
The Hussite Background to the Sixteenth-Century Eucharistic Controversy

Amy Nelson Burnett (Nebraska, Lincoln)

Historians outside of the Czech Republic generally ignore Hussite discussions of the Eucharist in the fifteenth century and their influence on early Protestantism.¹ Studies of the development of Eucharistic theology and of church history usually begin with the early church, then jump to the debate provoked by Berengar of Tours in the eleventh century and the development of scholasticism in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, and finally describe the controversy over the sacrament that broke out in Germany in the mid-1520s.² When they do discuss the views of Wyclif and his Hussite successors, Protestant church historians have sometimes taken an oddly anachronistic approach by describing them in terms of the positions held by later theologians.³ Not surprisingly, this has obscured rather than illuminated the Hussite contribution to the early Reformation discussion of the Eucharist.

The focus of modern discussions on the central figures of Martin Luther and Huldrych Zwingli has also distorted our understanding of Hussite influences on the sixteenth-century debate. Luther's connections with the Bohemians have been well studied, and it is clear that although the Wittenberg reformer was open to discussions with both Utraquists and

1 The major exception is the work of Erhard Peschke, *Die Theologie der böhmischen Brüder in ihrer Frühzeit*, 2 vv. (Stuttgart, 1935–40); and idem, *Die Böhmisches Brüder im Urteil ihrer Zeit, Zieglers, Dungersheims und Luthers Kritik an der Brüderunität* (Stuttgart, 1964).

2 Among English-language accounts, see: Hermann Sasse, *This is my Body, Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis, 1959); Alasdair I. C. Heron, *Table and Tradition* (Philadelphia, 1983); William R. Crockett, *Eucharist, Symbol of Transformation* (New York, 1989); Paul H. Jones, *Christ's Eucharistic Presence, A History of the Doctrine* (New York, 1994); as well as the first chapter of Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation, Incarnation and Liturgy* (Cambridge, 2006). Hussite discussions of the sacrament are not discussed in either Ian Christopher Levy, Gary Macy and Kristen Van Ausdall (eds.), *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages* (Leiden-Boston, 2012) or Lee Palmer Wandel (ed.), *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation* (Leiden-Boston, 2014).

3 David Broughton Knox, for instance, claimed that Wyclif was "the first Englishman to teach clearly and fully the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper." See: David Broughton Knox, *The Lord's Supper from Wycliffe to Cranmer* (Exeter, 1983) 9; cited in Brian Douglas, *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology* (Leiden-Boston, 2012) 2: 420.

Bohemian Brethren at different times, his own understanding of the Lord's Supper was not substantially influenced by Hussite understandings of the Eucharist.⁴ The reformer who is considered his chief opponent, Huldrych Zwingli, did not have any direct contact with Bohemian thought, and studies have looked instead at the influence of Swiss reformers and Anabaptist immigrants on developments in Bohemia, rather than the other way around.⁵

To detect the influence of Hussite theology on the sixteenth-century debate over the Lord's Supper, we must turn our attention away from Luther and Zwingli and look at other reformers. Bart Jan Spruyt has argued that Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana...tractans Cenam Dominicam* was strongly influenced by medieval heretical – and especially Hussite – ideas.⁶ My own work on the Eucharistic controversy has revealed the importance of the Basel reformer Johannes Oecolampadius and of Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, Luther's colleague turned opponent, as key figures in the development of what is usually called the "Zwinglian" understanding of the Eucharist.⁷ Both Oecolampadius and Karlstadt drew on ideas developed and defended by Hussite thinkers throughout the fifteenth century. In fact, Hussite discussions of the Eucharist are the "missing link" between Wyclif in the late fourteenth century and arguments both for the lay chalice and against Christ's bodily presence in sixteenth-century Reformation Germany.

I use the term "bodily presence" quite deliberately, for it was the phrase used by participants in the sixteenth-century debate. In order to understand both Bohemian and Protestant Eucharistic theology, we must avoid using the concept of "real presence" developed in the nineteenth century.⁸

4 There are a number of works that look at Luther, Hus and Bohemia. Those that consider Luther's knowledge of Hussite Eucharistic theology are: S. Harrison Thomson, "Luther and Bohemia," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 44 (1953) 160–181; Konrad Bittner, "Erasmus, Luther und die böhmischen Brüder," in *Rastloses Schaffen*, ed. Heinz Seehase (Stuttgart, 1954) 107–129; Bernhard Lohse, "Luther und Huß," *Luther, Zeitschrift der Luthergesellschaft* 36 (1965) 108–122; Amedeo Molnár, "Luthers Beziehungen zu den Böhmisches Brüdern," in *Leben und Werk Martin Luthers von 1526 bis 1546*, ed. Helmar Junghans (Göttingen, 1983) 1: 627–639; and Thomas R. Fudge, "Luther and the 'Hussite' catechism of 1522," in *Confessional Identity in East-central Europe*, ed. Maria Craciun, Ovidiu Ghitta and Graeme Murdock (Aldershot, 2002) 31–48.

5 Joseph Th. Müller, "Die böhmische Brüderunität und Zwingli," *Zwingliana* 3 (1920) 514–524; Jarold K. Zeman, *The Anabaptists and the Czech Brethren in Moravia 1526–1628, A Study of Origins and Contacts* (The Hague, 1969).

6 Bart Jan Spruyt, *Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honijs) and his Epistle on the Eucharist (1525)* (Leiden, 2006) 127–165.

7 Amy Nelson Burnett, "Oekolampads Anteil am frühen Abendmahlsstreit," in *Basel als Zentrum des geistigen Austauschs in der frühen Reformation*, ed. Christine Christ-von Wedel, Sven Grosse and Berndt Hamm (Tübingen, 2014) 215–31; and eadem, *Karlstadt and the Origins of the Eucharistic Controversy, A Study in the Circulation of Ideas* (New York, 2011).

8 Albert B. Collver III, "'Real Presence,' An Overview and History of the Term," *Concordia Journal* 28 (2002) 142–59.

Sixteenth-century theologians knew that the term *realiter* was ambiguous, meaning either “substantial” or “true,” and so they generally avoided it in their debates over the Eucharist. Like earlier Hussite theologians, they used a range of other terms to explain how Christ might be present in the sacrament. Rather than forcing fifteenth-century discussions of the Eucharist into the Procrustean bed of modern terminology by asking “did so-and-so teach the Real Presence of Christ,” we need to ask more broadly: “how did Bohemian thinkers try to explain Christ’s presence?” This is a much more fruitful question that allows a number of answers beyond “yes” or “no,” and that in turn helps us understand the significance of fifteenth-century Bohemian Eucharistic theology.

