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Introduction

The drive to understand the cultural transmission of values in the modern world has been of primary importance to sociologists of religion as well as scholars of religious history. As the institutional churches of the contemporary United States have constantly grappled with the intersection of religious and societal values, tensions have emerged. My interest in the specific conflicts of the Episcopal Church (TEC) has been longstanding, and in attempting to understand the current friction of diverging groups I grew weary of the entrenchment of theological debate.

As a student of religious studies, I found a needed point of comparison in the Bohemian Reformation of the 15th and 16th centuries. Predating Luther’s own potent Reformation, the Bohemian Reformation served as an impetus to the Thirty Years’ War and ultimately culminated in the extension, albeit brief, of frequent and full communion to the laity of Bohemia. Recognizing the parallels of reform groups attempting to extend sacraments to marginalized groups within an institutional church, I developed the notion of sacramental exclusivity.

In discussing the historical parallels between the Bohemian Reformation and the current Episcopal schism, I understood both the Eucharist, the eating and drinking of bread and wine as symbols or manifestations of Christ’s body and blood, and ordination, the sanctifying of an individual for the priesthood, in the larger tradition of sacramental churches. Though baptism and the Eucharist remain the central sacraments, minor sacramental rites such as ordination, penance, and confirmation allow the churches of apostolic succession to delineate the boundaries of morality for their members. I posit
that in the restriction of the sacraments to certain individuals in the church, the larger church institution arbitrates the values of the religious community; sacramental exclusivity, then, is the exclusion from the sacraments of all individual members who do not meet institutional standards of morality.

From this interest in sacramental exclusivity, I decided upon a socio-historic exploration of the parallels between the two churches and instances of sacramental exclusivity. Thomas Luckmann, an early sociologist of religion and an opponent of secularization theories, addressed the state of religion in modern societies and, in his *The Invisible Religion*, unpacked the complicated relationship between modern secular societies and religious institutions. Using Luckmann’s theories regarding the historical development of religious institutions in society and the current interplay between the two, I have adopted his focus on individualism, environmental derivation and modernity as heuristic devices for exploring the sacramental exclusivity of the Bohemian Reformation and the current Episcopal schism.

Moving from the Bohemian Reformation to the Episcopal schism requires a dramatic shift in surrounding historical circumstances, applicable sacraments and even contextual churches. My use of both the Bohemian Reformation and the current Episcopal schism may seem unusual in the temporal disparity they display, but I contest that both of these periods of reform present pertinent inquiries into the efficacy of individualism in modern societies. The early Modernism of the Bohemian Reformation and the cultural revolution of the post-WWII United States share an increased attention to individual needs, and thus sketch an encompassing picture of the history of “the changing face of religion” in the West.
By using Luckmann’s theories, I will understand the ways in which modern societies and institutional churches negotiate value systems. In examining the individuality at the core of Luckmann’s assertions, I will evaluate the methods of sacramental exclusivity and place them in the context of their socio-historical narrative.

I aim to realign the debate that surrounds TEC by resettling the main questions in a new environment. Rather than engage in theological discourse on sources and interpretation, which has been thoroughly explored with only further entrenchment occurring, I will discuss the questions of schism and sacramental exclusivity in a historical and social context. Rather than something new and thus a break from tradition, I will argue that the current machinations of TEC reflect a common historical pattern of the institutional reflection of societal values. Just as the Bohemian Reformation challenged sacramental exclusivity supported by the Catholic hierarchy of the day, the current Episcopal Church allows for a questioning of the sacramental exclusivity that exists within the modern institutional churches.
Chapter One: Luckmann as Framework

Introduction

Thomas Luckmann’s work *The Invisible Religion* serves as his refutation of secularization theories, popular in 1967 when the monograph was first released and not yet erased from public conceptions. Though the focus of my research does not deal with secularization itself as a central point, the ways in which Luckmann defines and describes the religious processes of society will serve as a point of departure. Using Luckmann’s descriptive theories I will create a methodological frame of reference for the exploration of two specific case studies.

