The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement in its European Context

David R. Holeton (Toronto)

When the subject of the Bohemian Reformation is raised in casual conversation, if people have heard of it at all they will usually remember Jan Hus and the chalice.[1] In the popular mind as well as in reality, the eucharist (at least symbolically) was at the very heart of the reform movement in Bohemia. The chalice became the symbol emblazoned on the flags and shields of Hussite armies; Jan Žižka [of the Chalice][2] as well as catholic crusaders would send men, women and children to their deaths because of their eucharistic beliefs;[3] debate about eucharistic rite and vesture remained a constant feature of Bohemian life from the time of Jan Milíč until well after the suppression of Utraquism following the Hapsburg victory at Bilá Hora[4]. While some of the achievements of the Bohemian eucharistic movement have been well studied, they have infrequently been put into the context of the

1) In a major recent study, Miri Rubin (*Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* [Cambridge, 1991]) completely ignores the eucharistic movement in Bohemia.

2) When, in 1421, Žižka captured the small fortress of Trebusín near Litoměřice, he appropriated the site for his own use, replaced the wooden structure with one made from stone and called the new castle "Kalich" (Chalice). Thereafter he styled himself no longer as Jan Žižka z Troconova but, instead, Jan Žižka z Kalicha. Frederick G. Heymann, *John Žižka and the Hussite Revolution* (New York 1955) 218–19.

3) Laurence of Březová [*Historia Hussitica* in Jaroslav Goll ed., *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum* V (Prague 1893)] singles out eucharistic heresy as a principal reason for Žižka's burning of the Adamites at Klokoty in 1421. [*Historia Hussitica*, 475f.] Similarly, Laurence [385–86] recounts the deaths of Václav, priest of Arnostovice, his curate, three peasants and four children aged seven, eight, ten and eleven, who were arrested by Albert of Austria on his way to the assistance of Sigismund. Interrogated and tortured in an unsuccessful attempt to have them renounce their Utraquism, they were sent to the stake where they died, the priest Wenceslas holding the children to himself. Such deaths for the chalice came to play an important rôle in the prosæ written for the feast of S. Jan Hus. [cf. D. R. Holeton, "*'O felix Bohemia – O felix Constantia'*: the Liturgical Commemoration of Saint Jan Hus", forthcoming.] Bohuslav Bílejovský, kept this memory alive in his *Kronyka cýrkewní* [*Ecclesiastical Chronicle*] (Prague 1537). [Cf. Zdeněk V. David, "Bohuslav Bílejovský and the Religious *Via Media*: Czech Utraquism in the Sixteenth Century", n. 29 below.

4) The Counter-reformers had a monumental task to extirpate the well-established eucharistic piety of the Utraquists. Long after Bilá Hora, tractates continued to be written and circulated against both the chalice and against the communion of infants.

"Czech Contribution to World Culture Past and Present". It will be the purpose of this paper to do so.

I) Frequent Communion

The frequency with which the sacrament has been received has varied from age to age.[5] If we are to take the Acts of the Apostles [2:42] as historically descriptive, daily communion was the norm in at least some parts of the apostolic church. Hippolytus (c. 215) refers to the practice of Christians taking the eucharistized bread home so that it could be received on weekdays when the eucharist normally was not celebrated.[6] In his exposition of the Lord's Prayer (c. 250) Cyprian said that the phrase "give us today our daily bread" could be understood both spiritually and literally for "we receive the eucharist daily as food for our salvation".[7] Here is evidence that daily communion was commonplace in his part of North Africa in the third century.[8] Patristic evidence abounds supporting dominical reception of the eucharist by *all* the baptized as an integral part of the celebration.[9] But, by the sixth century, there was a sharp drop in the frequency with which the laity

---

5) An exhaustive modern study of this subject has yet to be achieved. Much information can be garnered from the various studies on different aspects of communion practice by the German Jesuit Peter Browe. His *De frequenti communione in Ecclesia occidentali usque ad annum c. 1000 documenta varia* [Textus et documenta, Series Theologica 5] (Rome 1932) presents a basic collection of texts primarily from the patristic period. More information about the mediæval period, which is most relevant to this present study can be gained from Browe's *Die häuflige Kommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1938); "Die öftere Kommunion der Laien im Mittelater", *Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge* 6 (1929) 1–28; *Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1940); "Die Pflichtkommunion der Laien im Mittelalter", *Theologie und Glaube* 20 (1928) 625–641; "Die Kommunion der Heiligen im Mittelalter", *Stimmen der Zeit* 117 (1929) 425–437; "Die Kommunionandach im Altertum und Mittelalter", *Jahrbüch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 13 (1933) 45–64. Other, briefer, studies of the subject are either succeeded by those of Browe or else are derivative.

6) *Apostolic Tradition*, 37. Cf. Geoffrey Cuming, *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* [Grove Liturgical Study No. 8] (Bramcote 1976) nn. 3–7.

7) *De dominica oratione*, 18 (*CCL* 3A,101)

8) It is difficult to tell if this was only in the context of a domestic meal during times of persecution (*Epistula* 58,1; *CSEL* 3,ii, 657) when a particle of the eucharistized bread taken home from the Sunday eucharist (cf. the 'miraculous' account related in *De lapsis* 26; *CCL* 3, 235) was received along with a consecrated cup of wine or if this was a weekday "stational" eucharist to which Tertullian witnessed earlier as North African practice (*De oratione* 19; *CSEL* 20, 192).

9) Cf. Browe, *De frequenti communione*, 10–35. The Bohemian reformers made a large collection of these texts to justify their own practice. Cf. D. R. Holeton, *La Communion des tout-petits enfants: Etude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohème vers la fin du Moyen-Age* [Bibliotheca «Ephemerides Liturgicae» «Subsidia» 50] (Rome 1989) 257–283.

(and sometimes even the clergy[10]) received communion. From the sixth century onward, there were numerous attempts to enforce a minimum number of required communions: sometimes weekly,[11] sometimes relatively frequently but only periodically,[12] sometimes monthly,[13] or even just three times a year.[14] These measures seem to have met with little success. From the eighth century, annual communion increasingly became the general practice.[15] This *de facto* norm became the legal minimum when, in 1215, Canon 21 of Lateran IV established communion at Easter as obligatory[16] in order to maintain good standing in the church.[17]

---

10) On priests not receiving communion at the masses they celebrated cf. Adolph Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1902) 77f.

11) The Council of Mâcon (585) legislated weekly communion and Charlemagne made this one aspect of his campaign for ecclesial reform. Theologians such as Walafred Strabo (c. 840) and Regino of Prüm (906) promoted it. Regino's commendation found its way into the canonical collections of Burchard of Worms, Yves of Chartres and, then, into Gratian. Various penitentials, such as those of Cummean, Monte Cassino and Theodore of Canterbury preserved weekly communion either as a desired goal or as a rule.

12) Theodulph of Orleans († 821) tried to enjoin weekly communion during Lent and daily communion from Maundy Thursday to Easter Day. This was adopted by other contemporary French bishops like Raoul of Bourges (c. 840–868) and Amalar of Metz († c. 850).

13) When and where weekly communion appeared to be an unobtainable goal, councils and bishops tried to legislate monthly communion [e. g. the Councils of Elvira (c. 306) and Sardicia (343/4)] and threatened with excommunication those who had not communicated for three weeks. A Bavarian Synod (c. 740/50) recommended communion every three or four weeks, a discipline later imposed by Hérard of Tours († 871).

14) In time, as it became clear that more frequent communion was not being observed by the faithful, councils and bishops enjoined three communions annually (Christmas, Easter and Pentecost) occasionally adding a fourth (Maundy Thursday). Hence the Synods of Agde (506), Autun (663–80), Tours (813), Estergom (1114). While the Synod of Estergom required the laity to do penance and communicate three times annually, it only required clerics to communicate on major festivals. Cf. C. Peterfy ed., *Sacra Concilia Ecclesiæ Romano-Catholicæ in Regno Hungariæ* (Posoni 1741) 56 col. 1.

