

Marek Karczewski*

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn (Poland)

SACRAMENT OF EUCHARIST ACCORDING TO *EXPOSITIO SYMBOLI APOSTOLORUM* BY JOHANNES MARIENWERDER

Summary: The article is called *Sacrament of Eucharist according to “Expositio Symboli Apostolorum” by Johannes Marienwerder*. The subject of the analysis is late medieval work of Johannes Marienwerder (Jan z Kwidzyna) (1342–1417) *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum* (1399–1401). The theme of the Eucharist is interesting for at least two reasons. The late 14th century is the time of extremities: intensification of the postulates of Eucharistic revival and emergence of views which negated Christ’s real presence in the Eucharist. References to a discussion on the subject can be found in *Expositio*. Second, discussing the views of Johannes Marienwerder on the Eucharist presented in *Expositio* can provide a supplement for studies of the eucharistic piety of blessed Dorothea of Montau. The following issues are dealt with in this paper. The first section presents the state of debate on the Eucharist in Prague circles in the late 14th century. Postulates of frequent Holy Communion appeared. There were currents negating the Catholic teachings on Eucharist in Prague at the time. The second section discusses the theology of the Eucharist as presented in *Expositio*. It can be described as a form of apology of the Catholic teachings on the Eucharist. Moreover, the Prologue to Johannes Marienwerder’s work contains a series of brief practical guidelines mainly concerning the celebration of the mass. One should hope that this study will be useful both to theologians and to other scholars who deal with the literary circles of the late Mediaeval Pomesania and also the pre-Hussite period.

Keywords: Johannes Marienwerder, *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, Sacrament of Eucharist, medieval sacramentology.

Introduction

*Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*¹ is the major work of Johannes Marienwerder (1343–1417), the eminent theologian of Pomesania (cf. Glauert,

* Address: rev. dr. habil. Marek Karczewski, prof. UWM; marek.karczewski@uwm.edu.pl; ORCID: 0000-0001-9435-3832.

¹ This study is based on the version of the text presented in Jan z Kwidzyna, 2023, *Wykład Symbolu Apostolskiego Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*. Hereinafter abbreviated as *Expositio*. The Johannes Marienwerder’s work was known mainly in German-speaking countries, which is testified to by the several dozen copies of its manuscript kept at various libraries in Western Europe. In 1485 in Ulm, K. Dinkmut published an abbreviated version of *Expositio* in German: *Johannes Marienwerder, Erklärung der zwölf Artikel des christlichen Glaubens*. It is based on text translated into German by Jakob Lantzenberger in 1432 (Brandauer, 2008).

2003, p. 486–494). He spent more than twenty years of his life at Charles University in Prague. After he returned to Pomesania, he joined the Teutonic Order in 1387, in which he performed important roles in the Chapter of Pomesania in Kwidzyn (Marienwerder). He played a significant role in promoting the worship of blessed Dorothea of Montau (1347–1394), a visionary and mystic (cf. Parcheniak, 2021, p. 495–510; Dygo, 2023, 9–21). A long-term stay in Prague shaped Johannes Marienwerder’s outlook on the world (cf. Karczewski, 2021a, p. 288–293).

Expositio is linked to the Western Church tradition of many centuries, in which a particular role is played by *Symbolum Apostolorum*, i.e. the Apostles’ Creed. The very term *Symbolum Apostolorum* did not appear until the late 4th century². However, it is since the post-apostolic times that so-called “rules of faith” or “rules of truth” were developed, presenting the contents of faith in a clear and compact form (Pietras, 1997, p. 63–76). Knowing them was required from those who wanted to become baptised. The importance of *Symbolum Apostolorum* was increased by the conviction that its twelve articles were written by the twelve apostles (*Expositio*, Tabula, p. 24; Prologue, p. 33. 46–47.51–52; cf. Starowieyski, 1997, p. 51–62). The truths of faith contained in the *Symbolum* had been formulated since the patristic period³. A most valued commentary to the *Symbolum Apostolorum* was written by Thomas Aquinas. When explaining why he wrote *Expositio*, Johannes Marienwerder points to the need to explain the *Symbolum* as a sign of the unity of faith of all the faithful ‘converted, of various peoples, languages, nations’ (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 52)⁴. The spread of heresies and errors was given as the immediate reason. Those who succumbed to them not only hurt the Ecclesial community, but they also became exposed to the great danger of forfeiting their salvation (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 32–40). Moreover, by writing *Expositio*, Johannes wished to become part of the inner revival of the Church. According to the author of the work, the situation in the Church was extremely difficult and saddening (*Expositio*, Art. IX, p. 263; cf. Karczewski, 2022a, p. 253–257)⁵.

There is no direct reference to Eucharist in the Apostles’ Creed. However, according to Johannes Marienwerder, like the others, this sacrament is also

² In Saint Ambrose’s (+397) letter to pope Siricius during the Synod of Milan, Letter 42, 5. PL 16, 1125 (Gładyszewski, 2010, p. 5–6).

³ The comments’ authors included: Rufinus of Aquileia, Augustine of Hippo, Peter Chrysologus, Venantius Fortunatus (see: Gładyszewski, 2010; cf. Żurek, 2017, p. 789–800).

⁴ Special emphasis was placed on the knowledge of the Apostles’ Creed in the medieval Church in Pomesania (see: Wiśniewski, 1998, p. 39, 44, 55). Its knowledge was also required from candidates to the Teutonic Order (Kowalczyk, 2018, p. 151).