Luckmann in Prototype

Prior to the publication of his monograph Luckmann published several papers regarding his own revised sociology of religion, most specifically his negation of the popular theory of secularization. A most cohesive and clearly unique version of this, which is reflected heavily in his monograph, was published in 1962. He would later mention his previous work in the introduction of his monograph, and mentions this 1962 paper specifically as an impetus for *The Invisible Religion*:

In 1962 I read a paper on the problem of religion in modern society to the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. The paper was published in the Society’s Journal (2:12, 1963, pp. 147-162). Having undertaken to translate – or retranslate – the volume published by Rombach (*another version of the paper, “Notes on the Case of the Missing Religion”* – JCL) for American publication, I found myself rewriting it. Some sections were expanded, others reformulated, still others shortened.¹

The paper Luckmann mentions generally follows the chronology and arguments of *The Invisible Religion*, and includes only minor insights not found in the later monograph. The origination of some of Luckmann’s themes elucidated here may give an indication of his initial interest in the subject: he notes he “became concerned with the questions treated here in connection with research in parish sociology,” and later critiques this “parish sociology” as “leading to the collection of rather boring sociographic details on ecclesiastical institutions.”

This common theme of the inadequacy of previous “parish sociology” is later addressed in his monograph. Most importantly, however, his main themes and goals are preserved; he recounts the history of the self and religion, the varieties of religion historically, and the state of religion today. As Luckmann states:

> Modern religiosity is neither institutionally formed nor predefined in the world view as a coherent structure of sense. It originates and remains in the interstices of the social structure, in the widening private sphere, which it dramatically glorifies in a variety of themes. We might say that the new social form of religion is radically subjectivized religiosity.

**Luckmann Beginning and Diverging From the Secularization Thesis**

In his monograph, Luckmann’s primary interest in the modern individual leads him to question the methodology and conclusions previous sociological research has provided regarding trends in religious belief. Dissenting from the popular secularization thesis, he instead focuses on individuality manifest in religious preferences as the key for understanding the new ways in which religiosity is to be measured. For this reason Luckmann states that “a unifying perspective on the problem of individual existence in

---


society is to be found in the sociological theory of religion.”

Luckmann acknowledges his academic debt to both Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, in that “both...recognized what is presupposed in the present essay: that the problem of individual existence in society is a ‘religious’ problem.”

Luckmann, Weber and Durkheim all place the sociological question of the individual in a religious realm because “the relevance of sociology for contemporary man derives primarily from its search for an understanding of the fate of the person in the structure of modern society.”

However, both Weber and Durkheim ultimately put value in the theory of secularization, which posits that individuals are disassociating with traditional institutional religions and substituting a wholly secular world-view. Luckmann does not share this assumption, and his monograph is a direct refutation of the sociological work that has been done to support secularization. Rather than continuing the tradition of simply recording the declining number of congregants in Western Christian denominations, Luckmann argues that a new way of assessing sociological questions in religion must be found.

In my survey of modern sociological research, it appears that secularization has in general lost its domination of the field. Many still disagree with Luckmann’s particular articulation of what religion currently looks like, but his rejection of secularization seems to be widely accepted. In Rodney Stark’s article, “Secularization, R.I.P.,” he rejects the theory of secularization while simultaneously arguing that the “Age of Faith” never existed. According to Stark, this was a mythical rather than historical time. His paper focuses on historical data supporting this thesis, and does not reference Luckmann.

---

However, he ends with a statement somewhat similar to the place where Luckmann begins:

Let me emphasize that no one can prove that one day religion will not wither away. Perhaps the day will come when religion has been relegated to memory and museums. If so, however, this will not have been caused by modernization, and the demise of faith will bear no resemblance to the process postulated by the secularization doctrine.\(^8\)

Luckmann, it seems, would accept the second half of this statement, but would deal in none of the equivocal possibilities of the first half.