15) Peter Comestor († 1178) notes this tendency and deplores it. "At present, the times are bad and virtually degenerate and worthless. That is why, with the tacit permission of the church, the custom (for I hardly dare call it a law) is established that everyone must communicate annually. Not to do so is a crime." *Serm.* 16; *PL* 198,1765.

16) But even this Canon foresaw the possibility of a Christian abstaining from the sacrament for longer time "for a good reason and on the advice of their own priest ...".

17) The reasons for this gradual diminution of frequency of communion are diverse and complex and cannot be discussed fully here. Some of the major contributing factors were: the evangelization of whole nations but with limited sacramental catechesis, an alienation of the laity from active participation in the liturgy through the retention of Latin rather than the vernacular as the language of the liturgy, the insistence on abstinence from the eucharist for a number of days (or weeks) after sexual intercourse, the dimished sense of the *eucharistia*

While the scholastic theologians who followed Lateran IV were keen on encouraging more frequent communion, they managed to entrench a piety which demanded of the would-be communicant the dispositions of perfection and consequently had the effect of discouraging frequent reception of the sacrament.[18] Ironically, even those who exhibited these dispositions of perfection were usually discouraged from frequent reception by their confessors.[19]

Thirteenth century Flanders was the centre of a eucharistic movement which was to have a profound effect on western eucharistic piety. Born, in part, out of a desire to make reparations to the sacrament for the abuse it suffered at the hands of the Cathars and Waldensians among others, the movement engendered an increasing love for and devotion to Jesus present

in the host. The most long lasting products of this movement were the feast of *Corpus Christi*, elevations of the host and (a century later) the chalice during mass, exposition of the sacrament and processions of the blessed

---

of all the faithful in favour of the mass as a sacerdotal activity in which, during the canon, God came down from heaven onto the altar and the consequent awe and fear of the sacrament that inspired, the emphasis on the presence of the divine nature of Christ in the face of Arian attack and so forth. Confronted by this, Canon 21 of Lateran IV, which required annual reception of the sacrament must be seen as an act of desperation in a world where the patristic sense that “to abandon the [weekly] eucharist was to abandon the community and to abandon the community was to abandon Christ” would have been met with total incomprehension.

18) The popular standards for frequency of reception were established by three scholastic theologians: S. Albert the Great, who, drawing on a text from S. Augustine (*Ep*. 54,2–3) suggested that “frequently” should be understood as meaning “monthly” (*In IV Sent.* d.13 a.27–28; S. Borgnet ed. *Opera Omnia* 29,383b); S. Thomas Aquinas who suggested that the criterion for frequency should be determined by whether or not the reception of the sacrament increased the communicant’s ardour *towards* the sacrament without diminishing respect *for* it (*Summa theol*. III q.80 a.10 ad 3); and S. Bonaventure who suggested there were three categories of humans (the good, the bad and the moderate) and then correlated frequency of reception with these categories – the third category, which included the average Christian, was to communicate or abstain as s/he felt appropriate depending on which best taught respect *for* the sacrament (*In IV lib. Sent.* IV, d.12, II, a.2 q.2; A. C. Peletier ed. *Opera Omnia* 5,535–6). The net result of this teaching was that the frequency with which communion was received became a matter of individual judgement, without ecclesial considerations, and was determined more by reverence and respect *for* the sacrament as an object rather than by an understanding of communion either as an ecclesiological event or as a personal encounter with Christ.

19) Luitgarde of Aywières († 1246) was allowed to communicate frequently only when she became physically ill as a result of the eucharistic abstinence imposed on her by her confessor. The Venerable Ida of Louvain († 1260), a woman of extraordinary eucharistic fervor and who, it is said, was once given communion by an angel, was permitted to receive communion frequently over the grave reservations of her superiors and confessors. Browe, “Kommunion der Heiligen”, 429.

sacrament itself. While it is these externals that are best remembered today, restoration of frequent communion was also one of its goals. But while there were members of this movement who encouraged weekly and even daily communion,[20] its impact was limited so that, by the end of the fourteenth and during the next century, frequent communion remained a rare exception in most of western Europe.[21] This appears to be the case for several reasons. First, because the scholastic emphasis on perfection remained the primary arbiter by which would-be communicants judged whether or not they ought to receive the sacrament. Second, in an age obsessed with guilt, there was a moral scrupulosity which tortured consciences and inculcated a sense of unworthiness which kept the faithful from receiving the sacrament. Third, the heavy emphasis on the eucharistic fast made it extremely difficult for the average Christian both to communicate and to maintain their regular activities. Finally, the exaggerated individualism of contemporary eucharistic piety (in which the social and communal dimensions of eucharistic life had been seriously obscured or lost) made communion an individual act subject to individual judgement rather than a corporate act subject to the will of the whole *ecclesia*.

The dicta of two well-known preachers contemporary with the Bohemian movement set the general attitude to frequent communion in relief. Vincent Ferrier († 1419) believed it adequate if "pious persons communicated once a month, others annually"[22] or, at most, "on the four great festivals of the year".[23] In 1443, the popular Franciscan preacher Bernardino of Siena told his hearers in Padua that "pious Christians should communicate at all the

---

20) The Archbishop of Cologne, Johann Tauler († 1361) recommended frequent communion in his *Institutiones* (c.35) and preached fervently in favour of frequent, best daily, communion in his sermons for Corpus Christi. In so doing, he was much less exigent in demanding standards of personal holiness than was common for his time. Jean Gerson (1363–1429) was also an ardent advocate of frequent communion and scandalized many when he opposed the commonly held opinion that conjugal intimacy was an obstacle to communion. Neither Tauler nor Gerson appear to have had widespread or long-lasting effect.

21) In Spain, for example, the Council of Salamanca in 1335 ruled that the names of those wo had not communicated within the year were to be reported to the bishop. The Synod of Tortosa in 1432 noted that many had not received communion even once in the year. In Germany, communion only once or twice a year was common and Synods were still restricting (rather than encouraging) frequent communion.

22) *S. Vincentii Ferrerii*, *Opera*, ed. Caspar Erhard (Augustæ Vindelicorum, 1729) *Dominicale, Sermo 118 [Festo Corporis Christi, Sermo I]* 348.

23) *ibid., Quadragesimale, Sermo 63 [Feria V Cœnæ]* 215.

important festivals[24] and monthly; those who are less devout should communicate at least quarterly but at the very least annually".[25] This stands in stark contrast with what was developing in Bohemia.

While the history of frequent communion in Bohemia has been told (at least cursively) elsewhere,[26] it is important to remind ourselves that what took place during the last quarter of the fourteenth century was the constellation of a variety of forces each of which gave momentum to a movement which, without the full range of complimentary dynamics, probably would have had the much more modest effects of the movement begun a century earlier in Flanders. Those dynamics are worth rehearsing.

First, the invitation extended by Charles IV to Konrad Waldhauser, to come to Prague as a preacher of reform served as a catalyst in a church and society ripe for change. Not only were there the ongoing Bohemian tensions of language and culture (often correlated with social class) but there were also the tensions between traditional piety (before Charles IV made Prague his capital as Holy Roman Emperor, Bohemia had been spared some of the more exaggerated aspects of fourteenth century piety) and the "new" piety introduced and encouraged by Charles himself in conjunction with the beginnings of early humanism which had appeared in the land.[27] Waldhauser achieved a degree of success that may well have exceeded Charles' expectations. His preaching in the cause of ecclesiastical and moral reform was well received – at least by those who could understand him as he was limited to Latin and German. If the Bohemian soil was ready for reform when Waldhauser arrived, he tilled it and sowed the first seeds.

It was Jan Milíč of Kroměříž[28] who inherited the spirit of reform and gave the nascent movement its eucharistic character. In the midst of his "Jerusalem" community, Milíč was able to bring together several dynamics. In

24) Bernardino lists these as: Easter, Advent, Epiphany, feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Corpus Christi.

25) *De preparatione comunionis in particulari et de oratione dominica* in Salvator Testi ed. "Di alcuni codici delle prediche di S. Bernardino di Siena con un saggio di quelle inedite", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 12 (1919) 257.

26) Holeton, *La Communion* 19–27.

27) Eduard Winter, *Frühhumanismus: Seine Entwicklung in Böhmen und deren europäische Bedeutung für die Kirchenreformbestrebungen im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1964) 165–177.

28) Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1967) 9–14; Paul De Vooght, *L'Hérésie de Jean Hus* [Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique 34 bis] (Louvain 1975) I,11–24; Holeton *La Communion* 19ff.

the context of an heightened eschatological expectation, Milíč introduced daily communion to a community that included clerics, the laity (both single and married) as well as his ever-growing group of penitents.[29] Unlike the earlier movement in Flanders, this nascent movement was both a social leveller of immediate consequence as well as an agent for long-term social transformation bringing together, as it did, classes that would ordinarily have little or nothing to do with one another.[30] Here is the uniqueness of the Bohemian contribution to this succession of eucharistic movements. Nowhere else in this period is there any account of a community of any sort – let alone one of such disparate composition – actually receiving the eucharist daily. One ought not to be surprised either that Milíč and "Jerusalem" ran into such heavy opposition from the local clergy or that the eucharistic movement that it had engendered could not be suppressed with Milíč's death and the forced dispersal of the "Jerusalem" community when its buildings were turned over to the Cistercians.

A sense of Milíč's eucharistic teaching can be found in his sermon for Corpus Christi in his postilla *Gratia Dei*[31] in which he rehearsed the scholastic rationale for frequent reception of the sacrament and reminded his readers of the high value the same apologists placed on respect for the sacrament which, paradoxically, lead to eucharistic abstinence.[32] Milíč then put the usual selection of patristic proof texts for frequent communion into a wider context to which he then added a patristic dossier (drawing largely on Augustine and John Chrysostom) in which reception of the sacrament is seen much more in ecclesial rather than individual terms.[33] To this he added later authorities (Gregory the Great, Bernard of Clairvaux) which, taken together, made a convincing case for frequent communion and, at the same time, called into serious question the case for eucharistic abstinence.[34]

---

29) While the latter may seem to us an unusual group to include in his apostolate, Milíc did have predecessors in this mission. Cf. De Vooght, *L'Hérésie* I,17 and Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy* (London 1977) 49.

30) Amedeo Molnár, "Die Eschatologische Hoffnung der Böhmischen Reformation" in Josef L. Hromádka ed., *Von der Reformation zum Morgen* (Leipzig 1959) 59–87; Thomas A. Fudge, *Myth, Heresy and Propaganda in the Radical Hussite Movement, 1409–1437* (Ph. D. diss., Cambridge University, 1992) 148ff.

31) "Caro mea vere est cibus..." MS Prague, NK XII D 1 ff.21–24.

32) *ibid.* f.21'.

33) *ibid.* ff.21'–22'.

34) Interestingly, Milíč presents the theological case for concomitance in which both the body and blood are said to be received under each of the eucharistic species (*ibid.*, f.23). While this part of the sermon is not reproduced in Matěj *Regulæ*, the wide dissemination of

Matěj of Javov,[35] a member of the "Jerusalem" community before continuing his studies at the Sorbonne, was the next force to give momentum to the movement to restore frequent communion. His experience of "Jerusalem" was clearly so formative that it imbued him with a passion for the eucharist such that his tractates on the subject (contained in his *Regulæ veteris et novi Testamenti*)[36] are among the most fervent extant in the entire corpus of eucharistic literature.

In the *Regulæ*, Matěj, operating on the fundamental principal that "if you are in communion with the church through one mode (baptism), you ought to be in communion through the second mode (communion)"[37] challenged contemporary eucharistic theology and piety.[38] While not dismissing the relationship between contrition and communion, Matěj suggested that frequent communion has as one of its fruits contrition, thus undoing a primary impediment to frequent communion. Similarly, the heavy emphasis placed on fasting, physical mortification and long devotional preparation before communion (which otherwise characterized contemporary eucharistic piety) are minimized as being neither the best preparation for communion nor practices which lead to growth in Christian love.[39] Representative communion, a popular rationale for eucharistic abstinence in which the priest was said to receive on behalf of the faithful,[40] was rejected.[41] The best

---

Gratia Dei and the respect in which Milíč was held by others in the eucharistic movement may actually have had a retarding effect on the restoration of communion *sub utraque*.

35) Kaminsky, *History* 14–23; De Vooght, *L'Hérésie* 24–38; Holeton, *La Communion* 28–66.

36) Vlastimil Kybal ed., *Regulæ Veteris et Novi Testamenti* 4vv. (Innsbruck and Prague 1908–1913); Vol. 5 Otakar Odlozilík and Vlastimil Kybal edd., (Prague 1926); Vol. 6 Jana Nechutová ed. (Munich, 1993).

37) *Regulæ* L. IV, art. III, c.4 (V,38): "... quod omnis christianus, qui abscisus est a communione primo modo dicta, puta per mortale peccatum, abscisus est quoad participacionem vite et spiritus eciam a secunda iam de facto; quodsi talis se ingerat ad sacramenta ecclesie, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit."

38) *De Corpore Christi*, the fourth book of the *Regulæ* (V), is largely devoted to an enumeration of the reasons that have been used by the clergy to dissuade the laity from communicating frequently and a reasoned argument against each.

39) *Regulæ* L.I, tr.II, reg,IV, c.12 (I,145). "Quod si commemores supra notatum apparatum, puta ieiunia, psalmodiam et simila ... non valde acceptabilia aut inductiva preparacionis digne ad divinum sacramentum, nisi moveantur a caritate."

40) Berthold of Regensburg († 1272) *Serm.* 31 Von der Messe (Franz Pfeiffer [I] and Joseph Strobl [II] edd. Vienna 1862/80) says of the communicating priest: "he nourishes his own soul and us all" (I,502) "for all participants form with the priest one body of which he is the mouth". (II,686) This point is elaborated in a thirteenth century English manual for preachers (A. G. Little ed., *Liber Exemplorum ad Usum Praedicantium* [Aberdeen 1908] 39) when the laity are told to stay until the end of mass because it is then that the celebrating

preparation for communion, according to Matěj, was to approach the altar with an humble and contrite heart.[42] In coming to this conclusion, Matěj overturned centuries of eucharistic piety which had made devotion to the sacrament a greater good than the actual sacramental nurture of the baptized. In so doing, Matěj's conclusions regarding frequent communion are effectively those reached by Pius X in his decree *Sacra tridentina synodus* published in 1905![43]

In addition to Matěj of Janov, three other theologians working at the university in Prague produced works that corroborated Matějs' own conclusions. Vojtěch Raňkův z Ježova [Adalbertus Ranconis de Ericinio],[44] Matthew of Cracow [Mateusz z Krakowa][45] and Henry of Bitterfeld[46] all wrote

---

priest, as mouth of the congregation, receives communion on behalf of the whole parish and all those present in good will and devotion receive the spiritual nourishment in their own souls. William Durandus († 1296) *Rationale divinorum officiorum* IV,56,1 (Venice 1599) 133a said that "while in the primitive church the faithful communicated daily ... it was decided because of human sinfulness that we receive the sacrament of communion three time a year *et sacerdos quotidie pro omnibus*". Ludolf of Saxony († 1377) *Vita Jesu Christi* I,37,7 (L. M. Rigollot ed., [Paris/Bruxel les 1870] I,305a) says that the eucharist is called our daily bread "*quia quotidie ipsum sumimus per ministros Ecclesiæ, qui hoc sacramentum percipiunt per se et pro tota communicate*".

41) *Regulæ* L.IV, art.VI, c.15 and much of L.IV, art.VII, cc.1f. are devoted to establishing the point that the priest cannot communicate on behalf of the faithful.

42) *Regulæ* L.IV, art.VII, c.8 (V,290) "Sed quantum ad presens, dicitur quod nulla preparacio magis est ydonea ad sumendum hoc deo plenum sacramentum quam cor habere contritum et humiliatum." *ibid.* (V,292) "Non itaque sunt alia requirenda preparatoria ab hominibus volentibus accedere ad sacramentum, supposita fide et statu honesto christiano, quam vera penitencia vel cor contritum et humiliatum."

43) Paul De Vooght, *L'Hérésie* I,31.

