

---

## Utraquism in 1414

---

**Helena Krmíčková**

(Brno)

Older literature, which dealt with the reintroduction of the lay chalice, placed the event toward the end of 1414, when Hus was confined to the dungeons. For this dating, it relied on the testimony of *Staří letopisové čeští* [SLČ, The Old Czech Annals].<sup>1</sup> More recent studies, roughly since the start of the twentieth century, have mostly pointed to the time shortly after Hus had departed from Bohemia to attend the Council of Constance.<sup>2</sup> In addition to SLČ, this recent scholarship has also relied on a later statement of Jan Rokycana that Hus had urged Jakoubek of Stříbro not to rush the momentous step, but rather await his own return from Constance.<sup>3</sup> Opposing voices were rare, and their argumentation was not particularly convincing. František Palacký sought support in Hus's response to the so-called *Depositiones testium*, and viewed the anathematisation of the four Prague priests as a retribution for introducing the lay chalice. He considered Utraquism likely before Hus's departure.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Václav Novotný, who – in contrast to other scholars – accepted Palacký's interpretation of *Depositiones testium*, dated the practice of lay communion *sub utraque* to September 1414; however, he placed the theoretical justification of this theological reform into a later period.<sup>5</sup> Jan Sedlák dated the origin of the quaestio *Utrum probari potest demonstracione vel evidencia naturali Deum esse trinum cum aliis fidei articulis* into the first half of 1414, and connected the beginnings of Utraquism with it.<sup>6</sup> In reality, this quaestio had not originated until January 1416.<sup>7</sup> Romolo Cegna presented fresh arguments for the existence of Utraquism in 1414,<sup>8</sup> but above all he advanced to as early as before 1412 the origin of the allegedly first Utraquist treatise, *Replika rektorovi v Korbachu* [A Reply to the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Staří letopisové čeští od roku 1378 do 1527, čili pokračování v kronikách Přibíka Pulkavy a Beneše z Hořic, z rukopisů starých vydané*, ed. František Palacký, *Scriptores rerum Bohemicarum* 3 (1829) 20, 472-473.

<sup>2</sup> The first to advance this position was František M. Bartoš in the two editions of his *Počátky kalicha v Čechách* [ČMKČ 96 (1922) 43-51, 157-173; ČNM 97 (1923) oddíl duchovnědný, 34-51; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. In his *Husitství a cizina* (Prague, 1931) 59-112 and his view was upheld by a majority of later scholars.

<sup>3</sup> Jan Rokycana, *Postilla* I, ed. František Šimek (Prague, 1928) 692-693.

<sup>4</sup> František Palacký, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě*. v. 3: *Od roku 1403 až do roku 1439*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Prague, 1894) 102-104.

<sup>5</sup> Václav Novotný, *M. Jan Hus: život a učení*. I. *Život a dílo*. 2 vv. (Prague, 1919-1921) 2:351-352 (esp. 352, n. 1), 367-370.

<sup>6</sup> Jan Sedlák, "Počátkové kalicha," *Časopis katolického duchovenstva*, 52 [77] (1911) 99-104.

<sup>7</sup> For correct dating and survey of the literature see Jiří Kejř, *Kvodlibetní disputace na pražské universitě* (Prague, 1971) 152 (n. 19).

<sup>8</sup> He called attention to a passage in Nicholas of Dresden's treatise *De purgatorio*, which notes preparations for communion *sub utraque* even before Hus's departure for Constance. He connected this passage with his earlier finding in his article, "Początki utrakwizmu w Czechach w latach 1412-1415: W związku z odnalezieniem dzieła 'Plures tractatuli pullulant...Omnibus Christi fidelibus' Jakoubka ze Stříbra," *Przegląd historyczny* 69 (1978) 106. Cegna further called attention to a manuscript in the Gniezno Chapter, which contains *Responsio*, an extensive reply of Jakoubek to Ondřej of Brod, and which notes on its covers the year 1414, see Cegna, "Początki utrakwizmu," 105-106. *Responsio* is a work which reflects intensely developed polemics concerning the lay chalice.

Rector of Korbach], the composition of which, according to him, occurred not in Bohemia, but in Germany.<sup>9</sup> Thereby he had led the investigation of Utraquism's beginnings into a blind alley; while the debate revolved around the pre-1412 possibilities (which ultimately proved to be unsubstantiated<sup>10</sup>), Cegna's arguments concerning the year 1414 were set aside.