**Individuality, the Self, and Religion**

Luckmann begins by addressing the problematic notions of religion and self that had plagued sociological research in the years leading up to his monograph. Luckmann points out that religion and church have been theorized to be synonymous in previous sociological studies, as religion is supposedly “amenable to scientific analysis only to the extent that it becomes organized and institutionalized.”\(^9\) In looking merely at those religious institutions, sociologists have observed declining numbers and determined that “religion” is declining. Luckmann, then, wants to separate notions of religion and church, which when combined have resulted in “obviating methodological reflection on the special nature of the problem.”\(^10\) This assumption gives credence to any and all actions of the church as the sole possessors of religiosity in a given society, and necessitates that those who hope to partake in religion do so through the church. Though churches certainly contain aspects of religiosity, to assume the identical nature of the church and religion “accepts the self-interpretations – and the ideology – of religious

---

\(^8\) Stark, “Secularization, R.I.P.”, 269.
\(^9\) Luckmann, _The Invisible Religion_, 22.
\(^10\) Luckmann, _The Invisible Religion_, 24.
institutions as valid definitions of the range of their subject matter."\textsuperscript{11} This uncritical acceptance invalidates a large portion of previous religious-sociological research, in Luckmann's view, and subsequently invalidates the conclusion of secularization.

A Totality of Worldview: Diffusion of the Sacred Cosmos throughout the Social Structure

To begin his reformulation, Luckmann describes the original nature of religion in society before institutionalization. Luckmann acknowledges at this point the distinctive nature of Western religion, in its institutional forms, and the tendency for some to view it as "exceptional," a view that he does not share and will subsequently refute. The "exceptionality" which Luckmann refers to as erroneous is the view that Christianity, as an institutionalized form of religion, exists as a rare form of "true" religion, over and against the lesser "natural" forms of religion; Luckmann points out that these assumptions coincide with secularists’ assumptions that "religion" proper is declining and that this represents a "regression."\textsuperscript{12} In contrast, Luckmann goes on to describe the process by which humans acquire "symbolic universes" generally, regardless of institutionalized religious systems.\textsuperscript{13}

Luckmann states that concepts of self can only arise through human interaction. The individual consciousness alone, without outside contact, can never develop a detachment from the world if it is one and the same with the whole world. In this way, systems of "objective" reality are agreed upon by groups only after many individual "subjective" interpretations are compared and determined to be similar. This

\textsuperscript{11} Luckmann, The Invisible Religion, 26.
\textsuperscript{12} Luckmann, The Invisible Religion, 41.
\textsuperscript{13} Luckmann, The Invisible Religion, 44.
construction of reality, a specialization of Luckmann’s that he explores at length in other monographs\(^\text{14}\), results in the ability to achieve a “transcendence of biological nature by the human organism,” an early example of “a religious phenomenon” which “rests upon the functional relation of Self and society.”\(^\text{15}\) The interplay between the self and society is what creates religious experiences, according to Luckmann, humans cannot experience religiosity on their own. This functional relationship is of particular importance to Luckmann, who places religion within history only as far as it reflects exchanges of humanity. Religion, as he has asserted, should be divorced from the historical vicissitudes of the institutionalized church, but it can never be separated from the relationship between humans and their societies.

Luckmann goes on to describe the situation of religion in societies that pre-date institutionalized religion. In these “traditional” societies, he states, religion existed as a “sacred cosmos” inherent in the entirety of the social structure. Humans are born into world views, “a historical reality which precedes the individuation of any organism’s consciousness and conscience.”\(^\text{16}\) Humans that are born into these world views develop their Selves in relation to the pervasive world view, in a process of “socialization” which “consists in the internalization of the world view as an encompassing configuration of meaning.”\(^\text{17}\) This means that the entirety of the world view, coherent in its fullness and presenting a unified picture of being, is accepted by the individual. In these “traditional” societies, religion exists as a part of that world view, not institutionalized in a church, and represents a commonly held sub-conscious conviction. This is described by Luckmann


\(^{15}\) Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion*, 49.

\(^{16}\) Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion*, 52.