Bohemia would be extremely important as the seedbed for later Protestant Eucharistic theology, because it was the one place in the fifteenth century where university-educated scholars could elaborate an intellectually feasible alternative to transubstantiation, or, to put it another way, where they could develop an alternative discourse concerning the Eucharist. No other group was in any position to do so. The Cathars and the Waldensians rejected belief in Christ’s bodily presence in the consecrated host, but the former were effectively eliminated in the fourteenth century, and the latter were skeptical of the Latin learning taught at universities.⁹ Likewise, one should not discount the role of common sense skepticism in raising questions among laypeople about Christ’s physical presence in the consecrated host; how, for instance, could Christ’s body simultaneously be on many altars? And if a mouse ate the consecrated host, did it also eat Christ’s body? But scholastic theologians felt they had answered such objections in their own discussions of the Eucharist, and so they dismissed such arguments.¹⁰ Throughout most of Europe, the practice of academic condemnation within the university and inquisitorial procedures against those suspected of heresy effectively prevented the elaboration of an understanding of the Eucharist that could challenge the scholastic doctrine of transubstantiation as it had developed by the early fourteenth century.¹¹

The University of Oxford was for a brief time the exception to this general rule. But in the early 1380s Wyclif’s position on the Eucharist drew the

9 Alexander Patschovsky, “The Literacy of Waldensianism from Valdes to c. 1400,” in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*, ed. Peter Biller and Anne Hudson (Cambridge, 1994) 112–36.

10 Gary Macy, “Of Mice and Manna: Quid mus sumit as a Pastoral Question,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 58 (1991) 157–66; and Anne Hudson, “The Mouse in the Pyx: Popular Heresy and the Eucharist,” *Trivium* 26 (1991) 40–53.

11 On the procedures for academic condemnation, see: Johannes M. M. H. Thijssen, “Academic Heresy and Intellectual Freedom at the University of Paris, 1200–1378,” in *Centres of Learning, Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Leiden-New York-Köln, 1995) 215–228; see also Johannes M. M. H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris 1200–1400* (Philadelphia, 1998).

opposition of both university and ecclesiastical authorities.¹² The results are well-known: Wyclif left Oxford, his supporters were pressured to recant, and the inquisition was introduced into England in the early fifteenth century. Lollardy became an underground movement without university-trained leadership, similar to the Waldensians on the continent. By this time, however, Wyclif's ideas had spread to Prague, where several generations of theologians could develop them further without an effective threat of prosecution for heresy. The adaptation and elaboration of Wyclif's Eucharistic theology by Bohemian theologians were important in providing new ways to think about Christ's presence in the sacrament.

This essay describes the evolution of certain aspects of Hussite Eucharistic theology that would influence the Protestant reformers. It is concerned with the development and circulation of ideas in general, rather than trying to identify groups or schools of thought or to prove direct connections. Fifteenth-century Bohemia was fertile ground for the development of new ways of understanding the Eucharist, and these ideas spread into Germany in a number of ways, both directly through their adherents and indirectly through the writings of scholastic theologians who opposed Hussite heresy. From Wyclif in the late fourteenth century through Brother Lukáš in the early sixteenth century, there were several phases of development: a division between (Prague) Utraquist and Taborite theologians, the emergence of the Bohemian Brethren, and a gradual shift away from the sophisticated metaphysical and logical assumptions that underlay Wyclif's formulations to a more popularised and simplified presentation in the early sixteenth century. This development complicates any attempt to describe a monolithic "Hussite eucharistic theology," for the specific content of that theology differed according to its stage of elaboration and the language in which it was expressed (whether Latin or the vernacular). But this very variety enriched sixteenth-century discussions because it enabled a broad range of ideas that suited the varying purposes of the reformers.

Wyclif's Eucharistic Theology

There were three related elements of Wyclif's thought that were important for discussions of the Eucharist in Bohemia: his defence of remanence, his interpretation of Christ's words, "This is my body," and his understanding of Christ's presence in the Eucharist.¹³ On the basis of his realist metaphysics,

12 On the proceedings against Wyclif, Andrew E. Larsen, *The School of Heretics, Academic Condemnation at the University of Oxford, 1277–1409* (Leiden, 2011) 127–76.

13 Two other important topics that will not be considered here are Wyclif's view of the sacrament as an efficacious sign and his rejection of the veneration of the host, which he regarded as a form of idolatry. There are a number of studies of Wyclif's Eucharistic theology. Ian Christopher Levy summarises the historiography before giving his own interpretation

Wyclif argued that the substance of bread and wine remained in the elements after their consecration. He rejected the annihilation of the substance of bread and wine and its replacement by the substance of Christ's body and blood, for God could not destroy that which corresponded to the archetypes in the divine mind.¹⁴ Conversion of the substance was, in Wyclif's eyes, no different from its annihilation and replacement; both contradicted the underlying reality that structured the universe. For the same reason, it was impossible for accidents to exist apart from their substance.¹⁵

This does not mean that Christ's body was not present in the Eucharist, however. Leaving aside Aristotelian metaphysics, Wyclif analysed Christ's statement, "This is my body," as a logical proposition. "This" referred to the bread, while "my body" was predicated of it. This statement was an example of habitual predication, a proposition that was true but that expressed a relationship rather than identity between subject and predicate.¹⁶ Christ spoke *figurative* or *tropice*, as when he said that John the Baptist was Elijah (Mt 11:14). Tropic statements were nonetheless true, and Christ's words had the power to make his body exist under the sacramental species. After consecration the natural bread had added to it a sacramental essence, so that it efficaciously figured and became the true body of Christ.¹⁷

Although Wyclif showed no hesitation whatsoever in criticizing those who upheld the substantial conversion of the bread into Christ's body, he was much more tentative in explaining how Christ might be present in the sacrament. In his treatise *De Eucharistia* he posited several modes of Christ's human presence. Just as a king could be said to be in his kingdom in location, in intention, and in power (*situale, intencionale et potencie*), so in location (*situale*) Christ was seated at the right hand of God; in power (*potencie*) he was everywhere as king of kings; in intention (*intencionale*) he was with the saints in heaven. Beyond that, he was supernaturally with the faithful gathered in his name; and sacramentally in the consecrated host.¹⁸ This made the host more than just a sign, for Christ was present really and truly (*realiter et vere*), according to his whole humanity and in a more efficacious way.¹⁹

in Ian Christopher Levy, *John Wyclif's Theology of the Eucharist in its Medieval Context* (Milwaukee, 2014) 236–237. His discussion of Wyclif (pp. 235–332) is the most extensive recent treatment, and it underlies the following account.