Why did historical literature, beginning with Bartoš, deviate from the report in SLČ by advancing Utraquism's beginning prior to Hus's imprisonment? Bartoš did not give an explicit reason, but apparently he was guided by the fact that one of the manuscripts of Nicholas of Dresden's sermons, *Nisi manducaveritis*, belonging to the University of Prague [Ms. V G 19], bore the colophon date of 12 November 1414. Hence Bartoš assumed that in this period – as indicated by the sermon's text -- Utraquism was already in full swing, including its actual practice.<sup>11</sup> Of course, not everyone interpreted the colophon like Bartoš. Howard Kaminsky considered a period somewhat before 12 November, evidently so that Utraquism's origin would fit into the time frame between that date and Hus's departure for Constance on 12 October 1414.<sup>12</sup> Others, first Sedlák<sup>13</sup> and recently Cegna,<sup>14</sup> considered the text a sermon for the feast of Corpus Christi and, thus, dating to 7 June 1414.

Let us, therefore, examine more closely the extant manuscripts of *Nisi manducaveritis*. The crucial colophon, which notes the full date, is a part of a mere fragment of Nicholas's sermon, *Nisi manducaveritis*; it appears on f. 251<sup>a</sup> which contains only nine incomplete lines of the sermon's conclusion, and the scribe's postscript. Hence, unfortunately, we cannot ascertain the character of the text, and its closeness to, or its distance from, the archetype. The very text of the colophon, however, prevents us from upholding Bartoš's interpretation of the sermon: *Finitus anno Domini MCCCCXIII in die quinque fratrum et factus eodem anno per Nicolaum, baccalarium decretum, in ecclesia sancti Michaelis Antiquae civitatis Pragensis, etc.* The colophon clearly distinguishes the completion of writing [*finitus*], from the oral delivery of the sermon [*factus*]. Furthermore, the text of the completely preserved manuscripts indicates that the recording was not a preparatory draft of the sermon, but its final version designed for further copying. The notation *factus* must, therefore, indicate a time prior to 12 November 1414. Incidentally, this was also the view of Sedlák, Kaminsky, and Cegna.<sup>15</sup> It is, however, not possible to establish the

<sup>9</sup> This theory was first presented in his "Appunti su Valdismo e Ussitismo: La teologia sociale di Nicola della Rosa Nera (Cerruc)," *Estratto del Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi* 130 (December 1971) 10-13.

<sup>10</sup> See Helena Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* (Brno, 1997) 62-77; *idem*, "The Fifteenth Century Origins of Lay Communion *sub utraque* in Bohemia," *BRRP* 2 (1998) 61-64.

<sup>11</sup> Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha," *ČMKČ* 170, n. 12; *idem*, *Husitství a cizina*, 86-87, n. 12.

<sup>12</sup> Howard Kaminsky et al., eds., *Master Nicholas of Dresden: The Old Color and the New, Selected Works Contrasting the Primitive Church and the Roman Church* (Philadelphia, 1965) 30 (n. 7).

<sup>13</sup> Jan Sedlák, *M. Jan Hus* (Prague, 1915) 304 (esp. n. 4).

<sup>14</sup> Cegna published an edition of the sermon in a book, which also included Nicholas's *Puncta*, as: Nicolai (ut dicunt) de Dresda vulgo appellati de Čerruc (de Černá růže id est Rosa Nigra [+1418?]), *Puncta* (Warsaw, 1996). Although he did not give arguments for his chronology, he inserted his dating in the book's subtitle: *Sermo ad clerum de materia sanguinis Nisi manducaveritis, in templo S. Michaelis Veteris Civitatis Pragae in festo Corporis Christi die septima mensis Iunii anno MCCCCXIV habitus*.

<sup>15</sup> Sedlák and Cegna, however, erred in associating the sermon with the feast of Corpus Christi. At the time, this feast was viewed as a celebration of the Lord's Body, and the second species (that of Blood) was not relevant here. Moreover, Nicholas's sermon was much more advanced (from the

earlier date. The text of the colophon can only justify the assumption that *eodem anno* did not signify a time very close to 12 November 1414. Had the sermon been delivered in November, then it would have been more appropriate for the scribe to use the expression *mense*, instead of *anno*. Had Nicholas preached in October, then the scribe should have been able to remember the date. The formulation of the colophon suggested that on 12 November 1414, the scribe no longer knew exactly when the sermon was preached. The time lapse between *factus* and *finitus*, therefore, could not have been very brief.

