

---

## The Janovite Theory and the Renewal of the Lay Chalice

---

**Helena Krmíčková**

(Brno)

We have been meeting Matthias of Janov at the origin of the chalice's renewal for more than five and a half centuries.<sup>1</sup> Jan Rokycana first testified at the Council of Basel that a Master of Paris, by the name of Matthias, had initiated communion *sub utraque*, and the claim was repeated by further theologians and historians until the appearance in 1881 of Josef Kalousek's "O historii kalicha v dobách předhusitských" [History of the Chalice in the Pre-Hussite Times],<sup>2</sup> with enjambments well into the twentieth century,<sup>3</sup> and virtually up to the present.<sup>4</sup> Janov was by no means the sole actor cast into the role of the chalice restorer. As early as the fifteenth century the centre stage was occupied by Master Peter of Dresden, who had allegedly inspired Jakoubek of Stříbro,<sup>5</sup> the theory about a continuous use of the lay chalice in Bohemia since the time of Sts. Cyril and Methodius emerged in the sixteenth century,<sup>6</sup> and in the twentieth century there appeared first the theory of Wyclif's influence on Jakoubek's Utraquism,<sup>7</sup> and finally the theory which heard in Bohemian Utraquism an echo of the Eastern eucharistic practice, discovered by Jerome of Prague on his Lithuanian journey.<sup>8</sup> Kalousek's rejection of the Cyrilomethodian theory, and of the theory about Master of Paris's Utraquism, still left intact the Dresden theory and the subsequently suggested possibilities. Thus it seemed almost superfluous to return once more to Janov. Yet, it so happened and Janov with his eucharistic treatises came to occupy the leading position among the

---

1) From the literature, analyzing the theories of the renewal of the chalice, let us note at least D. Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches. Leben und Wirkung eines Wiener Theologen in der Zeit des grossen Schismas*, [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 12] (Göttingen, 1964) 129-148; Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, 1967) 98-108; Helena Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, [Spisy Masarykovy univerzity v Brně, Filozofická fakulta, 310] (Brno, 1997) 7-15.

2) ČČM 50 (1881) 543-547.

3) The most significant contribution is L. Brož, "Utravismus Matěje z Janova," *Theologická příloha Křesťanské revue* 20 (1953) 20-23.

4) Janov's advocacy of the chalice is deemed tenable by František Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, (Prague, 1995-19962) 2:84; and M. Ransdorf, *Mistr Jan Hus* (Prague, 1993) 47.

5) Sources concerning Peter of Dresden are analyzed by Mathilde Uhlirz, "Petrus von Dresden: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Laienkelches," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereines für die Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens* 18 (1914) 227-238; H. Boehmer, "Magister Peter von Dresden," *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, 36 (1915) 212-231.

6) This theory has been attributed to Bohuslav Bělejovský, *Kronika církevní*, ed. Josef Skalický (Prague, 1816) 7-20.

7) See Mathilde Uhlirz, *Die Genesis der vier Prager Artikel*, [Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 175, Bd. 3, Abhandlung] (Vienna, 1914).

8) František Bartoš, "Paměti M. Jeronyma Pražského," *Lumír* 44 (1916) 289-302, and in several of his subsequent publications.

possible causes effecting a restoration of the chalice in Bohemia.

The reappearance of the Janovite theory - albeit in a somewhat altered form - owed its spark to two notable historians, Vlastimil Kybal and Jan Sedlák. In the first and still most extensive monograph on Janov,<sup>9</sup> Kybal - partly inspired by Palacký - pointed to the genetic connections between the writings of Janov and those of Jakoubek. On the basis of this discovery, derived mainly from a comparison of their ideas concerning the Antichrist,<sup>10</sup> Kybal maintained that also on the issue of the chalice Jakoubek drew on the teaching about the frequent communion in Janov's *Regulae*.<sup>11</sup> A convincing support for Kybal's theory was provided by Jan Sedlák, who identified a whole series of borrowings from Janov in Jakoubek's oldest preserved Utraquist work, the *quaestio* titled *Quia heu in templis*.<sup>12</sup> Subsequently, other signs were revealed, pointing to a direct influence of the Master of Paris's work on Jakoubek. This new epiphany of the Janovite theory enjoyed a wide acceptance, while most of the others received the role of a supporting cast in a play the denouement of which was virtually predetermined, or in Paul De Vooght's words "suspended in the air."<sup>13</sup>