- 14 Gordon Leff, "Ockham and Wyclif on the Eucharist," *Reading Medieval Studies, Annual proceedings of the Graduate Centre for Medieval Studies in the University of Reading* 2 (1976) 1–13.
- 15 John Wyclif, *De Eucharistia Tractatus Major*, ed. Johann Loserth (New York, 1966; orig. London, 1892) 53–61 and 132–136; partial English translation in Matthew Spinka, ed., *Advocates of Reform, From Wyclif to Erasmus* (Philadelphia, 1953) 77–81.
- 16 John Wyclif, *De Eucharistia*, 83–4; cf. John Wyclif, *Dialogus cum Supplemento Dialogi*, ed. Gotthard Lechler (Oxford, 1869) 266–269 or Stephen E. Lahey's translation in John Wyclif, *Dialogus* (Cambridge, 2013) 212–215.
- 17 Wyclif, *De Eucharistia*, 153; Levy, *John Wyclif's Theology*, 264–274.
- 18 Wyclif, *De Eucharistia*, 83–86, Spinka, *Advocates*, 80–81.
- 19 Wyclif, *De Eucharistia*, 121; Levy, *John Wyclif's Theology*, 289–295.

This brief summary illustrates one of the problems with using the term “Real Presence.”²⁰ Wyclif’s use of adjectives shows that he did teach a *real* and *true* presence, but he did not posit a *substantial* presence. Perhaps most important is that although Wyclif was deeply committed to Aristotelian philosophy, he was moving away from Aristotelian terminology in trying to explain Christ’s presence in the sacrament in a way that he believed conformed more closely to Scripture.²¹

Utraquist Theologians

This process would be continued by Wyclif’s disciples in Bohemia, who developed his ideas in various directions.²² Jakoubek of Stříbro was one of the earliest, and he would be far more important than Jan Hus for the development of the “Hussite” understanding of the Eucharist.²³ In his works Jakoubek combined key elements of Wyclif’s theology with the earlier Bohemian reformers’ emphasis on frequent communion, and he was the first to advocate the lay chalice, which became the hallmark of the Hussite movement.

Underlying the Bohemian approach to communion was a joining of spiritual and sacramental communion that differed from popular practice in Western Europe. In much late medieval preaching and devotional literature, spiritual communion was presented as an alternative to the sacramental communion that was received only at Easter in obedience to the church’s decree.²⁴ In Bohemia, however, Matěj of Janov and other reformers urged

20 Those who say he did not teach Christ’s real presence include Paul De Vooght, “La présence réelle dans la doctrine eucharistique de Wyclif,” in *L’hérésie de Jean Huss* (Louvain, 1975) 2: 808–815; Leff is more hesitant and concludes that “it is virtually impossible to know how Wyclif did understand Christ’s presence.” See Leff, “Ockham and Wyclif,” 8.

21 On the importance of Wyclif’s understanding of Scripture’s authority, Levy, *John Wyclif’s Theology*, 374.

22 Still fundamental for the developments in Bohemia is *HHR*, which provides the historical framework for the intellectual developments described here. It would go beyond the boundaries of this paper to discuss Wyclif’s influence in Bohemia, but for an overview, see: Frantisek Šmahel, “Wyclif’s Fortune in Hussite Bohemia,” in *Die Prager Universität im Mittelalter, Gesammelte Aufsätze, The Charles University in the Middle Ages, Selected Studies* (Leiden, 2007) 467–89. With regard specifically to Wyclif’s eucharistic theology, see Erhard Peschke, “Die Bedeutung Wiclefs für die Theologie der Böhmen,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 54 (1935) 462–483; Katherine Walsh, “Wyclif’s Legacy in Central Europe in the Late Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries,” in *From Ockham to Wyclif*, ed. Anne Hudson and Michael Wilks (Oxford, 1987) 397–417; and Marcela K. Perett, “A Neglected Eucharistic Controversy: The Afterlife of John Wyclif’s Eucharistic Thought in Bohemia in the Early Fifteenth Century,” *Church History* 84 (2015) 64–89.

23 Hus’s understanding of the sacrament was quite traditional. See: Alexander Kolesnyk, “Hussens Eucharistiebegriff,” in *HENC*, 193–202.

24 Amy Nelson Burnett, “The Social History of Communion and the Reformation of the Eucharist,” *Past and Present* 211 (2011) 77–119.

frequent sacramental communion. It was only a small step for Jakoubek to argue that the laity should receive both elements of the sacrament when they received communion.²⁵

Jakoubek defended communion in both kinds on the basis of Christ's command in the institution accounts in the New Testament and the practice of the early church, and he cited a number of church fathers, from Cyprian and Augustine through Gregory the Great, to support his position. He also cited canon law, which required priests to receive both bread and wine, as well as more recent theologians, including Thomas Aquinas and Nicolas of Lyra.²⁶ From Albertus Magnus he took the idea that the two elements of the sacrament symbolised different things: Christ gave his body for communion with his members, and he gave his blood for their redemption.²⁷ John 6:53 ("unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drink of his blood, you have no life within you") became central to his demand not only for the laity's communing in both kinds, but also for the communion of infants.²⁸ Theologians at the Council of Constance, including Jean Gerson, would write treatises refuting Jakoubek's arguments, in the process making those arguments known to a broader audience.²⁹

Like Wyclif, Jakoubek argued for remanence and against transubstantiation as substantial conversion, and he relied extensively on the Englishman's *De Eucharistia* when writing his own treatise *De Remanentia* around 1407. There he argued that the bread was "not identically but tropically and figuratively, truly and sacramentally the body of Christ."³⁰ As with his later defence

25 David R. Holeton, "The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement in its European Context," *BRRP* 1 (1996) 23–47; Helena Krmíčková, "The Fifteenth-Century Origins of Lay Communion *Sub Utraque* in Bohemia," *BRRP* 2 (1998) 57–66.