Two other manuscripts of the sermon contain colophons with chronological particulars. The scribes' postscripts are virtually identical in both manuscripts: (1) *Anno Domini 1414 in ecclesia s. Michaelis* in Ms. Prague UK XI D 9, and (2) *1414 in ecclesia sancti Michaelis* in Ms. Vienna \_NB 4940. The kinship of the two manuscripts<sup>16</sup> is indicated not only by the colophon, it is also confirmed by the texts of the sermon; both of these manuscripts derive from a the same witness, and clearly differ from another group of manuscripts which record the sermon *Nisi manducaveritis*. The two manuscripts must have originated at the earliest in 1416 because their common (now no longer extant) source contained also Jan Bradáček's work, *Passio fidelis et cristianissimi magistri nostri Iohannis Hus*, and this hagiography was written after Hus's death. The colophon was likewise copied from a now missing model. Its text, however, does not permit us to decide exactly whether the statement about the date and place referred to the time when the sermon was preached, or to the time when the original witness to the text – with its already distinct deviation – originated. Even the few lines of text, which ms. V G 19 has preserved, are sufficient to determine that this manuscript had the sermon text which was closer to the group of manuscripts, other than Ms. Prague UK XI D 9, and Ms. Vienna \_NB 4940. Nevertheless, it differed even from that other group, because it lacked the addendum of authorities for lay communion *sub utraque*. This addendum is now viewed, thanks to Cegna's influence, as an independent treatise, *Collecta*.<sup>17</sup> The pro-Utraquist authorities are not cited in either manuscript Prague UK XI D 9 or Vienna \_NB 4940, and their absence creates the impression that the *Collecta* had not yet existed in 1414, and that the manuscripts of the second group derived from a later source. Nevertheless, the *Collecta* must have been already known in 1414, as attested by Hus's quaestio *De sanguine Christi sub specie vini*.<sup>18</sup>

Hus's quaestio of Constance can serve us as a certain *point d'appui*, which suggests what was known about Utraquism previously, and what only subsequently. To be sure, it is classifiable chronologically. Although Vavřinec of Březová<sup>19</sup> and *Vetus collegiatus*<sup>20</sup> placed it into the period of Hus's imprisonment, it must have originated still prior to his jailing as, for that matter, its early reproductions have noted. After all, Hus referred to it already in his letter to Jan of Chlum of 4 January

---

Utraquist point of view) than Jakoubek's embryonic writings, which were only groping their way from Matěj of Janov's frequent communion to the lay chalice.

<sup>16</sup> These issues are discussed in detail in my article "Nedochovaná předloha rukopisů PUK XI D 9 and ÖNB 4940," SPFFBU, C 45 (2001), forthcoming.

<sup>17</sup> Cegna, "Appunti su Valdismo e Ussitismo," 20.

<sup>18</sup> The sources of this quaestio are analyzed in my article "K pramenům Husovy kvestie *De sanguine Christi sub specie vini*," SPFFBU, C 45 (1998) 79-102.

<sup>19</sup> Vavřinec of Březová, *Kronika husitská*, FRB V (1893) 333.

<sup>20</sup> *Chronicon veteris Collegiati Pragensis*, ed. Konstantin Höfler, in *Geschichtschreiber der husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen I*, FRA, Scriptores 2:86.

1415,<sup>21</sup> and it is absolutely out of the question that it might have dated to the first days of his imprisonment. Hence Hus wrote it in the period between 3 and 28 November 1414. In his work he used sources, which were sent to him from Bohemia; in Constance he certainly lacked the time and the reference sources so that he might set forth authorities, which moreover he had never used previously and thus could not have recalled from memory. It was exactly a gathering of such authorities that formed the substance of his quaestio. He adopted the citations from some of Jakoubek's treatises and also from the *Collecta* of Nicholas of Dresden. Hence the *Collecta* must have originated before November 1414. The fact that prior to November originated *Nisi manducaveritis* is also attested by the form of citation from Ambrose's work *De sacramentis*, which Hus had known from Jakoubek's treatise *Pius Iesus* and which Jakoubek had adopted from Nicholas.<sup>22</sup>

This analysis confirms my conclusion about the meaning of the colophon text in ms. Prague UK V G 19. The sermon definitely could not have been preached as late as November 12, 1414.