⁵ The author refers to an ordeal faced by the then Church at the hands of “family and false Christians”. The Church seems to lose rather than gain. It lacks accord and religious duplicity is ubiquitous.

closely linked to the profession of faith, especially to the articles concerning the Church (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 47). Therefore, the lecture on the Eucharist provided in *Expositio* is one of many discussed in the work (Karczewski, 2021b). This subject is very interesting for at least two reasons. First, the late 14th century is the time of extremities: intensification of the postulates of Eucharistic revival and emergence of views which negated Christ's real presence in the Eucharist. References to a discussion on the subject can be found in *Expositio*. Second, discussing the views of Johannes Marienwerder on the Eucharist presented in *Expositio* can provide a supplement for studies of the eucharistic piety of blessed Dorothea of Montau. The following issues are dealt with in this paper. The first section presents the state of debate on the Eucharist in Prague circles in the late 14th century. Postulates of frequent Holy Communion appeared. There were currents negating the Catholic teachings on Eucharist in Prague at the time. The second section discusses the theology of the Eucharist as presented in *Expositio*. It can be described as a form of apology of the Catholic teachings on the Eucharist. Moreover, the Prologue to Johannes Marienwerder's work contains a series of brief practical guidelines mainly concerning the celebration of the mass. One should hope that this study will be useful both to theologians and to other scholars who deal with the literary circles of the late Mediaeval Pomesania and also the pre-Hussite period.

1. Debate on the Eucharist in the Church circles in Prague in the late 14th century

1.1. Argument for frequent Holy Communion

The Church revival currents, which appeared in Western Europe, in the Teutonic state and in Bohemia in the mid-14th century, had many forms and shades (Bylina, 2001, p. 92). However, there were certain common tendencies, such as the return to the ideals of the Gospels and the revival of sacramental life. Striving for a personal experience of God's presence, typical of the *devotio moderna* currents, was especially linked to receiving the sacrament of Eucharist, lived through in an intense way (Bylina, 2001, p. 92). The development of Eucharistic piety was one of the typical features of the late Middle Ages. It is accepted that Bohemia, and especially Prague, was one of the Eucharistic revival centres in Europe (Bylina, 2001, p. 92). In the late 14th century, there were eminent personages operating in Prague circles, with a significant impact on them (Gajewski, 2016, p. 66–69). These included: the Austrian Augustinian Canon Conrad Waldhauser (ca. 1326–1369), his associate Jan Milíč of Kroměříž

(ca. 1320–1374), Jan's disciple – Matthias of Janov (1350/1355–1394). Apart from the calls for moral and disciplinary revival, the need for more frequent Holy Communion was also called for. The Church required only annual participation in the Eucharist – during the Easter period (Rozynekowski, 2020, p. 132). It is known that a model of seven-time Communion was promoted in the Teutonic state⁶ at the time (Kowalczyk, 2018, p. 164). Out of respect for the Eucharist and concern about receiving it with due veneration, calls for receiving it more frequently were not very popular. It would so happen that a confession was made several times to prepare well for the annual Communion (Bylina, 2001, p. 94). However, the idea of receiving the Eucharist frequently was known in the Rhenish mystic circles (cf. Piasecki, 2008, p. 246–261). One of the proponents of weekly Communion was Heinrich Seuse (1295/1297–1366) (Bylina, 2001, p. 92). Preachers in Prague also promoted frequent Communion. Jan Milíč and Matthias of Janov regarded Communion as a measure for the fight against sin and a source of sanctification (Gajewski, 2016, p. 67–68). According to Matthias of Janov, it should be received as often as possible, even every day. He claimed that frequently receiving the Eucharist strengthened a Christian on the path towards salvation. He also warned against avoiding Communion, claiming that rejecting it without justification exposes one to the threat of damnation (Bylina, 2001, p. 97–98). According to Matthias of Janov, the Eucharist is a live sign of Christ's sacrifice, His death on the cross and resurrection. In Christian life, the Eucharist is a sign of unity with God and a community of the faithful (Gajewski, 2016, p. 68). Among proponents of frequent Communion there was also another famous disciple of Jan Milíč – Tomáš Štítý (1333–1409). He was of the opinion that frequent communion is necessary to develop true piety (Paner, 2016, p. 26). Practicing frequent Communion in the New Jerusalem Community in Prague, established by Jan Milíč and run by Matthias of Janov, raised objections among the Church authorities and doubts among some influential clergy (Paner, 2016, p. 26). They wondered whether it would not be better to make frequent communion available to individuals properly prepared and advanced spiritually. This issue was also considered by some disciples of Henry Totting von Oyta (ca. 1330–1397), among them (Matthaeus de Cracovia, 1345–1410) and Johannes Marienwerder (1343–1417) (Krzyżaniakowa, 1995, p. 101–108). Matthias of Kraków suggested that the issue of the Communion frequency should be judged by the conscience of the person receiving the sacrament. At the same time – like Jan Milíč and Matthias of Janov – he rejected the need to complete complex

⁶ The Eucharist played an important role in the Teutonic piety and spirituality (cf. Kowalczyk, 2018, p. 162–164; Rozynekowski, 2020, p. 119–136).

preparatory procedures. Others suggested that the responsibility for the respectful dispensing of Communion falls upon the local parish priest, who knew the local faithful. The issue of frequent Communion does not appear in *Expositio*. However, Johannes Marienwerder is known to support Dorothea of Montau in this regard. As a recluse, she enjoyed the privilege of receiving the Sacrament of Eucharist daily (Kowalczyk, 2014, p. 161). Johannes Marienwerder's acquaintance with Matthias of Kraków and the debates on frequent Holy Communion may have affected the Pomesanian's view on the issue (Krzyżaniakowa, 1995, p. 106; cf. Mossman, 2010, p. 106–123). The Synod of Prague rejected Matthias of Janov's views on everyday Communion in 1389, after Johannes Marienwerder returned to Pomesania. Matthias of Janov was obligated to accept that lay persons can receive Holy Communion once a month at the most (Gajewski, 2016, p. 68).