\(^{17}\) Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion*, 53.
as the “sacred cosmos,” which “forms part of the objective social reality without requiring a distinct and specialized institutional basis.”  

Institutional Specialization of Religion

The sacred cosmos exists primarily in societies that are, as Luckmann states, “relatively ‘simple’ societies.” As societies develop “complex” institutions and differing social strata, a new form of religion arises. Luckmann defines the environment for the emergence of such institutionalization as “a concurrence of circumstances that is historically unique”; it appears that he means to describe the situation of Western civilization and the rise of Christianity, which has shaped the world he lives in and has proven to be a reckoning force. In any event, this change from merely a sacred cosmos to an institutionalized form of religion involves the specialization of knowledge, specifically the emergence of a priestly class and the stratification of religiosity that follows. Luckmann explains that “with increasing specialization of religious roles laymen come to participate less and less directly in the sacred cosmos. Only the religious experts are in ‘full’ possession of sacred knowledge.”

The institutionalization of religion coincides with the institutionalization of other aspects of society, which can lead to a disconnection. However, the mechanisms of institutionalization are able to deal with incongruities in that they have the authority to declare what will be congruent; heresies are heresies because they are declared to be outside of the church. In a society defined by the institutionalization of religion such

---

power can be used to legitimate existing circumstances or become “a dynamic social force.”

This opportunity reflects the essential truth of an institutionalized religion’s ability to create congruities, either by adapting the church to fit the outside world or the world to fit the church.

A New Form of Religion

Luckmann draws distinctions between the sacred cosmoses of “traditional” and modern societies. While traditional societies were intertwined with the dominant religion to form a wholly coherent worldview, the simple facts of a pluralistic society prevent the same from occurring in the modern world. We are no longer dominated by a singular political force or a worldview entirely centralized on our homeland; indeed, many of us have adopted new homelands which, in turn, create unending instances of pluralism. With multiple versions of a sacred cosmos thriving within a separate secular society, it is not possible to meld any version of the sacred cosmos together accurately with the outside society. When a sacred cosmos is applied to the outer secular society, areas of agreement and disagreement are observable. In this disparity cognitive dissonance arises in the individual, who can no longer solve problems of human fatalism by partaking of a neatly packaged and wholly coherent sacred cosmos. In a sacred cosmos inconsistent with the outside world, individuals must either retract into a “naïve” position of ignoring the disconnection or assert their individual identity to separate, evaluate, and discard certain aspects of their sacred cosmos or secular society. This leads to a necessarily eclectic version of religiosity: “The ‘autonomous’ consumer selects, instead, certain

---

religious themes from the available assortments and builds them into a somewhat precarious private system of ‘ultimate’ significance.”

Luckmann clearly asserts that this is not an example of a circular pattern; the individualization of religion is not akin to the previous diffusion of the sacred cosmos found in traditional societies. Though he describes several examples of what may be classified popular psychology of self-help phenomena in the current culture, he asserts that these instances of private religiosity depend upon personal consumption and thus will not end up institutionalized in the manner of, for instance, the Medieval Catholic Church. He asserts that “we are not merely describing an interregnum between the extinction of one ‘official’ model and the appearance of a new one, but, rather, that we are observing the emergence of a new social form of religion characterized neither by diffusion of the sacred cosmos through the social structure nor by institutional specialization of religion.” These models will be highly personalized and generally piecemeal, resulting in a dramatically reduced number of *au sérieux* internalizations. Luckmann posits that without the supporting structure of an institutionalized church these “autonomous” sacred cosmoses will be inherently less stable, but infinitely more flexible. Additionally, without the justifying forces of an institutionalized church, individuals will find support in others who construct an autonomous sacred cosmos, such as friends and family. Those with similar sacred cosmoses will naturally group together and practice the ideals that they share. However, the highly personalized nature of these sacred cosmoses will continually make the institutionalization of any one sacred cosmos nearly impossible.25

This new way of engaging in religion, as Luckmann states, “is a radically subjective form

---

of ‘religiosity’ that is characterized by a weakly coherent and nonobligatory sacred cosmos and by a low degree of ‘transcendence’ in comparison to traditional modes of religion.”