Hus's quaestio, however, does not contain the citations – which we know from the works of Jakoubek and Nicholas – in full, but only in abbreviated formats, which represent their crux. As can be deduced from the use of such abbreviations in Bohemia both before and after the composition of Hus's quaestio, this contraction of citations was not the work of Hus – who in any case would have lacked time for such an exercise. The champions of Utraquism, Jakoubek and Nicholas, performed the operation of themselves shortening, by condensing, the lengthy citations of authoritative theologians in support of lay communion *sub utraque* which they had gathered and presented in their own earlier treatises. Hus's quaestio of November 1414, therefore, originated at a time, after Utraquism had already been discussed at length, and not just newly broached as a fresh topic of polemics. When Hus wrote, several mature literary works had already become extant, and Jakoubek and Nicholas had had ample opportunities to work on the raw data of lengthy quotations from authorities – which they cited in their earlier works – and reduce them through pruning and selection into more elegant and substantively richer quotations. It is out of the question that this happened after the Synod of St. Luke on 18 October when, according to Bartoš, a peremptory prohibition of the lay chalice should have sparked the debates about Utraquism.<sup>23</sup> The beginnings of the literature in support of Utraquism, as well as the associated polemics, must be shifted more toward the mid-point of 1414, if not outright into the first half of that year. This can be supported by several other pieces of evidence.

In the first place, it is an allusion of Jakoubek's, which he had let slip in his sermon of 1 April 1414, and to which Bartoš has already called attention.<sup>24</sup> His formulation<sup>25</sup> clearly showed that already at this time the issue of the lay chalice was

<sup>21</sup> Novotný, 239-241 (n. 106).

<sup>22</sup> See Krmíčková, "K pramenům Husovy kvestie," 87.

<sup>23</sup> Bartoš, "Poč<tky kalicha," ČMKČ 170-1171; *idem*, *Husitství a cizina*, 87-88.

<sup>24</sup> References to Utraquism in this homily are analyzed in Bartoš, "Poč<tky kalicha," ČMKČ 166-169; *idem*, *Husitství a cizina*, 82-85.

<sup>25</sup> "Sicud nunc subvertunt nobis verba nostra, quando enim predicamus, quod institutio Cristi debet teneri de communione, ipsi tunc dicunt, quod predicaremus et divideremus sanguinem Cristi a corpore Cristi. Et quando predicamus, quia ymagines non debent venerari, tunc ipsi dicunt, quod predicaremus, quia non debent esse ymagines." Jakoubek of Stříbro, *Evangelijní postila*, Ms. Prague KNM XIV E 4, f. 98<sup>a</sup>.

debated, even though it might not have been done in written form. It was definitely not an expression of Jakoubek's "*revelatio*" of the chalice, which he wished to share immediately with the faithful. In view of Jakoubek's well-known caution<sup>26</sup> – which was not simply a characteristic of his later old age – the principle of lay communion *sub utraque* must have by then fully matured through debate, if Jakoubek were to announce it from the pulpit.

As yet unappreciated has been Jakoubek's authentic testimony about Hus's attitude toward communion *sub utraque*, which was included in the treatise, *Omnibus Cristi fidelibus*, of 1415: "Unde magister Iohannes, cum inceperat publicari punctus iste ewangelicus de communione calicis ad plebes, dicebat penitendo: O miser ego, quociens hunc punctum legi 'Probet se ipsum homo et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat' et nunquam pensavi, quomodo cecatus eram, quod hoc nec at populum proclamavi."<sup>27</sup> We know from *Evangelijní postila* that Jakoubek discussed Paul's verse in a sermon on the feast of Corpus Christi, 1414 (7 June),<sup>28</sup> and it is probable that Hus had been informed still earlier than the faithful were from the pulpit. Also this piece of evidence moves the discussions of the chalice, within the circle of Hus's adherents, back into the first half of 1414.

Finally, there is the testimony of Nicholas of Dresden, who in his treatise, *De purgatorio*, likewise from 1415, mentioned preparations for lay communion *sub utraque* first, and only then Hus's departure for Constance.<sup>29</sup> Thus, not only theoretical discussions, but also the actual practice of Utraquism might have started prior to Hus's journey to the Council, rather than subsequently.