1.2. Unorthodox views

Waldensians in Prague

Although the Waldensian movement was born in the 12th century, it also played a certain role in the pre-Hussite period (Gajewski, 2016, p. 35–45). Waldensian ideas were known and well-received in various regions of Europe at the time (Tourn, 2003). There is some evidence of the Waldensian presence in Pomerania, Silesia and Bohemia⁷ in the 14th century. Waldensians exerted some influence in Prague, especially in the local circles of German merchants and craftsmen (Čornej, 2016, p. 82). The 1395 treatise written by Peter Zwicker of Orneta (Wormditt) provides characteristics of the views of Waldensians from Austria, Brandenburg, Pomerania, Bohemia and Hungary (Gajewski, 2016, p. 45–46). They regarded themselves as the only true Church. They rejected the cult and intercession of the Mother of Christ, the cult of images and relics. They also disapproved of the cult of purgatory, indulgences, and praying for the dead. They rejected the idea of special respect for shrines and cemeteries. Negating the importance of the (then) official church structures, including bishops and priests, was manifested in their attitude to sacramentology. Negating or selective treatment of the Church's teaching led to the need to create their own concept of sacraments. They retained only three sacraments: baptism, Eucharist and – highly regarded – penance. However, the Catholic concept of the mass was rejected. The Eucharist was received very rarely (Gajewski, 2016, p. 46–47). Particular importance was attached to preaching God's Word and teaching.

⁷ The number of Waldensians in Bohemia in the 14th century is estimated to be approx. 2.5 thousand. In Prague, they included mostly German-speaking people. Gajewski, 2016, p. 48 refers to calculation, made by A. Paschovsky (1979, p. 19–24) based on inquisition files.

In *Expositio*, Johannes Marienwerder polemicises with some Waldensians' opinions on the cult of the saints and the way the sacrament of penance is understood (cf. *Expositio*, Art. X, p. 270; Art. XI, p. 285). He also exposes heretics' errors, without their direct identification, in other doctrinal issues (cf. *Expositio*, Art. XI, p. 285–286.303; Karczewski, 2022a, p. 251–252). They are identical to Waldensian views on many issues.

The impact of Wycliffe's teachings

The late 14th century was the time when discussion on the understanding of the Eucharist became radicalised in certain Church circles. Of particular importance was the discussion on the views of John Wycliff (ca. 1329–1384), who was a Catholic priest and professor at Oxford University. The dispute on the Eucharist was associated with personal philosophical views and a radical vision of the Church revival based on the Holy Scripture authority. On the philosophical level, Wycliff is regarded as one of the major opponents of William of Ockham's (1288–1347/49) nominalism. He himself was regarded as a proponent of philosophical realism. Both philosophical currents were polemical with respect to traditional philosophy and scholastic theology. Wycliff's philosophical views on the universalia, drawing on the positions of Plato, Augustin and Anselm of Canterbury, are sometimes called ultrarealistic (Gajewski, 2016, p. 53). In his assessment of the state of the Church in light of the Bible, Wycliff voiced sharp criticism of its structures, led by the pope. In Wycliff's opinion, the Church's earthly structures no longer fulfilled the Divine idea. Only the spiritual Church was Christ's real Community (Gajewski, 2016, p. 54). Indulgences, which were, in fact, only a source of exploitation, should be rejected. Wycliff was also of the opinion that the Holy Scripture did not need the Church's comments and that it exceeded all authority (Gajewski, 2016, p. 55–56). The Bible verifies all doctrines. Wycliff's most radical work, *De Eucharestia*, was written in 1380. In it, he attacked the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, regarding it as unacceptable (Kaczmarek, 1969, p. 56–68). According to Wycliff, the transformation of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood during the Eucharist ceremony is impossible. Bread remains bread and wine remains wine. Wycliff dissociated himself from the Catholic concept of the Eucharist, according to which only a properly consecrated priest can celebrate it. Wycliff is sometimes thought to perceive Eucharist in the meaning of consubstantiation (Gajewski, 2016, p. 57). Christ's presence in the Eucharist does not transubstantiate bread or wine. One can only talk about the presence through analogy – spiritual presence. Its effectiveness depends on the participant's faith. According to other opinions, the meaning of Eucharist was

only symbolic for Wycliff (Kaczmarek, 1969, p. 69–83; Krzyżaniakowa, 1992, p. 19).

The marriage of Richard II and Anne of Bohemia, daughter of Charles IV, facilitated trade contacts and provided the possibility of studying at Oxford and Cambridge (Gajewski, 2016, p. 59). Moreover, owing to contacts between the universities at the time, Wycliff's views on the Eucharist were known in Prague in the late 14th century. This is also pointed out in the lecture of Johannes Marienwerder (cf. *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 52–53), and his polemic against treating the Eucharist only as a symbol (Müller, 2008, p. 601–602).

The discussion on the conditions of celebrating the Eucharist in a valid manner and, in consequence, on adopting the rule of *ex opere operato*, which is binding in Catholic sacramentology, intensified with the activities of Jan Hus (1370–1415). Like Johannes Marienwerder, he was a graduate of (and a professor at) Prague University (Nodl, 2016, p. 71–81). He was also its rector. Jan Hus' impact on Bohemian circles culminated in the early 15th century, when Johannes Marienwerder was already in Pomesania. Jan Hus was a proponent of the Church revival and an influential preacher. He supported Wycliff's views on the necessary ecclesial reforms, the importance of God's Word and predestination. However, he did not support rejecting the science of transubstantiation. According to Hus, the Eucharist, after consecration, undergoes transubstantiation and becomes Christ's Body and Blood, but it also retains the substance of bread (Paner, 2002, p. 22; Hintz, 2016, p. 193). The rectors of Prague University, Štěpán of Pálče (ca. 1370–1424) and Stanislav of Znojmo (1351–1414) initially supported Wycliff's and Hus' views. However, ultimately they became their adversaries. Jerome of Prague (ca. 1378–1416), a professor at the university, remained a faithful supporter of Hus and Wycliff⁸. It is notable that initially, the Prague university circles were divided into the Bohemian camp, which was sympathetic to Wycliff and his philosophical realism, and the German camp, which included opponents of Wycliff's views and proponents of nominalism; it also included Johannes Marienwerder. Gradually, the dispute about Wycliff's teachings became the Bohemians' internal affair, leading to an open religious conflict. The archbishop of Prague and the king became involved in it (Paner, 2016, p. 29). Its intensification in 1411–1415 was followed by the tragic end of Hus' life.