44) Cf. "Die Lebensverhältnisse des Magisters Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio" in Jaroslav Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften des Prager Magisters Adalbert Rankonis de Ericinio*, (Münster 1971) 1–63; Holeton, *La Communion* 69–72.

45) Cf. Holeton, *La Communion* 72ff.

46) Cf. "Bitterfelds Lebenslauf" in Vladimír J. Koudelka, "Heinrich von Bitterfeld († c. 1405) Professor an der Universität Prag", *Archivim Fratrum Prædicatorum* 23 (1953) 6–14; Holeton, *La Communion* 77ff.

important tractates favouring frequent communion of the laity.[47] Between Matěj and the other three authors, frequent communion was given a solid, I would suggest irrefutable, historical and theological foundation. Here lies another uniqueness in the Bohemian situation. Nowhere else was there a similar constellation of academics (all highly respected within their own academic community) producing theological works supporting frequent communion for the laity.

These tractates could, however, have been stillborn – simply works written by academics for academics or for students who would forget the passions of their teachers the moment they leave their colleges – were it not for Tomáš of Stitné[48] who popularized current academic thought through his Czech writings on theological as well as moral issues. The chapter on the eucharist in his section on the sacraments in his *Six Books on the Common Teachings of Christianity*[49] (the longest chapter in that part) is a fine theological and pastoral apology for frequent communion. Remarkable for its time was the corporate and ecclesial emphasis Tomáš placed on the sacrament. While there are still marks of the "received piety" towards the eucharist,[50] the reforming influence of both Milíč and Matěj is clear. The general tenor of the work is such that it encourages the faithful to receive the sacrament frequently rather than discouraging them from approaching it as was the effect of 'popularised' eucharistic theology in Flanders and elsewhere. While, in an age obsessed with guilt, the fear of communicating while in a state of serious sin had deterred many who wished to communicate

---

47) Vojtěch Raňkův: *De frequenti communione ad plebanum Martinam* in Kadlec, *Leben und Schriften* 199–230. Matthew of Cracow: *Dialogus rationis et conscientiæ de crebra communione* in Władysław Seńko and Adam Ludwik Szafrański eds., *Mateusza z Krakowa: Opuscula Theologica* [Textus et Studia II,1] (Warsaw 1974) 367–409. This text circulated widely in central Europe and, ironically, survived the controversies of the time to become, after Trent, a tract used by the catholic hierarchy in many parts of Europe to promote frequent communion. Henry of Bitterfeld's two works *De institutione sacramenti eucharistiæ* and *De crebra communione* exist only in manuscript. They are discussed and excerpted in Koudelka, "Heinrich von Bitterfeld", 34–36.

48) Cf. De Vooght, *L'Hérésie* 39–42; Holeton, *La Communion* 66–69.

49) Karel Jaromír Erben ed., *Tomáše ze Štítného, Knížky šestery o obecných věcech křesťanských* (Prague 1852) 227–261.

50) In his section "How often is the sacrament to be received?", Tomáš makes a strong case for the importance of frequent communion yet leaves the final decision to the individual: "If you receive communion daily, be sure that it is grace that moves you to do so. Do not receive Holy Communion for the purpose of comparing yourself to others who may receive it frequently. Decide for yourself if you should receive the host, as you alone know whether you are worthy of it." *ibid.* 247. This is, however, a considerable step beyond the scholastic criterion of whether or not frequent reception increased devotion *to* the sacrament itself.

frequently and warnings against unworthy communion had figured prominently amongst those writing to encourage more frequent communion outside Bohemia, this was not a preoccupation of Tomáš'.[51] While attentive to the need for preparation for communion and the importance of not being in a state of mortal sin, Tomáš circumscribes generous terms by which to determine whether or not one is in a state of grace.[52] In this context he makes the remarkable statement that: "Even if one is in a state of deadly sin which one may have forgotten to confess, one would not sin by receiving communion as one would have asked [in confession] for the forgiveness of all sins."[53]

In an age in which the eucharistic fast had taken on such importance, it is equally remarkable that Tomáš does not once mention fasting communion in his section on preparation for communion.[54] Similarly, in Tomáš one does not find the moral scrupulousity that was so common to the age and which made the soul draw back but, rather, one who reminded his readers of the generous invitation to feast frequently at the Lord's table which had been issued to all Christians. This attitude towards the eucharist, circulated in the vernacular, helped to create a popular eucharistic piety which was unlike that anywhere else in contemporary Christendom.

---

51) *loc. cit.* "Insofar as I understand it, I believe communion can be received daily as its substance is bread or daily nutrition. This is supported by Christ's saying: 'Whenever you do this, do it in remembrance of me.' He did not say receive communion once or three times a year. Rather, that we should receive communion as many times as we desire. However, each time it is to be done in memory of him. St. Augustine recommends that communion be received every Sunday. Communion should be given by those who are free from mortal sin. St. Thomas states 'as with wheat, bread is nutrition for the body, so then communion is nutrition for the spiritual body.' Thus, one should participate in communion often. Those of you who wish to receive communion properly must take into consideration two points. First, you must have much grace and, second, you must be true to the sacrament. Grace will bring you to frequent communion. Truth will keep you from falsehood which may take you away from frequent communion. The knowledge of truth is a gift from the Holy Spirit. Thus, be sure you acknowledge your growth in grace and truth because of frequent communion.

52) *ibid.*, 248. "How are we to prepare ourselves for this sacrament?" Tomás summarizes St. Thomas Aquinas' principles for knowing whether one is in a state of grace. They are in a state of grace who: 1) hear the word of God gladly; 2) do good deeds; 3) while sinning hate the sin; and 4) seek to be reconciled and confess their sins. Given the burdens imposed on contemporary consciences, these are most generous criteria.

53) *loc. cit.*

54) Tomáš' concerns are that the communicant should 1) be in a state of grace; 2) find comfort in things spiritual rather than material; and 3) approach the sacrament honestly and not with the intention of impressing others. He follows the common mediæval concern that married couples should abstain from sexual relations for two or three days before receiving communion as well as those who had [wet] dreams the previous night. *loc. cit.*

The constellation of the dynamics behind the experience of Milíč's "Jerusalem", the academic foundation laid by Matěj of Janov, Vojtěch Raňkův, Matthew of Cracow and Henry of Bitterfeld, and its popularization by Tomáš of Štítné were all that the movement needed save one piece:

ecclesiastical approbation. A movement as radical as this, without the approbation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, would have been an uphill struggle, extremely fragile, and subject to censure and possible eradication during episcopal or archidiaconal visitations.

Initially, the movement was subject to these pressures. In 1388, the Prague Synod determined that monthly would be the maximum frequency with which the laity could communicate.[55] The next year, the same Synod required Matěj to abjure his teaching on frequent communion.[56] It was only Archbishop Jan Jenštejn's[57] close brush with death in 1390 and his unexpected recovery, which Jenštejn saw as miraculous and attributed to the reception of the eucharist,[58] that caused him to abandon his opposition to frequent communion and, instead, to promote its cause.[59]

The movement for frequent communion in Bohemia was complete. Rooted first in the powerful experience and memories of those involved in Milíč's "Jerusalem", subsequently it had acquired articulate theological and historical apologists, a popularizer who had assured that the ideas were widely sown and a prelatial patron in the form of the senior ecclesiastic in the

55) *Regulæ* L.IV, art. 1, c.1 (V,18). "Item reverendissimus in Christo pater dominus Johnnes sanctissimi in Christo patris ac domini, domini pape Urbani sexti legatus, atque venerabiles domini pro tunc sui in spiritualibus vicarii statuerunt et sinodaliter promulgari procurarunt, ut plebeis tantum semel in mense hoc sacramentum altaris terrificum poscentibus a presbiteris deberet ministrari; per hoc utpote servi fideles sui patris familias et prudentes, non inpigre providerunt, ut pro captu cuiuslibet tritici mensura eidem suo tempore ministretur, ne fortasse, quod absit, per dispensatorum negligenciam dari sanctum canibus et margaritas contingeret proici ante porcos, patre familias ewangelico reclamante."

56) V. Polc, "Statutes of the Synods of Prague (1386–1395)" *Apollinaris* 53,3–4 (1980) 437–38.