26 See his *Demonstratio per Testimonia Scripturae, Patrum atque Doctorum, Communicationem calicis in plebe Christiana esse necessariam*, written for the Council of Constance in 1415, in Hermann von Hardt, *Rerum Concilii Oecumenici Constantiensis de universali ecclesiasticae disciplinae reformatione: quae res antiquae imperatore Sigismundo ... imperatore Leopoldo ... Rudolphi Augusti Brunsvic. ac Lunaeburg ducis ... ex inaeestimabili Germaniae & Angliae thesauro literario antiquissimorum manuscriptorum caesareorum, ducalium, academicorum ... erutae ac illustratae*, (Frankfurt-Leipzig, 1697–1742) 3: 805–827; as well as his treatise, *Salvator Noster de Communione Spirituale et Sacramentali integri sub duplici Forma...*, in *Betlémské texty*, ed. Bohumil Ryba (Prague, 1951) 108–138.

27 Paul De Vooght, *Jacobellus de Stříbro, Premier Théologien du Hussitisme* (Louvain, 1972) 130. On the differentiated meanings of bread and wine among late medieval theologians, Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood, Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia, 2007) 173–174 and 219.

28 David R. Holeton, "The Communion of Infants and Hussitism," *Communio Viatorum* 27 (1984) 207–225.

29 So, for instance, Gerson's treatise of 1417 against the lay chalice, *De necessaria communione laicorum sub utraque specie*, in Jean Gerson, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. P. Glorieux (Paris, 1973) 10: 55–68; Ian Christopher Levy, "Interpreting the Intention of Christ, Roman Responses to Bohemian Utraquism from Constance to Basel," in *Europe after Wyclif*, ed. J. Patrick Hornbeck II and Michael Van Dussen (New York, 2017) 173–95.

30 Jakoubek of Stříbro, *Tractatus de Remanencia*, "Confiteor antiquam Fidem," in De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 320; cf. De Vooght's discussion of Jakoubek's defense of remanence, 95–108.

of the lay chalice, he cited a number of patristic and scholastic texts, interpreting them to uphold his argument that the substance of bread and wine remained and that the true body and blood of Christ were added to them at consecration. For this process he preferred the term “supersubstantiation” to “transubstantiation.”³¹ The referents of “this” in “this is my body/this is my blood” were the bread and the cup; therefore the statements had to be understood figuratively or tropically.³²

In his 1421 treatise *Jhesus Christus Dominus et Salvator*, Jakoubek described “the blood of Christ Jesus” as “truly and really existing under external signs, i.e. of bread and wine.” He also asserted that in the sacrament “our God is present in a more special way than [he is] everywhere and in every place.” Christ’s mode of existing in the sacrament was “beyond all other modes that there are in creation, incomparably more perfect, better, and nobler than in the Rod of Moses, or in the cloud, or in the ark [of the covenant].”³³ Jakoubek used this argument to defend the adoration of the sacrament, a practice that Wyclif had condemned, although he did not here use the term “substantial” in referring to Christ’s presence.³⁴

The date of this treatise is significant; it was written at a time when the “Picards,” a radical offshoot of the Taborites who denied any presence of Christ whatsoever in the bread and wine, were still perceived as a threat within the Hussite movement,³⁵ and when the divisions between the more conservative Prague masters and the theologians at Tabor had become apparent. Jakoubek refuted a number of arguments that devalued the sacrament in this treatise, including that Christ pointed to his body when he said “this is my body;” that although Christ may have made his body and blood present, he did not give such power to priests; or that Christ’s body had ascended and was seated at the right hand of the Father and so could only be enjoyed spiritually.³⁶

After Jakoubek’s death in 1429, his student and friend Jan Rokycana would head the Utraquist church until his own death in 1471.³⁷ Rokycana led the Bohemian delegation at the Council of Basel in 1434, where discussion centred on the Four Articles, the first of which demanded the lay chalice. Rokycana presented the case for communion in both kinds, following the

31 See the discussion of Jakoubek’s defense of remanence and his use of Wyclif, De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 95–122.

32 De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 343–347.

33 Edited in De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 400–3.

34 De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 338–339; cf. De Vooght’s discussion of Jakoubek’s defence of the Real Presence, *Jacobellus*, 79–95.

35 On these, see František Michálek Bartoš, “Picards et Pikarti,” *Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire du Protestantisme Français* 80 (1931/1932) 465–486; and 81 (1932) 8–28.

36 De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 391–395.

37 Frederick G. Heymann, “John Rokycana — Church Reformer Between Hus and Luther,” *Church History* 28 (1959) 240–280.

lines of argument already laid down by Jakoubek. He asserted that the reception of both bread and wine was useful and salutary for the laity, and that the two elements had different effects: while Christ's body strengthened one against temptation, his blood brought redemption and the washing away of sins. In the institution accounts, Christ gave both bread and wine to his followers, and John 6:53 spoke of both eating and drinking. Like Jakoubek, Rokycana drew from a number of patristic and scholastic authors to support his position, and he pointed out that not until the Council of Constance had a demand for the lay chalice been condemned as heretical.³⁸

The Council of Basel played a central role in diffusing Wycliffite and Hussite arguments, not only directly but also indirectly through the refutations of Wycliffite and Bohemian ideas that circulated there. Thomas Netter's anti-Wycliffite *Doctrinale*, for instance, was used at the Council of Basel, and from there copies spread to other parts of Europe.³⁹ The number of manuscripts related to the discussion of the lay chalice still preserved in Basel's *Universitätsbibliothek* testifies to the significance of the debate on this topic; many of these came from the city's Dominican cloister.⁴⁰ The Basel manuscripts also raise the possibility that members of the Erasmian circle in Basel were familiar with Hussite arguments. These men worked closely with the city's printers and borrowed manuscripts from Basel's monasteries. Johannes Oecolampadius, for example, used manuscripts preserved in the Dominican cloister for his Latin translation of Chrysostom.⁴¹ Several of these men would become convinced "Zwinglians," including not only Oecolampadius but also Wolfgang Capito, Kaspar Hedio, and Konrad Pellikan.