The burning of the Prague reformer at the stake in Constance in 1415 did not end the doctrinal disputes concerning the Eucharist (Iwańczak, 2016, p. 113–122). His proponents were not a monolith. Those who represented

⁸ It is sometimes alleged that it was Jerome of Prague, as Hus' associate, who studied at Oxford in 1399–1401, that facilitated access to Wycliff's writings to him (cf. Górka, 2019, p. 196). However, the Oxford university professor's ideas were probably known in Prague earlier.

moderate views discussed with those representing the Council. Their main topics included the Eucharist views and a call for administering communion in two forms to adults and children (Nowakowski, 2016, p. 38).

2. The lecture on the Eucharist in *Expositio*

2.1. Theology of the Eucharist

In the introduction to *Expositio*, Johannes Marienwerder provides a compendium of knowledge on the Sacrament of Eucharist, which should be known to the faithful (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 52–53). The lecture is of an apologetic nature. The author rejects the opinion that the Eucharist is a symbol of Christ's Body and Blood. He emphasises the truth that Christ's real Blood and Body have the form of bread and wine in the Eucharist⁹. This is done after the consecration performed by the priest with the proper intention by saying the oral formula established by Christ. The following words are said over the bread: *This is my Body*, and over the wine: *The is a chalice of my blood*. Bread and wine are transubstantiated into Christ's Body and Blood, while their forms perceived with senses are retained¹⁰. Johannes stresses that the whole of Christ is visible sacramentally in the Eucharistic forms. He rejects the view that it could be only a descriptive presence¹¹. Christ gives himself as food in the sacrament of the Eucharist.

Anyone who receives Him with due respect, not only as a sacrament but also spiritually, through faith and love, is included in Christ's mystic Body (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 53; cf. Karczewski, 2022b, p. 179–180). Moreover, he experiences inner revival and purification (cf. Kowalczyk, 2018, p. 190–195). Like the other six sacraments, the Eucharist is a spiritual medicine for diseases of the soul, and it leads one to salvation. Holy Spirit's grace cures and revives a person following the pattern of the Holy Trinity. It is not given to the haughty, to non-believers or to the conceited (*Expositio*, Art. IX, p. 258.262–263).

Whoever receives the sacrament of Eucharist without due respect is exposed to God's judgement. The author paraphrases the text of 1Cor 11:29, which contains the teachings on respectful participation in the Eucharist: *For those*

⁹ *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 53: *De quo hoc tenendum quod in hoc sacramentum verum corpus Christi est verus sanguis eius non tantum significatur, verumeciam continetur sub duplici specie, scilicet panis et vini, tanguam sub uno, non duplici sacramento.*

¹⁰ *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 53: *Transsubstantiatur utrumque elementum secundum substantiam in corpus est sanguinem Ihesu Christi remanentibus speciebus sensibilibus.*

¹¹ *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 53: *In quarum utraque continetur totaliter non circumscriptibiliter sed sacramentaliter totus Christus.*

who eat and drink without discerning the body of Christ eat and drink judgment on themselves. Johannes Marienwerder provides three cases of disrespectful participation in Eucharist: persistence in a mortal sin, intention to sin and a wrong faith.

Persistence in a mortal sin, or an intention to sin, destroy the state of grace in a person and disrupt their bond with God and prevent them from receiving Communion (cf. *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 39–40). This state requires one to receive absolution from sins by a duly ordained priest with proper jurisdiction (*Expositio*, Art. X, p. 278–279.285). In fact, God himself absolves one's sins through the priest. Johannes Marienwerder points to the texts of Isa. 43:24, Matt. 18:18 and John 20:22–23. The priests only fulfil Christ's order and is only His tool.

The phrase “a wrong, improper attitude of faith”¹² is very broad and applies to all those who doubt the reality of the Eucharist. The author does not make it clear whether it is only about heretics or if he means all those who succumb to their influence or whose faith in the Eucharist is wrong and weak. A polemic against heretic views is an important feature of *Expositio* (cf. Art. X, p. 285–286; Wojtkowski, 2015, p. 366–370). It is based on a conviction that persistence in error excludes one from the Church and exposes the erring person to the danger of eternal damnation (Karczewski, 2022b, p. 181). Cutting oneself off from the Church due to heresy excluded one from participation in sacraments. Those who died in heresy forfeit their right to be buried in a cemetery. Prayers or sacrifices for heretics were forbidden (*Expositio*, Art. IX, p. 258).

Celebrating the Eucharist may be a form of support for souls in purgatory. Those souls can also be helped by alms, fasting, prayers and voluntary penance (*Expositio*, Art. V, p. 138).

The mention of visiting the Eucharist in Church every day shows its fundamental importance in the religious life at the time (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 52). Johannes rejects the view – typical for proponents of Wycliff and Waldensians – that adoration of the consecrated Host is an act of idolatry (*Expositio*, Art. VIII, p. 224–225). In fact, everyone who intends to worship God and Christ transubstantiated in the Host worships Him (cf. Rozynekowski, 2020, p. 121–127; Zawadzki, 2021, p. 22–23). As has been said, *Expositio* does not deal with the issue of the frequency of receiving Communion¹³. This may

¹² *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 53: *in fide non recte credendo*.

¹³ Borzyszkowski (1974, p. 60) thinks differently, when he suggests that Johannes talks about everyday communion. The phrase *sacramentum eukaristie cottidie in ecclesia frequentatur* (*Expositio*, Prologue, f. 13 v d) – ‘The Eucharist is visited in church every day’ – does not mean precisely that it is about Communion. The text may only refer to the everyday participation in the mass or adoration (cf. *Expositio*, Art. VIII, f. 50a–b). It does not mean that Johannes was not a proponent of everyday communion.

be a consequence of the fact that it was a sensitive issue in the late 14th century. However, the work shows clearly that the Eucharist is a unique gift for a conscious believer. Johannes does not require that much from those who want to receive Communion. However, what is important is faith in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and embracing the conditions of receiving it with due respect.