57) Cf. Reuben E. Weltsch, *Archbishop John of Jenstein 1348–1400* (The Hague and Paris 1968).

58) Jan Jenštejn, *De morbo suo* in Jan Sedlák, *M. Jan Hus* (Prague 1915) *47.

59) Jenštejn became an advocate of frequent communion and presided over the 1391 synod which permitted the laity to communicate as frequently as they wished. Cf. Polc, "Statutes", 447. It has been suggested (Weltsch, *Archbishop John* 173) that Jenštejn may have been caught in a political struggle among the clerical hierarchy in which frequent communion was seen as a Beghard devotion for Jenštejn himself certainly held a high view of the eucharist. Cf. his two *Sermones de corpore Christi* in Weltsch, *Archbishop John* 189–191.

realm. The consequence was that, by the end of the fourteenth century, Bohemia was experiencing the most popular eucharistic movement found anywhere in mediaeval Christendom and the reception of communion as the fulfillment of the eucharistic action appears to have become normative in a way that it had not been since the end of the patristic age and would not be again until this century.

II) The Chalice

Not far short of six hundred years after the restoration of the lay chalice in Bohemia, the exact nature of the motives behind this bold act as well as the dynamics of that act itself are still a matter of debate. Much has been made of the innovation; perhaps less should be made of it as a theological innovation and more of its liturgical and social consequences.

When, in his apology for the chalice written to Ondřej of Brod,[60] Jakoubek of Stříbro described his action as a response to a "*revelatio*", he carefully explained that this was not some private revelation but, rather, the result of a careful reading and re-reading of the biblical, patristic and canonical dossier that has been built up during the work done establishing frequent communion.[61] As we might say in English, "the penny dropped". The catena of biblical and patristic texts that were used to promote frequent communion could be used equally to promote a restored chalice. If we are to take Jakoubek at face value, the lay chalice was a natural and logical consequence of the frequent communion movement and would, like communion for all the baptized, have occurred sooner or later once someone

---

60) *De communione plebis sub utraque specie, contra Brodum* in Herman van der Hardt, *Magni et universalis Constantiensis Concilii tomi VI* (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1697–1700) III, col. 416–585.

61) *ibid.* III, col. 566 "Hic doctori dicitur, quod generaliter vocando *revelationem*, modum cognoscendi ... venientem ex scrutino legis Domini, et ex solidis expositionibus et auctoritatibus antiquorum sanctorum, ut Augustini, Cypriani, Bernhardi, Chrysostomi, et aliorum, eos in eodem sensu sequentium, concedere possum, quod habeo revelationem. Quia habeo cognitionem ex lege et scriptis authenticis. Haec *cognitio*, *noviter* per illum modum *acquisita*, generaliter vocari potest revelatio. Quia per eam quodammodo velamen ignorantiæ intus deponitur, juxta illud psalmi [118/119:18]: 'Revela oculos meos, considerabo mirabilia de lege tua.'" See also Ferdinand Seibt, "Die *revelatio* des Jacobellus von Mies über die Kelchkommunion", *Deutsches Archiv* 22 (1966) 618–624.

had appropriated the full consequence of the dossier which already had been compiled as a rationale for frequent communion itself.[62]

If this is the case, however, it could be argued that what seems, at least in retrospect, like a very large seed sown amongst the texts supporting frequent communion took a very long time to germinate. What was the immediate catalyst in this chain of events? Romolo Cegna, in a important study,[63] argues convincingly that it was the influence of the Dresden School at the College of the Black Rose in Prague that provided this catalyst. This radical school of theology, which operated apart from the university, had taken a theological position in favour of the restored chalice as early as 1412.[64] This, significantly, was grounded on a catholic reading of Gratian (particularly the Canon *Comperimus*[65]) and the Fathers rather than on Waldensian principles as often has been argued[66] and certainly not under the influence of Wyclif in whose writings no basis for the lay chalice can be found.

If we are to accept Cegna's argument, the lay chalice must be understood as the result of the confluence of two theological streams: the Bohemian and the Dresdener. Why the former took so long to bear its final fruit is unclear. Perhaps it is an important comment on the self-perception of the basically conservative catholic nature of the Bohemian eucharistic movement itself whose aim was to restore frequent reception of the eucharist and which, in that aim, stood in solidarity with the other, albeit unsuccessful, movements elsewhere in Europe rather than a movement which saw itself in radical terms (as was the cast given to it once the lay chalice became an issue). Jakoubek's contact with the Dresden School at the Black Rose and its

62) It is unclear that Matěj of Janov himself saw the restored chalice as one of the ultimate consequences of his own argument. While he makes frequent reference to both species, many of these allusions could be found in any contemporary tractate on the eucharist. There are several, however, that seem much more specific and certainly could be said to adumbrate the restored chalice e.g. *Regulæ* L. I, tr.II, reg.II, c.1 (I,98): "Quod valde impeditores iniustos dei sacramentorum a plebeis respicit, in quibus per experienciam inpleri visum est, cum pluries murmurare et facto nec non multo ad modum conatu restiterunt, ne scilicet plebei corpus et sanguinem Jhesu Christi cottidie et sepe frequentarent...." Cf. Holeton, *La Communion* 62f., particularly nn. 203, 204.

63) Romolo Cegna, "La Scuola della Rosa Nera e Nicolo detto da Dresda (1380?–1417?), Maestro tedesco al Collegio della Rosa Nera in Praga (1412–1415)" in *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 30 (1990).

64) *ibid.* 26.

65) *ibid.* 29f.

66) Cegna presents a review of the literature on the alleged Waldensian and Wyclifite influences on Nicholas. *ibid.* 41f.

position on the lay chalice – based on catholic principle (albeit radical in its context) became the necessary catalyst for his *revelatio* and, perhaps, left him somewhat red-faced for not recognizing what had lain dormant for over a quarter century in the Bohemian catena of texts on frequent communion.

That the chalice became the symbol of Hussitism may well have had as much to do with the proximity of Hus' death to its restoration in Bohemian liturgical use as anything inherent in the symbol of the chalice itself.[67] Hus certainly did not die for the chalice, nor even did he die for frequent communion. The national outcry which resulted from his condemnation and death at Constance, however, was offered a ready symbol in the chalice and as such it served Bohemia well until Bilá Hora. It is ironic, though, that much of the power later historians read into the symbol of the chalice were not realized by the majority of Utraquists during the period of Utraquism itself.[68]

Much is made of the levelling effect of the chalice[69]: by it, the mediæval rift between clergy and laity is often said to have been abolished.[70] While this would have been visibly apparent during the celebration of the liturgy itself, like much of what is experienced liturgically, it also would have been a proleptic vision of a new social order. We cannot deny that the Utraquist Church remained highly clericalised and that its hieratic structure was little modified from the mediæval ecclesiastical structure it inherited. If there was a period of genuine levelling, it was in Tábor, but that was short-lived and even then gave little sign that the clerical domination of society was seriously challenged. As such, it would be fair to say that the failure to modify its social structures in such a way as to become more closely congruent with the

67) It is, after all, conceivable that other symbols, grounded in the Four Articles, could have emerged as Hussite rallying points instead of the chalice.

68) One of the great Roman Catholic liturgists of our time, Pierre-Marie Gy, has suggested that reception of the cup deepens the communicant's understanding of the sacrificial nature of the mass. ("The Catholic Liturgy Within the Unity of the Living Church", *Music and Liturgy* 15,4 (1989) 114.) While this may be the case for contemporary Roman Catholics, there does not appear to be any evidence that would support this thesis during the period of Bohemian Utraquism.

69) Kaminsky, *History* 124.

70) Restoring the chalice is often interpreted as a major blow to mediæval clericalism in which the chalice was an important symbol of the gulf fixed between the clergy and the laity. There seems to be little contemporary evidence to suggest that the chalice alone symbolized this gulf and, as such, it may be an anachronistic reading of the situation. Frequent communion, rather than "representative communion" (cf. n.39 above), could have become a symbol in the same manner equally well.

liturgy which itself anticipates and models a radical new social order[71] could be reckoned as a lost opportunity in the mainstream of the Bohemian reformation.[72]

71) Cf. D. R. Holeton, "The Formative Character of Liturgy" in Thomas J. Talley ed., *A Kingdom of Priests*, [Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study No. 5] (Bramcote 1988) 8–14

72) František Šmahel, *La révolution hussite, une anomalie historique* (Paris 1985) 127.