I have rejected the relevance of the supporting players in my monograph, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách* [Studies and Texts Concerning the Origins of the Chalice in Bohemia],<sup>14</sup> in which I recognize exclusively and solely the Janovite theory. It was clear for a long time that the chalice had not enjoyed an uninterrupted continuity in Bohemia, and that it had to reappear in 1414, or - to use Jakoubek's terms - had to be newly revealed.<sup>15</sup> It is, therefore, unnecessary to consider the Cyrilomethodian theory any further. The twentieth-century theories are based on the hypothetical speculations of their authors: those of Mathilde Uhlirz in the Wyclifite case, and those of František Bartoš in the Jeromite case can also be dismissed. There were neither primary sources, nor contemporary mentions to substantiate their surmises. It was impossible for Wyclif to influence Jakoubek on the issue of the chalice. He was not a Utraquist and his theory of remanence, even if it had affected Jakoubek's view of the eucharist, would tend to dampen, rather than inflame, Jakoubek's zeal for Utraquism. After all, the Evangelical Doctor did not stress - if he did not entirely deny - the real presence, which was the very inspiration and ground of Jakoubek's chalice.<sup>16</sup> There was no reason for Jerome to have been overwhelmed by the Utraquist practice of the Eastern Church in 1413-1414,

---

9) Vlastimil Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova: Jeho život, spisy a učení* [Spisy poctěné jubilejní cenou Královské české společnosti nauk v Praze, 17] (Prague, 1905).

10) Vlastimil Kybal, "M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Stříbra: Srovnávací kapitola o Antikristu," ČČH 11 (1905) 22-38.

11) Kybal, *M. Matěj z Janova: Jeho život*, 317-318.

12) 6-501.

13) Paul De Vooght, *Jacobellus de Stříbro (+ 1429), premier théologien du hussitisme*, [Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 54] (Louvain, 1972) 129.

14) Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, 47-123.

15) On Jakoubek's revelation see particularly Ferdinand Seibt, "Die *revelatio* des Jacobellus von Mies über die Kelchkommunion," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 22 (1966) 618-624.

16) Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, 54-60; David R. Holeton addresses the complexity of this issue in his "Wyclif's Bohemian Fate: A Reflection on the Contextualization of Wyclif in Bohemia," CV 32 (1989) 216, 221, nn. 28, 29.

inasmuch he had traveled in Orthodox regions earlier.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, there are no mentions of a Greek Orthodox model in the early days of Utraquism, and from the start the Bohemian communion from the chalice differed markedly from the Greek rite of *communio intincta*.<sup>18</sup> This leaves only the subsidiary Dresden theory, which has distinctly metamorphosed in the twentieth century. Peter of Dresden, the protagonist of the fifteenth-century chronicler, was superceded by Nicholas of Dresden who - in distinction from his older namesake at the house of Black Rose [Černá Růže] - actually composed several genuine Utraquist treatises.<sup>19</sup> Yet, Nicholas is not an appropriate candidate for the palm of primacy. He was not the conveyor of the chalice from abroad, inasmuch as his Utraquist writings postdated his arrival to Prague. Moreover, these compositions came after those of Jakoubek.<sup>20</sup> When all is said and done, there really remains only Jakoubek and the enigmatic influence of the Master of Paris.