2.2. Practical guidance on the Eucharist

2.2.1. Guidance for celebrants

The *Prologue to Expositio* contains a number of guidelines concerning the behaviour of a priest who celebrates the mass in the event of mistakes or omissions.

What to do when there is too much water compared to wine in the chalice? (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 53–55).

Since wine is necessary to consecrate Christ's Blood, the solution depends on the moment when the celebrant notices the deficit. If it happens before consecration, he should pour out the water and pour in wine. If the priest notices it after the consecration, he should prepare and consecrate wine anew. If the priest notices the fact after consuming Christ's Body, he should prepare the host and wine again and start the Eucharistic canon again. He should receive the Body and Blood for the second time, although he is not able to observe the Eucharistic fast. It is more important to complete the mass in a proper way. Johannes Marienwerder refers to the lecture given by Thomas Aquinas¹⁴.

If the celebration is public and the celebrant becomes aware of the lack of wine after consuming the Body, Duns Scotus' recommendation should be followed in order to avoid the outrage caused by putting in a new host (cf. Wojtkowski, 2015, p. 361–378)¹⁵. It involves repeating the Blood consecration. Subsequently, the priest should say a prayer on Communion and receive Christ's Blood. Penance should also be made for negligence.

On the other hand, if the negligent priest fails to correct his errors, he should be punished doubly.

Is a nocturnal pollution an impediment? (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 55–57).

The *Expositio* author reminds three conditions of respectful celebrations of the Eucharist by reference to Thomas Aquinas' lecture¹⁶. These include: pure conscience free from any sin, active piety and the purity of the body. Therefore, sin, acedia and bodily impurity are impediments to celebrating the Eucharist

¹⁴ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, p. III, q. 83, a. 6, ad 4.

¹⁵ Cf. Joannes Duns Scotus, *Quaestiones in quartum librum Sententiarum*, d. 13, c. 4. q. 2.

¹⁶ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super Sententiarum Libri IV*, d. 9, a. 2–4.

with due respect. According to Johannes, it happens that nocturnal emissions are linked to three, two or one of them. It can be without sin, it can be a light sin, but sometimes it can be a mortal one. It is a mortal sin when it is done with consent and involves seeking carnal pleasure (cf. *Expositio*, Prologue, p. 56). Johannes Marienwerder links the possibility of celebrating the Eucharist to the personal judgement of the celebrant's conscience. If he has doubts about consent to the sin, he should abstain from celebrating. If he is convinced that there was no consent and the mass has to be celebrated, he can do it. However, if it is not necessary, it is better to abstain from it. Celebration after a nocturnal emission without consent should be regarded as a venial sin (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 56). The Pomesanian theologian recommends that if there is doubt about the existence of sin, it is best to abstain from the celebration for 24 hours to calm the excited nature (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 57). However, the pastoral need should also be taken into account.

What to do if an insect or poison gets into the chalice? (Expositio, Prologue, p. 57).

According to the author of *Expositio*, when contamination with an insect takes place before the consecration, the chalice contents should be poured out, the chalice should be rinsed with water and wine with water should be prepared anew. If this happens after the consecration, the insect should be taken out carefully, washed and burned, and the remnants, after rinsing together with the ash should be left as relics. If the chalice is contaminated with poison after consecration, it should be placed in a special container, and the wine consecration should be repeated.

What to do if the celebrant does not remember if he said what he should have? (Expositio, Prologue, p. 57–58).

According to Johannes Marienwerder, if the priest does not remember at what place he has omitted something, he should continue to celebrate. However, if he is sure that he has not said the words of consecration, he should repeat the whole text with the intention to complete the consecration (cf. *Expositio*, Art. VIII, p. 224).

What to do if a drop of Christ's Blood has been spilled? (Expositio, Prologue, p. 58–59).

When a drop of Christ's Blood is spilled on a plank or on the ground, it should be licked off with one's tongue, and the place where it was spilled should be scrubbed. The scrubblings should be burned, and the ash should be placed on the altar. The priest should perform 40-day penance. If a drop leaks from the chalice to the altar without a pall laid out, it should be drunk off, and a three-day penance should be performed. If the blood is spilled on the top altar cloth, the penance should last two days. If it leaks to the second, third or fourth altar cloth,

the priest's penance should last for four, nine or twenty days, respectively. Moreover, the celebrant should wash the altar cloths three times, the water after washing should be drunk or put at the place for relics¹⁷. Johannes also suggests that it would be safer if the part of the altar cloth through which a drop of Christ's Blood leaked was cut off and burned. The ash should be put in a place for relics.

The priest's penance should involve fasting. Johannes also reminds us that some suggest abstaining from receiving Communion (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 58–59). However, he suggests that – in accordance with a view expressed by Thomas Aquinas in *Super Quarto Sententiarum*, in distinction 13, the length and type of penance was discretionary, depending on the state of the penitent, the possibility of fasting and abstaining from Communion. It is similar to penance if a priest drops Christ's Body by negligence (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 59).

If an animal eats and drinks the Eucharistic form because of negligence? (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 59).

If a mouse or a different animal eats part of the Eucharist, the person responsible for the negligence should make penance for forty days. If the animal can be caught, it should be burned and the ashes put in a place for relics.

What if the Eucharist is lost? (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 59).

Johannes Marienwerder considers this negligence by reference straight to Thomas Aquinas and Heinrich Seuse. If the Host or its part cannot be found, the guilty person should – according to Thomas – make penance for thirty days. According to Heinrich, if the situation did not lead to godlessness, the guilty person should be suspended for three months. Otherwise, the punishment should be more severe. Johannes also refers to *Extra* to the first chapter of *De custodia Echaristiae* and to a fragment of *De consecratione* of distinction 2 in chapter *Qui bene*¹⁸.