III) Children and Communion

The "penny that dropped" in 1415 which lead to the restoration of the chalice to the laity, dropped again in 1417 when the practice of communicating all the baptized, including infants, was restored. The catena of texts which lead to the restoration of the lay chalice was a fundamental part of the collection which was used in making the apology for this latest restored practice.[73] To this catena was added a large number of texts which provided witness to the historical continuity of the practice as well as to its theological foundation. With the rarest of exception, this dossier, like those used both for frequent communion and for the chalice, is as convincing today as it was then.[74] When the latter two dossiers were presented in the debates at Basel, the Council "fathers" took issue not so much with the legitimacy of the texts themselves (which they would routinely admit provided evidence that the laity had in the past received the cup and that communion had been given to infants) but, instead, with the fact that none of the texts made either practice obligatory.[75] Thus, the two sides came to an impasse. Utraquists argued that the chalice and the communion of all the baptized were "the Law of God" i. e. enjoined in Scripture and therefore not mutable;[76] Roman Catholics argued that the practices, like so many other areas of ritual and sacramental practice, were subject to the regulation of the church.[77]

When the communion of all the baptized was restored, the Bohemian Church brought to its ecclesial life a quality that had been unknown in the

---

73) Holeton, *La communion* 242ff.

74) The one conspicuous exception would be the use of Pseudo-Dionysius as an apostolic witness. It was not a half century after the composition of the dossier that doubts were raised about the authorship of the Dionysian corpus. cf. Thomas L. Campbell, *Dionysius the Pseudo Areopagite: The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (Washington 1981) 5.

75) This argument is used repeatedly in John of Dubrovnik's [Ragusio] response to Jan Rokycana. Cf. MS Basel, Univ. Bib. A I 29 ff.189–302 Inc: *Reverendissimi ... ad replicas magistri Iohannis de rochizana facturis de gracie intrepide responsum* and D. R. Holeton "The Communion of Infants: The Basel Years", *CV* 19,1 (1986) 17–26.

76) Cf. Thomas Fudge, "The 'Law of God': Reform and Religious Practice in Late Medieval Bohemia", herein.

77) The Basel debates are typical of this position. John of Dubrovnik's principal line of argument against the chalice was that, while there may be patristic evidence for the lay chalice, nowhere do the patristic authors claim that reception of the chalice is *necessary*. Thus, while the hermeneutic applied to the texts by the catholic authors were clearly anachronistic, they could claim that the practice (said to be unnecessary) had changed and was, therefore, subject to the regulation of the church. Cf. *Posicio Johannis de Ragusio in concilio Basiliensi contra communionem utriusque speciei* MS Prague, NK VIII F 22 ff.104–236' = MS Basel, Univ. Bib. A I 29 ff.25–138'.

west since the end of the patristic era: a church in which *all* the baptized participated in the dominical eucharist and at which *all* were communicated. Such a state was unparalleled anywhere in contemporary Christendom and was not to reappear in any other part of the church until the last decades of our own century.

IV) Theological Development

i) Eschatology

As has been alluded to earlier, at least for the early years of the eucharistic movement, there was a sense of eschatological anticipation that otherwise had long disappeared from western eucharistic theology. The "Jerusalem" community provided an experience where, evidently, there was a palpable sense that the old social order was being broken down and that the new order in which "the city of light", the heavenly Jerusalem, was being made present.[78]

This eschatological theme was picked up by Matěj in the *Regulæ* where he developed the idea that frequent reception of the eucharist changed not only the individual but also society itself. The ultimate effect of frequent communion was to usher in God's eschatological reign.[79] This marked a radical difference between the eschatology of Matěj and his Bohemian contemporaries and others said to have influenced Bohemian eschatological thought (Joachim of Fiore, Cola di Rienzo) for whom the sacraments were to play no rôle in the "last days".[80]

In an age in which the general theological culture was permeated with a sense of living in the eschatological moment, it should not be surprising that a number of non-Bohemian hands can be traced in the growing corpus of Bohemian eschatological literature – notably those of William of Saint-Amour and Wyclif from abroad and those of Matthew of Cracow and the Dresdener

78) D. R. Holeton, "L'eschatologie et le mouvement eucharistique en Europe centrale pendant la fin du moyen-âge" in A. M. Triacca and A. Pistoia edd., *Eschatologie et Liturgie* (Conférences Saint-Serge XXXI^e Semaine d'Etudes Liturgiques) [Bibliotheca «Ephemerides Liturgicae» «Subsidia» 35] (Rome 1985) 117.

79) *ibid.* 118–119.

80) Jana Nechutová, "Gioacchino da Fiore e i principi della riforma boema" in *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university, řada archeologicko-klasická* E 14, 18 (1969) 229–233.

School of the Black Rose from within.[81] In concert, and with the particular sacramental turn of the Bohemians, these non-Bohemian influences served to stiffen the commitment to frequent communion and, eventually, to the chalice which was seen as an eschatological sign in itself.

The sense of the coming eschaton probably reached its zenith in the preaching of Jan Želivský who ushered in the revolution with his eschatologically laiden sermons on 30 July 1419,[82] but was sustained in the preaching and writing of Jakoubek of Stříbro.[83] This sense of living in the eschatological moment took a prominent place in early Czech hymnody[84] and was a dominant feature of the early hilltop experiences which led to the foundation of Tábor.[85] Perhaps because of that, or merely with the waning of the hope that the reformation would precipitate the eschatological kingdom, the theme does not appear to have been sustained throughout the utraquist period. That it existed at all, however, is remarkable as this, again, is a theme that was not otherwise current in western eucharistic theology and was not to figure again with any prominence until our own century.[86]

ii) Eucharistic Presence

Debates over eucharistic presence are often given more prominence in an overview of the Bohemian Reformation than probably is their just due. This, in part, is attributable to the Wyclifite brush with which the Bohemian Reformation is often tarred, particularly by anglophones.[87] While remanentism did play a rôle in Utraquism, its overall position was a minor one. The one prominent utraquist theologian often accused of propounding a remanentist position was Jakoubek of Stříbro. But, as Paul De Vooght has

---

81) Cegna, "La Scuola della Rosa Nera", 73ff.

82) Cf. Amedeo Molnár, "Želivský, prédicateur de la révolution", *CV* 5,4 (1959) 324–334 and D. R. Holeton, "Revelation and Revolution in Late Mediæval Bohemia", *CV* 36,1 (1994) 29–45.

83) Cf. Cegna, "La Scuola della Rosa Nera", 80f.

84) Holeton, "L'eschatologie", 120f.

85) Cf. Howard Kaminsky, "Chiliasm and the Founding of Tabor, 1419–1420" in his *A History* 310 ff.

86) Petr Pokorný's observation that Pavel Filipi has not proven that the Utraquist eucharist was the anticipation of the eschatological banquet is curious in the light of the dearth of non-utraquist treatment of this theme by any contemporary catholic writer. That it exists at all is remarkable. Cf. Review of Pavel Filipi, *Hostina chudých* (Prague 1991) in *CV* 34,2 (1992) 86.

87) Cf. William R. Cook, "John Wyclif and Hussite Theology 1415–1436", *Church History* 42 (1973) 335–349; D. R. Holeton, "Wyclif's Bohemian Fate", *CV* 32,4 (1989) 209–222.

demonstrated,[88] Jakoubek's remanentism was more an ongoing loyalty to his beloved Mistr Jan Hus who died at Constance accused of Wyclifitism (including his remanentism) than it is an adoption of Wyclif's position on eucharistic presence. Jakoubek, like other mainstream Utraquists, held firmly to the catholic position on the real presence of Christ in the eucharist.[89]

Within this stream of Utraquism, I believe it is fair to say that there is little (if anything) that would differ from the received theological position on eucharistic presence.[90] What contributions there were, came from the Taborites and the more radical left. Here, opinions ranged from the radical rejection of any theory of real presence which characterized some of the small (and often short-lived) sectarian groups,[91] to a more conservative

88) Paul De Vooght, *Jacobellus de Stříbro († 1429) premier théologien du hussitisme* [Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique 54] (Louvain 1972) 95–121.