From the Taborites to the Bohemian Brethren

If the divisions between Utraquists and Taborites were not apparent in Basel, they were certainly clear within Bohemia. The development of Hussite theology through the 1440s would be spurred by debates between the Prague

38 E. F. Jacob, "The Bohemians at the Council of Basel, 1433," in *Prague Essays*, ed. Robert William Seton-Watson (Freeport, NY, 1949), 81–123; Paul De Vooght, "La confrontation des thèses hussites et romaines au concile de Bâle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 37 (1970) 97–137 and 254–291.

39 Margaret Harvey, "The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," in *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lesley M. Smith and Benedicta Ward (London, 1992) 281–94.

40 František Michálek Bartoš, "Husitika a bohemika několika knihoven německých a švýcarských," *VKČSN* 5 (1931) 1–91 (especially 40–65).

41 Heribert Smolinsky, "Ambrosius Pelargus OP (1493/94–1561)," in *Katholische Theologen der Reformationszeit*, ed. Erwin Iserloh (Münster, 2004) 6: 58–96 (here at 77–8); on loans from the Carthusian monastery, see: Max Burckhardt, "Bibliotheksaufbau, Bücherbesitz und Leserschaft im spätmittelalterlichen Basel," in *Studien zum städtischen Bildungswesen des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Bernd Moeller (Göttingen, 1983) 33–52.

Utraquists and the Taborites.⁴² The most important of the Taborite theologians were Wyclif's English disciple Peter Payne, the bishop of Tabor Mikuláš of Pelhřimov, and Jan Němec of Žatec.⁴³ There were differences of emphasis among the three theologians, but they together developed a distinctive Taborite theology with arguments against Christ's substantial presence in the Eucharist that would resurface in sixteenth-century debates.

Remanence was not a topic of debate at the Council of Basel, and it would gradually be abandoned by the Utraquists, but it continued to be important for the Taborites.⁴⁴ Following Wyclif, they argued that Scripture taught that the substance of bread remained after consecration: thus Paul spoke of the bread that was broken as the participation in the body of Christ (1 Cor 10:17), and throughout 1 Cor 11 he called the sacrament "bread."⁴⁵ The Taborite theologians further developed Wyclif's understanding of Christ's various modes of existence, now described in four ways. Substantially and corporally, Christ's humanity was in heaven as it had been on earth; spiritually he was with both the saints in heaven and believers on earth. Like a king was in his kingdom, Christ was present "*virtualiter aut potencialiter*" and so "*realiter*" throughout his kingdom in heaven and on earth. Finally, he was present *sacramentaliter*, *potencialiter*, and *spiritualiter* when the priest rightly consecrated the elements. The Taborites cited a host of Bible verses to prove that Christ's body would remain in heaven until the Last Judgment and so could not be in the Eucharist: Mark 13:21/Mt 24:23 ("Then if anyone says to you, 'Look! Here is the Messiah' or 'There he is' – do not believe it."); Acts 1:11 ("This Jesus has been taken up from you into heaven."); and Acts 7:56 ("I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God!").⁴⁶

Utraquists regarded the Taborite assertion that Christ was in the sacrament "*sacramentaliter*, *spiritualiter*, *virtualiter et vere*" with suspicion, and at a colloquy held in 1444 Rokycana pressed them to answer whether they believed that "the substance of Christ's body is or was present according to his natural existence (*existentiam naturalem*)."⁴⁷ The account of the colloquy

42 For an overview, see: William R. Cook, "The Eucharist in Hussite Theology," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 66 (1975) 23–35.

43 The greatest attention in English-language has focused on Payne; William R. Cook, "John Wyclif and Hussite Theology 1415–1436," *Church History* 42 (1973) 335–349.

44 William R. Cook, "Transsubstantiation, clef théologique de la fragmentation du mouvement hussite," *Irénikon* 49 (1976) 323–332.

45 Joannis de Zacz, *Tractatulus [de eucharistia]*, in *Táborské traktáty eucharistické*, ed. J. Sedlák (Brno, 1918) 4–5; Peter Payne, *Tractatus I de corpore Christi*, in *Táborské traktáty eucharistické*, 25; and Peter Payne, *Tractatus II de corpore Christi*, in *Táborské traktáty eucharistické*, 30.

46 Jan of Žatec, *Tractatulus [de eucharistia]*, in *Táborské traktáty eucharistické*, 9–15; cf. the anonymous *Tractus de 4 modis essendi*, in *Táborské traktáty eucharistické*, 39–44.

47 "Confessio sacerdotum Taboriensium de sacramento Eucharistiae," in *Geschichtschreiber der husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, ed. K. A. C. von Höfler (Wien, 1865) 2: 764–797 (here 766).

indicates two related issues underlying this question: the influence of the vernacular on the formulation of theological positions, and the difficulty of explaining technical theological concepts to the laity. The Taborites told Rokycana that they did not think that "Christian people should be burdened with such faith, which in our judgment cannot be proved from Scripture... since, according to our adversaries, the body of Christ, born of the Virgin, is posited to be in the sacrament of the altar in its own natural essence and according to his natural existence when speaking in Czech, but not according to the Latin language."⁴⁸

The language of theological discussion would be even more of an issue in the writings of Peter Chelčický, a contemporary of Rokycana. Chelčický did not know Latin, but he read Czech translations of Wyclif's works and discussed their contents with others.⁴⁹ His understanding of the Eucharist was influenced by both Wyclif and the Taborites, but it was almost entirely divorced from the sophisticated metaphysics and logical analysis that underlay Wyclif's position. Chelčický criticised the Taborites for saying that Christ was present only spiritually in the sacrament. His own view that "the bread is not converted into the body of Christ, but rather the body of Christ is united with the bread as an offering" comes very close to impanation, a position Wyclif specifically rejected.⁵⁰

Chelčický's Czech writings may have simplified Wycliffite theology, but they also aided its popular appeal, and they would shape the early teachings of the Bohemian Brethren. The Brethren in turn would be the most important group for transmitting this "late Wycliffism" to Germany in the early sixteenth century.⁵¹ Lukáš of Prague, the leader of the Brethren at the turn of the century, defended the orthodoxy of the Brethren in two different confessions written in 1503 and 1507 that were addressed to King Ladislaus, in a 1508 *Excusatio* responding to attacks on the Unity's teaching by the Moravian humanist Augustin Käsensbrod (or Olomucensis), and in the *Apologia Sacre Scripture*, which was published anonymously in Nuremberg in 1511.⁵²

In these works Lukas explained the four modes of Christ's body's existence: Christ's humanity was personally, truly, substantially, and naturally in heaven, from whence he would return in judgment. His second form of existence was with the church, *virtualis*, *spiritualis*, and *ministerialis*. Christ also had spiritual substance in the soul of believers. Lastly, in the sacrament

48 "Confessio," 773.