If the celebrant becomes aware of impediments to celebrating the Eucharist? (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 60).

Johannes Marienwerder describes a situation when, during a mass, the priest remembers that he did not observe the Eucharistic fasting or that he is in a state of mortal sin. If he becomes aware of it before consecration, it is better to discontinue the celebration and receive absolution first. If this should happen after the consecration, then he should regret it and decide to confess his sins as soon as possible.

Other issues (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 59–60). Johannes also answers other possible doubts. The first one concerns leaving a host on the altar by negligence

¹⁷ Cf. Gratianus, *Decretum*, p. III, d. 2, c. 27; Theodorus, *Poenitentiale*, c. 51; PL 99,950 BC.

¹⁸ Gratianus, *Decretum*, p. II, causa 1, q.1, c.71; p. III, d. 2, c.94.

or lack of knowledge of other hosts present there. A doubt arises about whether they were consecrated. Another doubt concerns the consecration of a drop of wine stuck to the outside surface of the chalice. According to Albert the Great's view expressed in *De missa*¹⁹, such hosts or drops are not consecrated, as there was no such intention. Johannes refers to the opinion of Augustin, who thought that an intention was required in all sacraments. However, Augustin did not address this issue²⁰.

Doubts concerning the respectful and valid celebration of the Eucharist contained in *Expositio* are not complete²¹, but they concern relatively frequent cases. Johannes Marienwerder's recommendations are based mainly on solutions proposed by recognised ecclesial authorities. Ultimately, it will be the celebrant's decision whether to follow them properly. These – very detailed, it might seem – notes are based on the conviction about the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of Eucharist.

2.2.2. *Universal guidelines*

What to do when someone vomits immediately after receiving Communion. (*Expositio*, Prologue, p. 59). This may apply both to lay persons and to priests. The vomit should be burned, and the ash should be placed on the altar. The penance for this deed varies²². If it happened because of drinking or eating too much, then a lay person should make forty-day penance, while a clergyman (priest, friar, deacon) – seventy days; a bishop should make penance for ninety days. If the sickness was caused by a disease, the penance should last seven days because that person behaved imprudently.

The solution of a somatic issue in the context of eating the Eucharist confirms that, according to Johannes Marienwerder, Christ is really present in this sacrament. Therefore, the Eucharist should be received with the utmost respect and prudence.

Conclusion

As an expert theologian, Johannes Marienwerder was sensitive to the proper understanding of the sacrament of the Eucharist and to celebrating it with respect. He also knew the new, extreme interpretations which were contrary to

¹⁹ Albertus Magnus, *Compendium theologiae veritatis*, Liber VI, caput 11.

²⁰ Theologians did not become interested in this issue until the 12th century.

²¹ The Synod of Pomesania of 1411 forbade to use spoiled wine for the mass. It also addressed the issue of drinking the water used for purification of the chalice (Wiśniewski, 1998, p. 33, 41),

²² Cf. Gratianus, *Decretum*, c. 28.

the teachings of the Catholic Church. The lecture on the Eucharist presented in *Expositio* is addressed mainly to the clergy. It is in their circles that lively discussions were initiated on the need for the Church revival. The return to frequent Communion was called for and the solutions proposed were radical for those times. Although Johannes does not address this issue in a straightforward manner, he agrees with the opinion that receiving Communion is particularly valuable for one's spiritual life. At the same time, he sees the Eucharist from the ecclesial perspective. Celebrating and receiving the Eucharist with due respect builds the Church, the mystic body of Christ. Rejecting the Eucharist is equivalent to losing the bond with its Head – Jesus Christ. The author of *Expositio* rejects the old Waldensian views and the new ideas that negated the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Johannes Marienwerder stressed that the Eucharist should be celebrated and received with due respect. The situation of sin can be resolved by the Sacrament of Penance. Johannes is a proponent of the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Host. He stresses that the transubstantiation of bread and wine into the real Body and Blood of Christ takes place during the celebration of the Eucharist. As has been rightly pointed out, the issue of the sacrificial dimension of the mass was strongly limited (Borzyszkowski, 1974, p. 60). The Eucharistic sacrifice is mentioned when various ways of helping the dead in purgatory are discussed. Possibly, Johannes perceives emphasising the real presence of Christ not only as a form of polemic with heresies but also as a way of renewing the Eucharistic piety of the clergy. The Eucharist should not be celebrated carelessly or without respect. It was to be a spiritual medicine for the priest, too, helping to remove his flaws and strengthening his bond with the Church. Priests are not glorified, although the author of *Expositio* sees their special role in celebrating sacraments. However, they are only God's tools. The importance of Johannes Marienwerder in the Prague circles was limited. In contrast, his opinions were of great significance in Kwidzyn (Marienwerder) and in the Pomesanian diocese. With respect to the Eucharist, it concerned not only the issue of the spiritual leadership for Dorothea of Montau (cf. Kowalczyk, 2018, p. 190–195). It may also have affected the care for the proper celebrating of the Eucharist in Pomesania and everywhere in Europe where *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum* by master Johannes Marienwerder was used.

Bibliography

Source

Jan z Kwidzyna, 2023, *Wykład Symbolu Apostolskiego Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, Latin-Polish version, translation in Polish language – Julian Wojtkowski; transliteration of original manuscripts – Julian Wojtkowski, Marian Borzyszkowski; scientific notes – Julian Wojtkowski,

Marian Borzyszkowski, Marek Karczewski, Katarzyna Parzych-Blakiewicz, Maria Piechocka-Kłós, Wydział Teologii Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski, Olsztyn.