89) Even Peter Payne, the English Wyclifite living at Tábor, interpreted Wyclif as holding to a doctrine of "real presence" if not transubstantiation when he debated with Jan Příbram on the eucharist in 1426. When the question of the eucharist was debated by these two again in 1429, the judges voted six to two in favour of Příbram's position against Payne who, by this time, was representing more accurately Wyclif's position, denying transubstantiation and the adoration of the eucharistic species. Cf. Cook, "John Wyclif", 340f. There is a danger of imposing a precision of terms on these debates that is, in the end, anachronistic. Stanislav Sousedík, "Huss et la doctrine eucharistique 'rémanentiste'" *Divinitas* 21,3 (1977) 382ff., for example, concedes that "Huss n'avait nulle part exposé ... la doctrine de la rémanence" but then asserts that "l'affirmation ... que la doctrine de Huss est identique avec le point de vue de l'Eglise, n'est pas correcte" and, in so doing, fails to acknowledge that orthodox opinions on eucharistic presence were considerably more diverse in the early fifteenth century than they were after the Council of Trent which he appears to use as his standard for the church's teaching. The relative merit of some of these debates might be put in context by recalling the "Windsor Statement" of the Anglican – Roman Catholic International Commission where two churches acknowledge that language that has been different historically expresses a common eucharistic belief.

90) One could not hope for a more orthodox expression of the catholic understanding of eucharistic presence than that of the Kutná Hora Synod of 4 October 1441 which established the official utraquist position on the question: Singuli sacerdotes sincere credant et ore fideliter confiteantur, in divinissimo Eucharistiae sacramento totum Christum, verum hominem, sua propria natura et substancia suae naturalis existentiae, quam sumpsit de Virgine Maria et qua residet in coelo in dextera Dei patris, sicque ab hominibus tenendum fideliter populo annuncient, et in eodem sacramento altaris venerabilis ipsi Christo honor cultu, genuflexione, adoratione, luminum accensione et aliarum veneracionum exhibitione impendi debet a christianis exerceri. Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Prameny k synodám strany pražské a táborské v letech. 1441–1444.* (Prague 1900) 33.

91) When Laurence [*Historia Hussitica* 476] lists the errors of Pickart teaching in 1421 he first names their refusal to genuflect to the sacrament because it is not the *verum corpus Christi* which is [according to them] ascended into heaven. In his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* of 1420–21, Jakoubek speaks against those who said that the eucharist was not the body of Christ but, instead, said "We are the body of Christ". (František Šimek ed., *Výklad na Zjevenie sv. Jana* [Prague 1932] I,596). Both these heresies arose out of the late mediæval inability to hold in tension the body of Christ as the body that had walked on earth

Wyclifite position found among some of the Taborites,[92] to Calvinist and Lutheran positions which became, after the advent of the Second Reformation, a focus for debate among the Jednota Bratrská.[93] In sum, however, I believe it can be maintained that there is little in the mainstream of the Bohemian Reformation that could be seen as novel or as making a significant contribution to the general corpus of thought on the question of eucharistic presence.

IV) Liturgical and Ceremonial Development

From at least the end of the second decade of the fifteenth century there were other issues that were to cloud Bohemian ecclesiastical life: these centred on rite and ceremony. As the chalice had become the symbol that identified Utraquists to the outside world, vesture, liturgical language and ceremonial became controverted symbols within Utraquism itself. While the modern eye might see these as *adiaphora* or non-essentials, they bore a disproportionate symbolic weight that must be taken very seriously and which issued in much emotion and polemic. For those involved at the time, the issues at stake were fundamentally those of continuity and fidelity.

Few reformers would claim that their aim is to break with the church; their desire is either to purify the contemporary church of alleged abuses

---

but was now ascended and glorified, the mystical body of all the faithful and the eucharistic body. *Vide* The classic study of this devolution: Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: L'eucharistie et l'église au moyen âge* (Paris, 1944). Orthodox belief in eucharistic presence was held to have definite social consequences. Petr Chelčický, for example, saw a causal relationship between Adamite denial of the real presence and their moral libertinism. *Vide* Howard Kaminsky, "Peter Chelčický: Treatises on Christianity and the Social Order; I Peter Chelčický's Place on the Hussite Left", *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* I (1964) 135, particularly n.61.

92) This was the basic position of the Taborites formed, perhaps, under the influence of the English Wyclifite Peter Payne. It is clearly presented in the Taborite position at the University Debate of 1434. Cf. "De sacramento dominici corporis et sanguinis seu cene dominice, ubi fundatur in fide scripture et quid est" in Amedeo Molnár and Romolo Cegna edd. *Confessio Taboritorum* (Rome 1983) 78f. It is interesting to note that the sixteenth century apologist Bohuslav Bílejovsky imputed a catholic understanding of the eucharist to Payne and, by implication, to Wyclif as part of his effort to whitewash a variety of Wyclif's heterodox positions. cf. David, "Bohuslav Bílejovský and the Religious Via Media", n.49 below.

93) This development can be traced in Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of the Brethren* trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem PA/Winston-Salem NC 1992) *passim*. See also my "Church or Sect?: The Jednota Bratrská and the Growth od Dissent from Mainline Utraquism", *CV* (forthcoming) nn. 62,63.

while maintaining a visible continuity with the historic church or else to dismiss the contemporary church as irreformable and then appeal to some model of the primitive church (usually founded on a rather naïve reading of the Acts of the Apostles) and then to set out to restore the church to that model. The type of church that emerges, of course, is radically different according to which model of reform is adopted. This is a lens through which much of what transpired in Bohemia from the early fifteenth century until the defeat at Bilá Hora might be viewed.

For main-line Utraquists, the model of continuity was supreme;[94] for the more radical reformers, it was the model based on the principle of the irreformability of the inherited structures and a return to the primitive church.[95] Needless to say, the models are not always neatly delineated and, because it is virtually impossible to have a detailed picture of the sacramental and liturgical life of the primitive church, what emerges is often filled with anomalies and pious imaginings. Regardless of tendency, all reformers in Bohemia could agree that the frequent communion of all the baptized *sub utraque* was a primitive practice to be maintained at all costs. Beyond this there was widespread disagreement. While mainline Utraquism displayed a toleration for a plurality of religious thought and practice that was remarkable for its time, there were extreme positions which could not be contained within a single ecclesial body. Schism was the result. The gradual emergence of the *Jednota Bratrská* is, perhaps, the most significant example within mainline Utraquism of increasingly "protestant" demands which could not be met and which eventually issued in schism.[96]

In their longing for a church that was in undisputed continuity with the catholic church, main-line Utraquists were very cautious about liturgical and ceremonial change and wrote apologies for the Bohemian Use of the Roman rite. The *Declaratio super canone missæ*,[97] for example, is an explanation of the traditional rites and ceremonies of the eucharist which relies heavily on allegory and is very much in the mediæval tradition of *explicationes missæ*.[98] As a utraquist text the *Declaratio* is interesting because of its particularly clericalized and conservatve nature. The author is concerned with explaining

---

94) D. R. Holeton, "The Evolution of Utraquist Liturgy: A Precursor of Western Liturgical Reform", *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995) 51.

95) This position emerged in Tábor and, later, in the Jednota Bratrská. I have dealt with this question more extensively in my "Church or Sect?..." *CV* (forthcoming).

96) I have dealt with this more extensively in "Church or Sect?..." *CV* (forthcoming).

97) MS Prague, Bib. Cap. O VII ff.64–69'.

98) *Cf*. Adolf Franz, "Die Mittelalterlichen Meßerklärungen", in *Die Messe* 333ff.

the meaning of the vestments and various elements of the priest's parts in the liturgy and gives no hint that the rites or ceremonies have been simplified in any way.[99] What is somewhat surprising is that the author never discusses the rôle of the laity in the celebration of the liturgy nor does he mention the communion of the faithful.