Hus's quaestio refers to a number of sources, which can be found also in a Czech verse composition, *Otázka nyní taková běží* [Such a Question is Now Current]. Bartoš injected this work into the scholarly discourse about the reintroduction of lay chalice.<sup>30</sup> He considered it an anonymous song of Jakoubek's folkish supporters, which originated immediately after the prohibition of the chalice by the St. Luke Synod. Subsequently, having discovered its text with the author's name at the University of Basel (ms. A X 66) under the title, *...řeč o přijímání těla Božího pod obým způsobem Čapkova* [Čapek's Speech About the Reception of the Body of Christ in Both Kinds], Bartoš treated the text in connection with this later Taborite priest.<sup>31</sup> He tried to include among Čapek's Utraquist writings also *Knižky o přijímání z kalicha* [Booklets About Communion from the Chalice] from 1417 (which he had earlier ascribed to Jakoubek), as well as the vesper readings from the Jistebnický kancionál.<sup>32</sup> František Svejkský, however, tried to show<sup>33</sup> – and

<sup>26</sup> Recently see Miloslav Ransdorf, *Kapitoly z geneze husitské ideologie* (Prague, 1986) 137-138.

<sup>27</sup> Printed from Jakoubek's unpublished treatise in Jaroslav Kadlec, *Studien und Texte zum Leben und Wirken des Prager Magisters Andreas von Brod* (Münster, 1982) 56, n. 100.

<sup>28</sup> "Sermo in festo Corporis Christi," in Nicholas of Dresden, *Puncta*, 190.

<sup>29</sup> Nicola della Rosa Nera detto Dresda (1380?-1416?), *De reliquiis et de veneratione sanctorum – De purgatorio*, ed. R. Cegna (Wrocław, 1977) 117-119.

<sup>30</sup> Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha," ČMKČ 169-171; *idem*, *Husitství a cizina*, 86, 88.

<sup>31</sup> In detail in František M. Bartoš, *Čechy v době Husově* (Prague, 1947) 398-399; *idem*, "Z politické literatury doby husitské," SH 5 (1957) 31-34.

<sup>32</sup> Bartoš, "Z politické literatury," 32-37.

<sup>33</sup> František Svejkský, "Z básnické činnosti Jana Čapka," LF 85 (1962), 282-288, 290-292; *idem*, *Veršované skladby doby husitské* (Prague, 1963) 22-24.

scholars have subsequently accepted his solution<sup>34</sup> – that the *Knížky*, as well as the vesper readings, were older than the *Otázka*. Svejkovský has argued that, prior to the end of 1414, Utraquism could not have been in such a vogue as to arouse a genuine popular enthusiasm. That would have become possible only by 1417.

*Otázka* was, properly speaking, a collection of versified citations in support of Utraquism, and most of these authoritative quotations were found also in Hus's quaestio – from Thomas Aquinas, Cyprian, and Gelasius. Čapek cited them in the same economic format as Hus (not in the earlier verbose rendition of Jakoubek and Nicholas). Moreover, his citation from Aquinas contained Hus's own appendage, which was never found in Jakoubek or Nicholas.<sup>35</sup> *Otázka*, therefore, demonstrably drew on Hus, and thus could not originate immediately after 18 October 1414 (as Bartoš assumed), but at the earliest in December 1414, by which time Hus's quaestio had a chance to become known in Prague, or more likely somewhat later. Not so late, however, as Svejkovský has assumed.