Others

- Borzyszkowski Marian, 1968, *Problematyka filozoficzna i teologiczna w twórczości Jana z Kwidzyna (1343–1417) (cz. 1)*, Studia Warmińskie, vol. 5, p. 111–199.
- Borzyszkowski Marian, 1969, *Problematyka filozoficzna i teologiczna w twórczości Jana z Kwidzyna (1343–1417) (cz. 2)*, Studia Warmińskie, vol. 6, p. 85–171.
- Borzyszkowski Marian, 1974, *Jana z Kwidzyna Prolog do Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, Textus et Studia in historiam theologiae in Polonia excultae spectantia, II, 2, Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, Warszawa, p. 9–61.
- Brandauer Christine, 2008, *Die Artikel des heiligen christlichen Glaubens' in der Übersetzung des Jakob Lantzenperger (1432)*. Edition, Glossar und Untersuchungen, Diss. University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck.
- Bylina Stanisław, 1984, *Nowa dewocja, postawy wiernych i kult maryjny w Europie środkowej późnego średniowiecza*, Studia Claromontana, vol. 5, p. 110–126.
- Bylina Stanisław, 2001, *Nurty odnowy wewnętrznej a problem częstej komunii w Europie Środkowej w XIV–XV wieku*, in: Dariusz Zydorek (ed.), *Scriptura custos memoriae. Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana Brygidzie Kūrbis*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań, p. 91–102.
- Čornej Petr, 2016, *Homo politicus*, in: *Jan Hus: życie i dzieło w 600. rocznicę śmierci*, Anna Paner, Marcin Hinz (eds.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, p. 82–103.
- Dygo Marian, 2023, *Mulier fortis. Studia nad Prologiem w Vita Dorotheae Montoviensis Jana z Kwidzyna*, Wydawnictwo DiG, Warszawa.
- Erklärung der zwölf Artikel des christlichen Glaubens*, 1485, Dinckmut Karl (ed.), Ulm.
- Gajewski Wojciech, 2016, *Postulaty reformy Kościoła: Waldo-Wikłef – Jan Milič z Kroměříža – Matěj z Janova*, in: *Jan Hus: życie i dzieło w 600. rocznicę śmierci*, Anna Paner, Marcin Hinz (eds.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, p. 33–70.
- Glauert Mario, 2003, *Das Domkapitel von Pomesanien*, Prussia Sacra 1, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń.
- Górka Leonard, 2019, *Mistrz Jan Hus – słowiański prekursor Reformacji. Spór o prawdę?*, Nurt SVD, no. 1, p. 191–205.
- Hintz Marcin, 2016, *Jan Hus i Marcin Luter – kontynuacje i teologiczne uzupełnienia*, in: *Jan Hus: życie i dzieło w 600. rocznicę śmierci*, Anna Paner, Marcin Hinz (eds.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, p. 184–194.
- Iwańczak Wojciech, 2016, *Jan Hus na soborze w Konstancji*, in: *Jan Hus: życie i dzieło w 600. rocznicę śmierci*, Anna Paner, Marcin Hinz (eds.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, p. 113–121.
- Kaczmarek Lech, 1969, *Nauka Jana Wikłefa o tropicznej obecności Chrystusa Pana w Eucharystii*, Studia Theologica Varsaviensia, vol. 7/1, p. 55–89.
- Karczewski Marek, 2021a, *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum Jana z Kwidzyna jako źródło badań na średniowieczną teologią i egzegezą biblijną*, Studia Elbląskie, vol. 22, p. 329–346.
- Karczewski Marek, 2021b, *Pismo Święte i odwieczne Słowo Boga w Expositio Symboli Apostolorum Jana z Kwidzyna*, Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 287–304.
- Karczewski Marek, 2022a, *Biblical Sources of Ecclesiology in Expositio Symboli Apostolorum by Johannes Marienwerder*, Studia Warmińskie, vol. 59, p. 241–260.

- Karczewski Marek, 2022b, *Jedność Kościoła w Expositio Symboli Apostolorum Jana z Kwidzyna*, Studia Elbląskie, vol. 23, p. 173–186.
- Kowalczyk Marta, 2014, *Charakterystyka doświadczeń mistycznych bł. Doroty z Mątów na podstawie historycznych źródeł autorstwa Mistrza Jana z Kwidzyna*, Studia Warmińskie, vol. 51, p. 95–107.
- Kowalczyk Marta, 2018, *Bł. Dorota z Mątów*, Flos Carmeli, Poznań.
- Krzyżaniakowa Jadwiga, 1995, *Zmierzch średniowiecznej i narodziny nowożytnej Europy*, in: Franciszek Mincer (ed.), *Polska a świat zachodni na przełomie średniowiecza i nowożytności*, Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna, Zielona Góra
- Krzyżaniakowa Jadwiga, *Henryk Totting z Oyty i jego prascy uczniowie*, Roczniki Historyczne, vol. 61, p. 87–109.
- Mossman Stephen, 2010, *Dorothea von Montau and the Masters of Prague*, Oxford German Studies, vol. 9/2, s. 106–123.
- Müller Ulrich, 2008, *Dorothea von Montau: historische Gestalt und dichterische Gestaltung in Günter Grass „Der Butt“*, in: Jarosław Wenta, Siegelinde Hartmann, Gisela Vollmann-Profe (eds.), *Mittelalterliche Kultur und Literatur im Deutschordensstaat in Preussen: Leben und Nachleben*, Sacra Bella Septentrionalia 1, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń, p. 599–613.
- Nodl Martin, 2016, *Jan Hus a pražská univerzita*, in *Jan Hus: życie i dzieło w 600. rocznicę śmierci*, Anna Paner, Marcin Hinz (eds.), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, p. 71–81.
- Nowakowski Paweł F., 2016, *Cechy husyckich polemik religijnych. Zarys zagadnienia*, Studia Środkowoeuropejskie i Bałkanistyczne, vol. 24, p. 35–44.
- Paner Anna, 2002, *Jan Hus*, Wydawnictwo Apostolstwa Modlitwy, Kraków.
- Paner Anna, 2016, *Kryzys ideologiczny i polityczny w dobie panowania Wacława IV Luksemburskiego*, in: Anna Paner, Marcin Hinz (eds.), *Jan Hus: życie i dzieło w 600. rocznicę śmierci*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, Gdańsk, p. 13–32.
- Parcheniak Małgorzata, 2021, *Zmagania błogosławionej Doroty z Mątów Wielkich z oficjałem pomorskim diecezji włocławskiej Henrykiem z Kamienia*, Studia Włocławskie, vol. 23, p. 495–510.
- Paschovsky Alexander, 1979, *Quellen zur böhmischen Inquisition im 14. Jahrhundert*, Böhlau, Weimar.
- Piasecki Piotr, 2008, *Droga do zjednoczenia mistycznego z Bogiem u bł. Jana Taulera*, Studia Theologica Varasaviensia, vol. 46/2, p. 243–261
- Pietras Henryk, 1997, *Geneza Symbolu Apostolskiego*, in: Ryszard Knapiński (ed.), *Symbol apostołski w nauczaniu i sztuce Kościoła do Soboru Trydenckiego*, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, p. 63–76.
- Rozynkowski Waldemar, 2020, *Kult eucharystyczny w Zakonie Krzyżackim*, in: Justyna Liguz (ed.), *Studia z dziejów diecezji pomezkańskiej w 775 rocznicę jej utworzenia*, Bernardinum, Pelpin, p. 119–136.
- Starowieyski Marek, 1997, *Legenda o powstaniu Symbolu Apostolskiego*, in: Ryszard Knapiński (ed.), *Symbol apostołski w nauczaniu i sztuce Kościoła do Soboru Trydenckiego*, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, p. 51–62.
- Tourn Giorgio, 2003, *I valdesi: identità e storia*, Claudiana, Torino.
- Wiśniewski Jan, 1998, *Średniowieczne synody pomezkańskie. Dekanat Sztum (1601–1821)*, Bernardinum, Elbląg.
- Wojtkowski Julian, 2015, *Piotr Lombard. Cztery Księgi Sentencji*, vol. 2, Archidiecezja Wamińska, Olsztyn.
- Wojtkowski Julian, Borzyszkowski Marian, Karczewski Marek, Parzych-Blakiewicz Katarzyna, Piechocka-Kłós Maria (eds.), 2023, *Jan z Kwidzyna. Wykład Symbolu Apostolskiego Expositio*