Despite the assertions of Rokycana and his epigones, Matthias of Janov was not a Utraquist; he was an advocate only of frequent holy communion. Thus he is characterized by Nicholas of Dresden, that is by the man who cooperated in the introduction of the lay chalice in 1414.<sup>21</sup> Thus Rokycana's assertion is challenged by his Conciliar opponent Jan Stojkovič, relying on the synodal acts.<sup>22</sup> After all, what a great excitement the chalice caused in 1414, compared with the muted response to Janov's defense of the frequent communion. The limit of his eucharistic aspiration can also be deduced from his *Regulae*.<sup>23</sup> Nonetheless there is a quantum leap between the influence of Wyclif (whose "subunism" we have also emphasized) and the influence of Janov on Jakoubek. Even Jakoubek's earliest writings betray the impact of the Magister Parisiensis (although cited *suppresso nomine*),<sup>24</sup> and the effect of Janov's eucharistic treatises is evident from 1412 at the latest. It is attested in that period by his *Tractatus responsivus*,<sup>25</sup> in which Jakoubek followed Janov in

---

17) In particular, the Holy Land.

18) This fact is noted in Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau*, 148; see also Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, 49-60.

19) An early reference to Nicholas's importance among the initial Utraquists appeared in Jan Sedlák, "Počátkové kalicha," *Časopis katolického duchovenstva* 52 [77] (1911) 786-789; 54 [79] (1913) 406-408, 468-470.

20) Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, 61-85.

21) In the sermon "Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis," published in Romolo Cegna, *Nicolai (ut dicunt) de Dresda vulgo appellati de Čerruc (de Černá růže id est Rosa Nigra [+1418?]) Puncta, Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum* 33 (Warsaw, 1996) 184.

22) This episode is recorded in "Replica Magistri Johannis de Ragusio ad replicam Magistri Johannis Rokycana," ms. NK Prague, IX D 10, f. 223r, cited in the survey of Stojkovič's literary activity in A. Krchňák, "De vita et operibus Ioannis Ragusio," *Lateranum*, ns 26, n. 3-4 (Rome, 1960), no. 25, pp. 64-65.

23) Especially from his Fourth and Fifth books in *Mathiae de Janov dicti Magister Parisiensis Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, vol. 4, ed. Vlastimil Kybal and Otakar Odložilík (Prague, 1926) (Monumentorum ad historiam reformationis religionis in Bohemia saec. XIV. et XV. spectantium, vol. 13); and vol. 6, ed. Jana Nechutová (Munich, 1993) [Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, 69].

24) Jan Sedlák, "Husův pomocník v evangeliu I," *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým* 1 (1913-1914) 368, 373-376.

25) This work is published, wrongly attributed to Hus, in *Mistra Jana Husi Tractatus responsivus*, ed. S. Harrison Thomson, *Sbírka pramenů českého hnutí náboženského ve XIV. a XV. století*, n. 15; *Spisů M. Jana Husi*, n. 10 (Prague, 1927).

explicating the triple meaning of *communio* and in analyzing thoroughly the relationship between *communio* and the eucharist.<sup>26</sup> He definitely did not lay aside the *Regulae* thereafter. Janov's influence can be discerned in his Corpus Christi sermon with the incipit *Die dominico audistis*,<sup>27</sup> and when Jakoubek participated in a university disputation with the earlier-mentioned *quaestio*, titled *Quia heu in templis*,<sup>28</sup> more than half of this work was extracted almost verbatim from Janov. Slightly later we see that Nicholas of Dresden also draws on the *Regulae*. For Nicholas, however, this work is one of many sources or a welcomed guide to other authorities, while for Jakoubek the *Regulae* are much more fundamental.