49 Matthew Spinka, "Peter Chelčický, The Spiritual Father of the Unitas Fratrum," *Church History* 12 (1943) 271–291.

50 Peter Chelčický, "Von den Sakramenten," in Peschke, *Theologie*, 2:104; on Wyclif's rejection of impanation, Wyclif, *De Eucharistia*, 221–222, 228.

51 See Milos Strupl, "The Confessional Theology of the Unitas Fratrum," *Church History* 33 (1964) 279–293.

52 Photomechanically reproduced as: *Apologia Sacre Scripture*, in *Bekenntnisse der Böhmisches Brüder*, ed. A. Eckert (Hildesheim, 1979).

of bread and wine he had a sacramental and spiritual subsistence.⁵³ Brother Lukáš used a number of Scripture verses to prove that Christ's physical body was seated at the right hand of the Father and would remain there until the Last Day, and he cited Christ's statement that John the Baptist "was Elijah" and Paul's assertion that "the rock was Christ" to uphold a figurative and tropic understanding of "this is my body."⁵⁴

Impact on the Early Protestant Debate

Printing would make all of the Brethren's confessions available in Germany. As already mentioned, the longest of the Brethren's confessions was published in 1511 as *Apologia Sacre Scripture*. Both Luther and Erasmus had read the *Apologia* by the early 1520s.⁵⁵ It was also possible to read the Brethren's confessions filtered through the writings of their opponents. The Leipzig theologian Hieronymus Dungersheim von Ochsenfurt published a section-by-section refutation of the *Apologia* in 1514; two years later he published the Unity's 1503 confession, also with a section-by-section rebuttal.⁵⁶ In 1512 the Bavarian humanist Jacob Ziegler reproduced the 1503 and 1507 confessions, Käsenbrod's letters condemning these confessions, and the 1508 *Excusatio* written in response to Käsenbrod as prefatory material to his own *Five Books against the Waldensian Heresy*.⁵⁷

The work that would have the greatest impact, however, was Aeneas Piccolomini's *Commentaries on the Council of Basel*, which was printed in Basel in 1523.⁵⁸ While seeming to support the authority of the church, the volume actually undermined it in the eyes of reform-minded Swiss humanists. In addition to the Brethren's confessions of 1503, 1507, and 1508, it contained a number of other works that raised questions about the ability

53 *Apologia Sacre Scripture*, ff. H4v-J1v.

54 This explanation was part of the 1508 *Excusatio*, which was published in: *Commentariorum Aeneae Sylvii Piccolomini Senensis De Concilio Basileae celebrato libri duo* (Basel, 1523) 153–154.

55 Erasmus was given a copy of the book by two Brethren who visited him in Antwerp in 1520; Bittner, "Erasmus, Luther und die böhmischen Brüder," Luther's letter to Georg Spalatin from 4 July 1522 reveals his knowledge of the Unity's understanding of baptism in the *Apologia*. See: Martin Luther, *WABr* 2, no. 515, 573–4.

56 Hieronymus Dungersheim, *Confutatio apologetici cuiusdam sacre scripture falso inscripti* (Leipzig, 1514); and idem, *Reprobatio orationis excusatorie picardorum* (Leipzig, 1516).

57 Jakob Ziegler, *In hoc volumine haec continentur, Duplex confessio Waldensium ad regem Ungariae missa, ... Contra Heresim Valdensem* (Leipzig, 1512). On all of these works see Peschke, *Böhmischen Brüder im Urteil ihrer Zeit*.

58 Piccolomini, *Commentariorum...De Concilio Basileae celebrato libri duo* (Basel, 1523). According to VD16, the work was edited by the Cologne humanist Jakob Sobius, on whom see: Peter Bietenholz (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus, A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation* (Toronto, 1985–87) 3:262–3.

of church leaders to judge heresy.⁵⁹ These ranged from Benno of St. Martine Silvestri's unflattering biography of Pope Gregory VII to Poggio's account of the trial and death of Jerome of Prague and an account of the inquisitorial proceedings against Johannes Rucherat of Wesel, which was presented as the petty manoeuvrings of Thomists against a nominalist theologian. The volume's introductory letter claimed that these documents were published "in part because they contain histories that were up until now little known or have been published other than they now are; in part because they involved paradoxes of certain old writers which are today circulating as new, although they were thought up a long time ago and condemned in sacred councils."⁶⁰ This apparently orthodox intention concealed the fact that evangelical readers might see the documents as confirming their suspicion that church authorities used the charge of heresy to hinder reform.

The Basel compilation also illustrated how the scholastic arguments that were effective in opposing Wycliffite and Hussite ideas in the fifteenth century might no longer serve this purpose in the early 1520s. In addition to the articles of Wyclif and Hus condemned at the Council of Constance, the volume reprinted William Woodford's refutation of eighteen articles drawn from Wyclif's writings. Woodford's attack on the first three articles, which concerned the Eucharist, relied heavily on the citation of medieval authorities from Paschasius and Lanfranc through the scholastic doctors of the thirteenth century.⁶¹ This appeal to tradition would not convince reformers who insisted on Scripture alone as the basis for doctrine. In fact, Heinrich Bullinger would later refer to the works of both Woodford and Thomas Netter when describing how Berengar had been wrongly condemned as a heretic.⁶²

Heinrich Bullinger either owned or had access to a copy of the Basel compilation, for in an entry for 12 September 1524 in his *Diary* he reported discussing with Zwingli his understanding of the sacrament "drawn from the writings of the Waldensian Brethren."⁶³ Joachim Vadian, the reformer of

59 The editor claimed that he was publishing the confessions of the Bohemian Brethren because they gave a more accurate summary of what the Brethren believed than was contained in the *Catalogus Haereticorum* of the Cologne theology professor Bernhard Lutzenburg, O.P., which had been published the previous year. See: Piccolomini, *Commentariorum...De Concilio Basileae*, f. 11v.