- Symboli Apostolorum. Translation Julian Wojtkowski, Marian Borzyszkowski*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, Olsztyn.
- Zawadzki Wojciech, 2021, *Dzieje kościoła Bożego Ciała w Elblągu do roku 1945*, Studia Elbląskie, vol. 22, p. 21–32.
- Żurek Antoni, 2017, *Symbol wiary jako przedmiot Disciplina Arcani w Kościele starożytnym*, Vox Patrum, vol. 67, p. 789–800.

Websites

- Albertus Magnus (1193/1205–1280), *Compendium theologiae Veritatis* [online], access: 15.01.2023, <<https://archive.org/details/ita-bnc-in1-00000789-001>>.
- Decretum Gratiani* (1140), in: *Münchener Digitalisierungs Zentrum – Digitale Bibliothek* [online], access: 15.01.2023, <<https://geschichte.digitale-sammlungen.de/decretum-gratiani/online>>.
- Joannes Duns Scotus (1266-1308), *Quaestiones in quartum librum Sententiarum*, in: *Heidelberg historic literature – digitized* [online], access: 15.01.2023, <<https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/id00376000/0183/image.info>>.
- Theodorus Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus (602–709), *Poenitentiale*, in: *Documenta Catholica Omnia* [online], access: 15.01.2023, <http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_06040690__Theodorus_Cantuariensis_Archiepiscopus_Poenitentiale_MLT.pdf.htm>.
- Thomas Aquinas (1224/1225–1274), *Summa Theologica*, part III, in: *Aquinas 101. The Thomistic Institute* [online], access: <<https://aquinas101.thomisticinstitute.org/st-iiiia>>.
- Thomas Aquinas (1224/1225–1274), *Scriptum super Sententiarum*, in: *Corpus Thomisticum* [online], access: 15.01.2023, <<https://www.corpusthomicum.org/snp4008.html>>.

Sakrament Eucharystii według *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum* Jana z Kwidzyna

Streszczenie: Podstawowym źródłem badań jest główne dzieło Jana z Kwidzyna (1342–1417) *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum* (1399/1401). Temat Eucharystii jest interesujący z dwóch przyczyn. Po pierwsze, koniec XIV w. to czas, gdy wierni przejawiają różne postawy wobec tego sakramentu: pojawiają się liczne postulaty, aby pogłębiać pobożność eucharystyczną i jednocześnie wykształcają się postawy negujące realną obecność Chrystusa w Eucharystii. Po drugie: omówienie poglądów Jana z Kwidzyna dotyczących Eucharystii zawartych w *Expositio* może stanowić uzupełnienie opracowań dotyczących pobożności eucharystycznej bł. Doroty z Mątów. W artykule poruszono kilka zagadnień. W punkcie pierwszym zaprezentowano stan debaty na temat Eucharystii w środowisku praskim w II połowie XIV w. Pojawiały się tu postulaty częściej komunii św. W tym czasie istniały w Pradze prądy negujące katolicką naukę o Eucharystii. W punkcie drugim opracowania omówiono teologię Sakramentu Eucharystii zawartą w *Expositio*. Można ją określić jako formę apologii katolickiej nauki o Eucharystii. Ponadto, w *Prologu* do dzieła Jan z Kwidzyna zawarł wiele krótkich wskazówek praktycznych dotyczących głównie sprawowania mszy św. Należy wyrazić nadzieję, że treści zawarte w opracowaniu będą przydatne zarówno teologom, jak i innym badaczom zajmującym się środowiskiem literackim późnośredniowiecznej Pomezanii, ale także epoką przedhusycką.

Słowa kluczowe: Jan z Kwidzyna, *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, sakrament Eucharystii, sakramentologia średniowieczna.