Janov's masterpiece provided Jakoubek with the very basis of his eucharistic teaching hence, properly speaking, also for his advocacy of the chalice. It must be emphasized how completely Jakoubek had internalized the *Regulae*. Conceptually, he draws on all of Janov's eucharistic treatises, for specific formulations he draws mainly on the Fourth Book, and partly also on the Fifth. For the *quaestio* on the Antichrist, *Utrum sicut ex Scriptura* Jakoubek extracted the principal propositions from Janov, only rarely changing their sequence and then just slightly.<sup>29</sup> In substance, he follows his model's line of thought. In our Utraquist *quaestio*, however, we see that Jakoubek analyzed Janov's work really thoroughly. Fitting Janov's ideas into his own paradigm, he selects from diverse loci in the articles and chapters of Book Four, and he responds to Janov's references to Book Five by citing from that Book as well.<sup>30</sup> Jakoubek bases himself on Janov when he stresses the verse from the Gospel of John (6:54) *Nisi manducaveritis*, when he stresses the value of, and the need to return to, the practice of the primitive church, when he rejects human inventions, when he emphasizes frequent communion not only for the clergy, but also for the laity, and when he stresses the need to receive sacramentally, not just spiritually.

František Bartoš in his days trivialized Janov's influence as an ornamental padding. He also claimed that Jakoubek used Janov's writings as a crutch which helped him to develop a given theme.<sup>31</sup> Jakoubek, however, did not approach the problems of the eucharist as a novice. By that time, he was a bachelor of theology, a status which presupposed a substantial knowledge of eucharistic teaching, and he had already written one treatise on the eucharist, *Tractatus de remanencia*. The editor of this work, Paul De Vooght, identified passages, in which Jakoubek was influenced by Wyclif,<sup>32</sup> and thus we can ascertain that the several authorities on which Jakoubek drew were of his own choosing. His selection of texts was not limited to the normal repertoire of available to every theologian, (such as the usual patristic and scholastic texts and citations from Gratian's *Decretum*), he also drew

---

26) *Tractatus responsivus*, 83-91.

27) Published in Cegna, *Nicolai (ut dicunt) de Dresda vulgo appellati de Čerruc (de Černá růže id est Rosa Nigra [+1418?]) Puncta*, 188-197.

28) Unpublished, see Pavel Spunar, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum provecum idearum post Universitatem Pragensem condita illustrans I* [Studia Copernicana, 25] (Wrocław, 1985), no. 567, p. 216-217.

29) See Kybal, "M. Matěj z Janova a M. Jakoubek ze Stříbra," 26-33.

30) Krmíčková, *Studie a texty k počátkům kalicha v Čechách*, 89-109.

31) František M. Bartoš, "Počátky kalicha v Čechách," in his *Husitství a cizina* (Prague, 1931) 63.

32) De Vooght, *Jacobellus*, 319-350.

on contemporary and less familiar authorities. Among them we encounter in Jakoubek's Utraquist period at least Rupert of Deutz, inasmuch as a citation from him, included first in the *De remanencia*,<sup>33</sup> reappears subsequently in part in the Utraquist treatises, namely in *Quod non solum sacerdote*,<sup>34</sup> and in *Salvator noster*.<sup>35</sup> Jakoubek, therefore, sought and incorporated Janov's eucharistic teachings not because of lack of alternative sources, but because the Master of Paris resonated with his inclinations and his mentality, and could thus captivate his full attention.

Let us return once more to Bartoš's critique. On the one hand, Jakoubek's *quaestio*, of course, contains certain citations from Janov which could be viewed as a kind of extraneous padding. On the other hand, we see that Jakoubek was rooted in Janov in his fundamentals. In this connection, we can cite above all the stress on the sacramental reception of the eucharist. This had been a burning issue already in Janov's times. In Jakoubek's times, the issue also became a matter of dispute between him and the champions of communion *sub una specie*, especially Ondřej of Brod,<sup>36</sup> and later similar disputes occurred during the polemics at the Council of Basel. In connection with this matter, we also see a substantial difference between Jakoubek and Jan Hus. Hus was not drawn to the lay chalice by his own eucharistic speculation, but by the arguments in the writings of his friends.<sup>37</sup> He did not approve the lay chalice for theological reasons, but in order to preserve unity among his confrères. In contrast to Jakoubek and his stress on sacramental communion, Hus remained convinced until the end that spiritual communion was more important.

