von Zezschwitz in his *Die Katechismen der Waldenser und Böhmisches Brüder* (Erlangen, 1863).

<sup>148</sup> Müller, I:481, 503 f. See also Molnár, “Luc de Prague édifiant la communauté,” *Communio Viatorum* 5 (1962), 193.

<sup>149</sup> *BL*, 120-133.

<sup>150</sup> Müller, I:481.

<sup>151</sup> Rícan, 103.

<sup>152</sup> Rícan, 104; *BL*, 118.

<sup>153</sup> Edmund de Schweinitz, “Catechism of the Bohemian Brethren,” *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society* 3 (1869): 90-106.

<sup>154</sup> De Schweinitz, “Catechism,” 99.

<sup>155</sup> Molnár, “Luc de Prague,” 192: Citations of Molnár's remarks on Luke's hymns are from this source.

<sup>156</sup> Molnár, 192. “Le fait même d'avoir composé des cantiques montre combien, malgré son intellectualisme prononcé, Luc pensait aussi par son coeur.”

<sup>157</sup> Molnár, 193. “C'est elle qui est le pivot de la piété de Luc.”