60 Piccolomini, *Commentariorum...De Concilio Basileae*, f. 11v: "Porro codex Commentariorum Aeneae, ueluti farrago quaedam erat uariorum tractatum: quos uisum est omnes imprimere, partim quod historias continerent, uel hactenus incognitas, uel secus proditas quam res habet: partim quod ueterum quorundam Paradoxa inerant, quae hodie circunferuntur ut noua, cum tamen iam olim inuenta sint, & in sacris concilijs damnata."

61 The articles were addressed to Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury; the first three condemned articles concerned the eucharist, Piccolomini, *Commentariorum...De Concilio Basileae*, 162–80.

62 Heinrich Bullinger, *De Origine Erroris, in Negocio Eucharistiae ac Missae* (Zürich, 1528) f. D1r-v. Bullinger referred to Woodford as "Wideford," the name used in the Basel compilation.

63 Emil Egli (ed.), *Heinrich Bullingers Diarium (Annales vitae) der Jahre 1504–1574* (Zürich, 1985; orig. Basel, 1904) 9. The Bohemian Brethren were known in German-speaking lands

St. Gallen, also owned a copy of the book.⁶⁴ Even more significant would be the impact of the Brethren's confessions on Johannes Oecolampadius, who was living with the Basel printer Andreas Cratander at the time that Piccolomini's history was being produced. Oecolampadius incorporated both arguments and scriptural proof texts from those confessions into his treatise *On the Genuine Exposition of the Words of the Lord, "This is my Body," According to the Oldest Authorities*, published in the summer of 1525.⁶⁵ As Jakoubek had done a century earlier, Oecolampadius took patristic citations traditionally used to defend Christ's corporeal presence and re-interpreted them to argue that the Fathers had not taught such a presence.⁶⁶ Oecolampadius also argued that "this is my body" had to be understood tropically and figuratively, as were Mt 11:14 and 1 Cor 10:4, and he asserted that because Christ's body was seated at the right hand of the Father, it could not be found in the consecrated host.⁶⁷ As his contemporaries acknowledged, Oecolampadius's *Genuine Exposition* would be the single most important defence of a sacramentarian understanding of the Lord's Supper, far more influential than Zwingli's earliest publications and the source of ideas that would later become associated with Zwingli.⁶⁸

Hussite ideas would influence the early Reformation in Wittenberg as well, initially in the form of arguments for the lay chalice. Charges that Luther was a Hussite began circulating at the end of 1519, after Luther suggested in his *Sermon on the Venerable Sacrament* that a church council should grant the laity the right to receive both the bread and the wine in communion.⁶⁹ Andreas Karlstadt would be more important than Luther, however, for the popularization of Hussite ideas, both those of moderate Utraquism and eventually more radical Taborite views.

Karlstadt began to investigate the question of communion in both kinds in response to an inquiry from the elector's advisor Georg Spalatin. In an undated letter to Spalatin (probably from the second half of 1520 or the first

as "Waldensian Brethren." Staedtke could only surmise the influence of the Bohemian Brethren on the Swiss reformers because he was not aware of the publication of their confessions in Basel. See: Joachim Staedtke, "Voraussetzungen der Schweizer Abendmahlslehre," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 16 (1960) 19–32.

64 Dieter Demandt, "Vadians Stellung zu Jan Hus und Hieronymus von Prag," *Zwingliana* 28 (2001) 165–182.

65 *De gervina verborum domini, Hoc est corpus meum, iuxta uetutissimos auctores expositione liber* (Strasbourg, 1525).

66 On Oecolampadius' use of the church fathers, see: Amy Nelson Burnett, "'According to the Oldest Authorities': The Use of the Church Fathers in the Early Eucharistic Controversy," in *The Reformation as Christianization*, ed. Anna Marie Johnson and John A. Maxfield (Tübingen, 2012) 373–395.

67 Burnett, *Karlstadt*, 78–88.

68 Burnett, "Oekolampads Anteil."

69 Martin Luther, *Eyn Sermon von dem Hochwirdigen Sacrament des Heyigen Waren Leychnams Christi Und von den Bruderschaften*, in WA 1:738–758 (here 742–3).

part of 1521), he expressed his surprise that the laity had not been restricted to communion in one kind until the Council of Constance.⁷⁰ Karlstadt would go further in the summer of 1521, when he asserted in a public disputation that those who received communion in both kinds “were not Bohemians, but were true Christians.” Claiming that it was a sin to communicate in one kind only, he argued that it would be better to abstain from communion than to receive it in one form only, for the latter did not conform either to Christ’s institution or to what was figured by the church fathers. Canon law prohibited priests from receiving only one element, and it was no less wrong for laypeople to receive communion in only one kind.⁷¹

In October of that year, while Luther was in hiding at the Wartburg and the pressure for practical liturgical reforms was mounting in Wittenberg, Karlstadt repeated these ideas in a disputation that addressed the issues of private masses and communion in both kinds. There he asserted that it would be better if masses were celebrated in the presence of others, but stated that those who said private masses did not sin as much as those who administered communion in only one kind. Citing the institution accounts, he stated that Christ’s own command was to “drink of it, all of you;” in other words, those who ate the bread were also to drink from the cup. Since Christ taught and commanded both eating and drinking, it was not permitted to anyone to teach or command otherwise, and it was a sin to defend communion in one kind. Like the Utraquists, Karlstadt argued that the bread and wine signified different things. Christ’s blood brought remission of sins, and this promise was signified by the cup. The bread, on the other hand, signified victory over death and the glory of the resurrection. The popes themselves had called it sacrilege for priests to receive only the bread. It was therefore better to abstain from the sacrament completely than to receive it in a way other than Christ had instituted. On one point Karlstadt acknowledged his disagreement with the Utraquists. He held that John 6:53 was not relevant to a discussion of the lay chalice, since it did not concern the sacrament, although it could be understood figuratively.⁷²

70 Karlstadt named two of the sources he consulted: the works of the Dominican John Capreolus, whose only objection to the practice was that “he did not want to favor the Hussites;” and the jurist Panormitanus, who had stated that some Carthusian monks received the sacrament in both kinds. See the publication of this letter in: Johann Gottfried Olearius, *Scrinium antiquarium, idiochieira Antiquitatis fragmenta, summorum videlicet in eccles. acad. et schol. superiore aevio virorum, manuque ipsorum scriptas nec hactenus unquam ed.; plus centum epistolas et schedas pandens atque communicans* (Halle, 1671) 342–3. None of the letters in this collection was from after 1521, and this letter almost certainly fell between Luther’s cautious endorsement of communion in both kinds and Karlstadt’s disputation from the summer of 1521.