Jakoubek even tells us how he had arrived at the idea of lay chalice. He received a "revelation," and this *revelatio* explains his enlightening recognition to which he was led by his studies. Naturally, his *quaestio Quia heu in templis* could not contain just passages extracted from Janov. Jakoubek had to justify the chalice itself and did so by citations from Gratian (Gelasius's decree *Comperimus*), Nicholas of Lyra, and William of Montlaurun, but the foundation came from Janov. In his statement about the "revelatio," Jakoubek emphasizes biblical and patristic studies. We can see, however, clearly that the apparatus of biblical citations had been prepared for him by Matěj of Janov. *Regulae Vestris et Novi Testamenti*, and particularly the Fourth Book, thus formed those *expositiones solidae* and *cognitio*, about which Jakoubek informs us in connection with the revelation of the chalice.<sup>38</sup>

Early Utraquism, however, soon received new stimuli. In 1417 the struggle

---

33) *Ibid.*, 323-324.

34) Unpublished, see Spunar, *Repertorium auctorum Bohemorum* I, no. 605, p. 225-226, ms. NK Prague, V E 16, f. 121v-122r.

35) In: *Betlémské texty*, ed. Bohumil Ryba (Prague, 1951) 138.

36) These polemics are analyzed by Jaroslav Kadlec, *Literární polemika mistra Jakoubka ze Stříbra a Ondřeje z Brodu o laický kalich*, in *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, 21/2 (1981) 71-88; and in his *Studien und Texte zum Leben und Wirken des Prager Magisters Andreas von Brod*, [Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Texte und Untersuchungen, Neue Folge, 22] (Münster, 1982) 34-47.

37) See Helena Krmíčková, *K pramenům Husovy kvestie De sanguine Christi sub specie vini*, [Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity C 45] (Brno, 1998), forthcoming.

38) Jakoubek discussed this question especially in his lengthy answer in his polemic with Ondřej of Brod with the incipit *Praemissis positione scholastica*, H. von der Hardt, *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense concilium* (Frankfurt, 1698) 3 col. 566.

exploded over communion for infants, although the genesis of this idea may be discerned earlier.<sup>39</sup> In this case Jakoubek, of course, could not be inspired by Janov who referred to the communion for infants only once and just in passing.<sup>40</sup> He had to reach for other authorities. In fact, we meet as early as 1414 with his and Nicholas's works on this topic, which rest by and large simply on citations from authorities.<sup>41</sup> The period after 1414 and into the 1420s could not merely recycle concepts from Janov's period, and Utraquism had to develop further. Matthias of Janov, of course, does not disappear even then, but lives on as a perennial component of Jakoubek's eucharistic teaching and, thus, we encounter his ideas also in Jakoubek's writings of the 1420s. Likewise, he is metamorphosed into a legacy for other Utraquists. Jakoubek, however, now looks to those authors who emphasize the chalice for fresh ideas. It is, as if we hear the Master of Paris whisper: *Illum oportet crescere, me autem minui* [He must increase, but I must decrease] (John 3:30). So fittingly a time has arrived when Janov must diminish and the chalice must grow. This denouement, of course, in no way devalues his stage in the relay journey of the return to the lay chalice.

(Translation from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David)

---

39) The question of communion for infants has been discussed in detail by David R. HOLETON, *La communion des tout-petits enfants: Étude du mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Âge*, [Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia 50] (Rome, 1989) For its prehistory see Helena Krmíčková, "Několik poznámek o přijímání malíčkových, 1414-1416," [Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty Brněnské univerzity C44] (1997) 59-69.

40) See Janov, *Regulae*, 5:231.

41) Jakoubek did so in his collection of citations appended to the *quaestio Quia heu in templis*, and in his treatise *Quod non solum sacerdotes*; Nicholas in the citation of authorities appended to the sermon *Sermo ad clerum Nisi manducaveritis*; this appendix is now considered an independent treatise *Collecta*.