The only authority, which Hus did not use, but which the *Otázka* did contain, was a gloss of Nicholas of Lyra on 1Cor 11:26. Paul's eucharistic statements have served Svejkovský as the strongest argument for the chronological precedence of *Knížky* over *Otázka*. These passages were prosaic in *Knížky*, and versified in *Otázka*. If *Otázka* had come first – reasoned Svejkovský -- then Čapek could have used the versified epistle of Paul also in the *Knížky*. This argument, however, can be refuted by comparing how the epistle was employed in the two works. In *Knížky*, Čapek included verses 11:23-29, with a particular stress on verse 29. Articulating his work into several themes, the author used 1 Cor. 11:29 to introduce the theme of *vážnost* [gravity], as he translated the Latin *diiudicans*. In *Otázka* the author did not advance beyond verse 26, which he considered most crucial, and provided with Nicholas of Lyra's commentary. This commentary was not customary in Utraquist writings, but it did appear in the earliest Utraquist work, Jakoubek's quaestio, *Quia heu in templis*.<sup>36</sup> Thus in *Otázka* we encounter references, which stemmed from the earliest of Utraquist writings, and were, therefore, definitely known in 1414. Lyra's commentary, however, was not included in one of the best known collections of Utraquist authorities of a somewhat later time, namely in Jakoubek's treatise, *Salvator noster*. This was written after Hus's death in 1415 or 1416, and was inscribed on the walls of Bethlehem Chapel. The *Otázka*, moreover, presented its message as distinctly up-to-date – *Such a Question is Now Current*. In March 1417, however, Jakoubek discussed the question: "Utrum communitates fedelium debeant divinissimam eukaristiam sumere sub utraque forma sacramentali tam panis quam vini,"<sup>37</sup> and a year earlier: "Utrum sacerdos nolens populo ministrare sub duplici specie est seductor et hereticus."<sup>38</sup> He had emphatically commanded the use of the chalice

<sup>34</sup> See entry "Jan Čapek," by Emil Pražák in *Lexikon české literatury* (Prague, 1985) 1:375-376.

<sup>35</sup> "Quamvis totus Christus sit sub utraque specie, non tamen frustra **datur sub utraque specie**: quia hoc est conveniens usui huius sacramenti (see Krmíčková, "K pramenům Husovy kvestie," 99) and that second "datur sub utraque specie" following after "non tamen frustra," is also found in Čapek's composition, both in its Latin version and in the Czech verses (Svejkovský, *Veršované skladby doby husitské*, 91-92).

<sup>36</sup> Ms. Prague UK, V G 7, f. 11<sup>b</sup>-12<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> A question from the quaestio, *Posicio de missa pro informacione monachi Predicatoris s. Clementis M. Petri de Uniczow*. (Spunar No. 570.)

<sup>38</sup> A question from the quaestio, *Utrum sacerdos nolens*. (Spunar No. 569.)

already in 1415.<sup>39</sup> Under these circumstances, Čapek's question would have been a stale anachronism and not a novelty, which it pretended to be. If it were relevant in 1417, it would have had to refer to the communion of infants, which then indeed was a hot issue.<sup>40</sup> It was actually in 1414 that one could hear two questions which were distinctly close to Čapek's *Otázka*. The first one, "Utrum expediens sit et necessarium ex institucione Christi, quod conmunitas fidelium laicorum sumat sepius corpus et sanguinem Cristi sub duplici forma sacramentali," was posed by Jakoubek to the University during the disputation about the quaestio *Quia heu in templis*. The second one, "Utrum expediat laicis fidelibus sumere sanguinem Cristi sub specie vini" was discussed by Hus in Constance in the quaestio *De sanguine Christi sub specie vini*. Čapek's *Otázka* was definitely not a work that would have corresponded with the situation of 1417, but it resonated clearly and closely with the ideas and writings of 1414.

In sum, Bohemia could boast – prior to Hus's quaestio – theological works, which showed that the idea of Utraquism had been overtly and thoroughly discussed even before Hus left for Constance. As demonstrated in this study, we can include among such writings not only Jakoubek's *Evangelijní postila*, but also quaestio *Quia heu in templis*, which he publicly presented in the university, and also at the very least his treatises *Pius Iesus* and *Quod non solum sacerdotes*, as well as Nicholas of Dresden's sermon, *Nisi manducaveritis*, and his *Collecta*.<sup>41</sup> Thus at that time, Utraquism had already received its proper theological exposition and – at the other side of the ledger – had aroused its earliest opponents. It is true that the first known Utraquist writings in the Czech language would follow a bit later; nevertheless – prior to Hus's departure from Bohemia – the idea of Utraquism was already finding its incarnation in the practice of communion *sub utraque*. In other words, Utraquism was turning from an academic theory into an applied art.

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

<sup>39</sup> See Krmíčková, *Studie a texty*, 24-25.

<sup>40</sup> See Jiří Kejř, "Auctoritates contra communionem parvulorum M. Jana z Jesenice," *StR* 19 (1980) 5-21; David R. Holeton, *La communion des tout-petits enfants: Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen Âge* (Rome, 1989).

<sup>41</sup> See Krmíčková, "K pramenům Husovy kvestie."