While the principle of liturgical reform had already been established in the fourteenth century,[100] main-line Utraquism did not promulgate an articulated programme for general liturgical reform.[101] In this sense it was quite unlike any of the reforms of the next century, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed or even that of the fathers of Trent. Hence, in the face of Táborite or Jednota demands for radical liturgical change, utraquist liturgical tractates tend to be *apologia* for why things must stay the same rather than for why they should change.[102] What was to emerge as liturgical reform did so at different rates in different utraquist parishes even within the same town. This tolerance for this religious pluralism (within limits) was quite remarkable and certainly was uncharacteristic of ecclesial life elsewhere in Europe.

Among the more radical parties, on the other hand, the principle of "reject and purify on a strictly 'primitive model'" was operative. This lead to the wholesale abandonment of much that had become traditional by way of rite and ceremony. While there were times when this appears to be little more than a naïve literalism in which the liturgy was reduced to the barest of bones

---

99) For example, he explains the meaning of all the priest's eucharistic vestments as well as the signs of the cross made by the priest during the Canon.

100) Jakoubek of Štříbro that as early as the 1380s Matěj of Janov had instituted reading the liturgical epistles and gospels in Czech but was censured for it and that the priest at SS. Philip and James near the Bethlehem Chapel had sung the passion in Czech. (Cf. Rudolf Holinka, "Nová betlémská postila M. Jakoubka ze Śtříbra", *Věstník české akademie věd a umění* 60 [1951] 23) Even earlier, some communities of women appear to have had the liturgical pericopes read in the vernacular as is evidenced by fourteenth century epistolaries and evangelaries. Cf. Josef Vašica, *Staročeské evangeliáře* (Prague 1931) and František Verner, *Bibliografie českých překladů celé bible i jejich částí* (Prague 1987) 71f.

101) Holeton, "The Evolution", 50.

102) From the outset, much of the debate focused on ceremonial and liturgical matters. See, for example, the 1417 protocol of Jan Jesenic in Kaminsky, *A History*, 230; the same matters figured prominently in the 1434 debate between the Taborites and the University Masters cf. Molnár and Cegna, *Confessio Taboritorum*, *passim* and remained a principal factor which precipitated the ultimate rift between the Utraquists and the Jednota Bratrská cf. D. R. Holeton, "Church or Sect?..." *CV* (forthcoming).

and which unleashed acts of liturgical philisitinism,[103] there was also a creative edge which made a serious contribution to western liturgical history. This can best be seen in the slow evolution towards a clearly "reformed" liturgy within the Jednota Bratrská in which traditional liturgical forms are retained but with the accretions of the centuries pared away. Here, proleptically, we see dynamics that appear again in the liturgical reforms of the churches issuing from the Second Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Conclusion

From what has been said, it should be clear that the Bohemian eucharistic movement was, without doubt, the most significant movement of its kind in the late middle ages and outshone anything that was to emerge in the Second Reformation of the sixteenth century. Its aims – first to restore frequent communion, then the chalice, and then the communion of all the baptized – are just beginning to be realized in the churches of our own day. While the reformers of the Second Reformation set out to restore frequent communion and the chalice, their success in the latter was considerably greater than in the former. The popular piety of the middle ages that weighed in favour of infrequent communion won out over these reformers best intentions. The question of communicating all the baptized was not a part of the programme for reform of any of the major sixteenth century reformers and only presented itself either in the context of religious polemic with Anabaptists[104] or in small, sectarian, communities.[105] The goals of the Bohemian eucharistic movement have, only in our age, become the goals of

103) From the time of Laurence of Brežová *(Historia Hussitica* 398, 400, 403ff.) until that of Bílejovský (*Kronyka cýrkewní* 53,55; see also David, "Bohuslav Bílejovský and the Religious Via Media", n.40 below) there was a long litany of offences imputed to the Táborites. These ranged from the merely iconoclastic (destruction of images of the Lord, the Blessed Virgin Mary and the saints), to acts of vandalism (smashing chalices and monstrances, destroying liturgical books and vestments), to the sacrelgeous (trammeling consecrated hosts into the ground, oiling boots with chrism, defecating in baptismal fonts).

104) D. R. Holeton, "The Communion of Infants in Anglicanism", *Anglican Theological Review* 59,1 (1987) 15–22.

105) The English Non-Jurors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, for example, restored the communion of all the baptized as did the Catholic Apostolic Church in the last century. Cf. D. R. Holeton, "The Communion of Infants and Young Children: A Sacrament of Community" in Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz ed., *... and do not hinder them*, [Faith and Order Paper No. 109] (Geneva 1982) 59–69; Kenneth Stevenson, "The Catholic Apostolic Church – its History and Eucharist", *Studia Liturgica* 13 (1979) 41 and "A Theological Reflection on the Experience of Inclusion/Exclusion at the Eucharist", *Anglican Theological Review* 68,3 (1986) 213.

the churches. It is ironic that Roman Catholicism today is trying to restore what the Counter-reformers in Bohemia sought to seek out and destroy – an ecclesial community in which the normative fulfillment of the Sunday eucharist is the communion of all the faithful.

Similarly, the gradual evolution of the liturgy both within mainstream Utraquism where there was no articulated programme of liturgical reform as well as in the more radically reformed Bohemian churches where there was such a programme, we are offered models of liturgical reform and renewal which are highly instructive for our own age. Both are certainly worthy of the attention of contemporary liturgical scholars.

It must be admitted that the eucharistic experience of Bohemia between Milíč and Bilá Hora made very limited contribution to world culture in the past. It's impact, if any, was negative. The lay chalice became, for many, the symbol of all that was excessive in the Second Reformation[106] and was, for centuries, a symbol of the division of the churches. The question of the communion of small children and infants was generally ignored during the Second Reformation and was remembered by Trent's anathematization of those who advocated its necessity.[107] Now, however, in a more ecumenical

106) Condemned by the Council of Constance (Session 13, 15 June 1415) [Heinrich Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationem de rebus fidei et morum* (Freiburg im Bresgau 1991[37]) 1198ff.] more as a defence of the mediæval doctrine of concomitance and the legitimate evolution of liturgical practice, the issue, by the Council of Trent, had become much more fundamental to 'catholic' identity. Thus, while Constance inveighs against those who "say that to observe this custom or law [of receiving under one species only] is a sacrilege or illicit" (quod hoc consuetudinem aut legem observare sit sacriligem aut illicitum), Trent anathematizes all those who claim that the general reception of both eucharistic species is "a precept of God or necessary for salvation" [Canon 1] (Denzinger 1731) as well as those who question the propriety of the change in liturgical practice [Canon 2] (Denzinger 1732) or denies the doctrine of concomitance [Canon 3] (Denzinger 1733). All of these anathematizations are aimed at least as much at the Utraquists as they are at the sixteenth century reformers, a fact that is generally overlooked by modern students of Trent. Even in our own age where the chalice has been restored as the normal means of distributing communion in many Roman Catholic parishes, resistance to the practice is founded not on theological argument but on the emotion invested in the chalice as the symbol of what Roman Catholics "do not do" to make them distinct from Protestants. This use of ritual practice primarily for the purpose of assuring a distinctive identity is common and positive feature observed by those who work in ritual studies and the anthropology of religion.

107) Council of Trent, Session 21 (16 July 1562) "The Doctrine on Communion under both Species and that of Little Children." Chapter Four: "Little Children are not Bound to Sacramental Communion" (Denzinger 1730) and the corresponding Canon 4 (Denzinger 1734): "Si quis dixerit, parvulis, antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint, necessariam esse Eucharistiæ communionem: anathema sit" is aimed at the Utraquists alone for no other church issuing from the Second Reformation advocated communicating young children let alone claimed it to be necessary.

age in which the goals of former enemies are more congruent with the goals of the Bohemian reformers, the experience of the Bohemian church has an important contribution to make towards world culture which could bear important fruit and, therefore, merits ongoing critical study.[108]

108) For example Pierre-Marie Gy begins a study of the practice of baptismal communion with the Tridentine anathematization and concludes by calling for a restoration of the practice. Cf. “Die Taufkommunion der kleinen Kinder in der lateinischen Kirche” in H. Auf Der Maur ed., *Zeichen des Glaubens* (Zürich/Einseideln 1972) 485, 491.