71 *LVTHERI,|| MELANCH. CARLOSTADII etc.|| PROPOSITIONES, VVITTEM=||BERGAE uiua uoce tractatae* (Basel, 1522) f. D8v-E1r. On the printing of these theses, see: Hermann Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*, 2 vv. (Leipzig, 1905; repr. Nieukoop, 1968) 1: 290–291 and 479. Cf. Burnett, *Karlstadt*, 15.

72 Barge, *Karlstadt*, 1:316–324; the disputation theses were printed on: 1:484–490.

Karlstadt presented these arguments to a broader audience in a pamphlet published a few weeks after this disputation. He defended the orthodoxy of the Hussites in the pamphlet's full title, *On Both Forms of the Holy Mass. On Signs in General, what they Effect and Signify. Those Who Receive Both Forms are not Bohemians or Heretics but Evangelical Christians*.⁷³ Karlstadt reminded his readers that the text of Scripture did not say, "the form of bread is my body," but instead, "the bread is my body." Christ therefore clearly said that the bread was his body, a point Karlstadt used to oppose the substantial conversion of the elements.⁷⁴ He cited other Hussite arguments to defend remanence and communion in both kinds. He repeated his position, for instance, that in the Mass Christ had ordained not one sign but two, and that each element signified something different: the wine the forgiveness of sins, and the bread the resurrection of the flesh. It was wrong to transpose the signification of one sign to the other, and Christians should not change or abolish what Christ had instituted.⁷⁵ He was the only Wittenberg reformer to adopt this particular Hussite argument in favour of communion in both kinds, and his emphasis on the bread and wine as separate signs differed from both Luther and Melanchthon, who saw the entire sacrament, and not its individual elements, as a sign.⁷⁶

Karlstadt did not accept all Utraquist arguments without qualification, as was indicated by his rejection of John 6:53 to justify the necessity of sacramental communion. In 1521 he also rejected a figurative understanding of "this is my body," which some used to argue against Christ's substantial presence and so to condemn adoration of the host.⁷⁷ It is of course conceivable that Karlstadt came to these conclusions through his study of Scripture, scholastic theology, and canon law. The fact that all of these arguments are clustered together, however, suggests that Karlstadt's thinking was stimulated either by direct contact with Utraquist ideas or through reading critically the anti-Hussite writings of others.

Karlstadt would repeat more radical Hussite ideas three years later, after breaking with Luther over Christ's corporal presence in the sacrament. his 1524 *Dialogue on the Horrible Idolatrous Abuse of the Most Venerable Sacrament of Jesus Christ* employed some of the arguments against Christ's bodily presence that Jakoubek had attacked in his writings. Perhaps most

73 Andreas Karlstadt, *Von beiden gestalteten der heylige Messze. Von Czeichen in gemein was sie wirken vnd dewten. Sie sind nit Behemen oder ketzer, die beide gestalt nehmen sonder Ewangelische Christen* (Wittenberg, 1521). English translation in Amy Nelson Burnett, ed., *The Eucharistic Pamphlets of Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt* (Kirksville, 2011) 49–77.

74 Karlstadt, *Von beiden gestalteten*, f. a4v–b3v; Burnett, *Pamphlets*, 53–57.

75 Karlstadt, *Von beiden gestalteten*, f. d3v–e1r; Burnett, *Pamphlets*, 65–67.

76 Cf. Melanchthon's discussion of signs in the first edition of his *Loci Communes von 1521*, in *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*, ed. Robert Stupperich and H. Engelland (Gütersloh, 1951–83) 2/1: 140–144.

77 Karlstadt, *Von beiden gestalteten*, f. b1r; Burnett, *Eucharistic Pamphlets*, 54.

famously, he endorsed the view circulating in Bohemia that Christ had pointed to his own body when he said, “this is my body.” Karlstadt also argued that Christ did not give priests the authority to convert miraculously the elements into his own body and blood, and that Christ’s body was seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven and so could not be called down to earth by any priest.⁷⁸

What Oecolampadius’ Latin treatise did for spreading Hussite ideas among the learned elite, Andreas Karlstadt’s vernacular pamphlets would do for spreading Utraquist and eventually more radical Taborite views among the German-reading laity. The arguments used by both authors would be repeated in the treatises of other sacramentarian authors. Zwingli, for instance, would make the location of Christ’s body at the right hand of the Father one of his chief arguments against his corporeal presence in the Eucharist. The influence of Oecolampadius, Karlstadt, and Hoen was also evident in Martin Bucer’s discussions of the Lord’s Supper from 1525 and 1526.⁷⁹

By the mid-1520s, “Zwinglian” arguments used against Luther’s understanding of the Eucharist had little direct similarity to those used by Wyclif. For that reason, Wyclif has generally been dismissed as a source for Protestant Eucharistic theology. But the Wyclifite origin of Zwinglian/sacramentarian arguments can be recognised if one takes into account the evolution and development of Wyclif’s theology in Bohemia. There it joined with the native Czech reform tradition in a fruitful way, resulting in discussions that advocated the lay chalice and experimented with new terminology to explain the nature of Christ’s presence. In contrast to scholastic theology in western Europe, which was hardening into various “schools” – whether Thomist, Scotist, or nominalist of various types – theological debate in Bohemia in the fifteenth century was lively and creative, and it fed into the theological ferment of the German Reformation. In both Switzerland and Wittenberg, Bohemian Eucharistic theology would influence the Protestant debate over the Lord’s Supper.

78 Andreas Karlstadt, *Dialogus oder ein gesprechbüchlin, von dem gewlichen abgöttischen mißbrauch des hochwirdigsten sacraments Jesu Christi* (Basel, 1524) ff. e2v-e3r, f3r-f4r, and g1v; Burnett, *Eucharistic Pamphlets*, 190–191, 196–197, and 200. It is possible that Karlstadt derived these Taborite arguments from Cornelis Hoen’s *Epistola Christiana*, where they also had an anti-clerical edge; cf. Spruyt, *Hoen*, 230–1.

79 Burnett, *Karlstadt*, 101–9.