Modern Religiosity and the Individual

Luckmann, in assessing the religious “themes” which are promulgated in his modern society, specifies that the churches which previously enjoyed the ability to “transmit” a whole sacred cosmos can no longer do so in a pluralistic society and therefore are relegated to status as a “secondary institution.” These institutional yet secondary sources of “‘ultimate meaning’” are forced to reconfigure their message to “compete” with other secondary sources, such as Playboy or communism. In modern societies, religious institutions are most likely assimilating aspects of other secondary sources, due to the porous nature of religion in general and the desperate search for ultimate meaning in particular. Luckmann recognizes that the themes of traditional churches may be influenced and changing, because “to the extent that Christian rhetoric survives it provides a vocabulary that may hide newly emerging themes.” Though this subtle metamorphosis makes the articulation of “religious themes” somewhat perilous, Luckmann endeavors to do so.

The first theme which he identifies, the emergence of “something like a sacred status upon the individual by articulating his ‘autonomy’,” further asserts the trends of religious individuality. His explication, moreover, links this theme of modern

---

religiosity with the goal with which he began the book; in finding the roots of the sociology of religion, that is, modern man’s search for significance. As Luckmann writes:

The theme of individual ‘autonomy’ found many different expressions. Since the ‘inner man’ is, in effect, an undefinable [sic] entity, its presumed discovery involves a lifelong quest. The individual who is to find a source of ‘ultimate’ significance in the subjective dimension of his biography embarks upon a process of self-realization and self-expression that is, perhaps, not continuous – since it is immersed in the recurrent routines of everyday life – but certainly interminable.\textsuperscript{30}

He later defines “self-expression and self-realization” as separate topics which inform the creation of individualistic religious beliefs. His further themes of mobility, sexual expression, and familism (his own word) explore this central theme of autonomy.\textsuperscript{31}

Luckmann sees each as possible “cornerstones in the construction of subjective systems of ‘ultimate’ significance,” with the secondary Christian or separately-sourced ideologies as satellites to one of these central tenets.\textsuperscript{32}

\textbf{The Significance of Invisible Religion}

Luckmann ends his monograph by stating forcefully the significance that he sees in the trend of religious individualization. Though he refrains from making unequivocal value statements, he repeatedly poses the question “Is this good or bad?”\textsuperscript{33} He acknowledges that the institutional churches have ceased to be the principal modes of religious self-expression in modern society, and points out that “this removes from the primary institutions much of the (potentially intolerant) human pathos that proved to be

\textsuperscript{30} Luckmann, \textit{The Invisible Religion}, 110.
\textsuperscript{31} Luckmann, \textit{The Invisible Religion}, 110-113.
\textsuperscript{32} Luckmann, \textit{The Invisible Religion}, 113.
\textsuperscript{33} Luckmann, \textit{The Invisible Religion}, 117.
fateful all too often in human history.” However, the receding of religiosity into the “private sphere” has its own dangers, namely apathy towards the secular world as well as an increased disengagement from other institutionalized forms of society. In general, these dangers center on the dissemination of values and a lack of coherence in secular societies. With either a multiplicity of beliefs or a detachment from a secularity that does not fit with secondary religious institutions, the role of religion as a cohesive force in society is lost. Luckmann writes that “by bestowing a sacred quality upon the increasing subjectivity of human existence it supports not only the secularization but also what we call the dehumanization of the social structure.”

Critiques of Luckmann’s Invisible Religion

Andrew J. Weigert’s critique of Luckmann attacks the methodology of Luckmann’s arguments, though in the end he does not negate the possibility that Luckmann’s “definition could legitimately refer to values, and [that] investigators may then study the themes, location, and hierarchy of values.” Thus, “in this way we may perhaps speak of invisible values, but not of invisible religion”; Weigert seems to reject Luckmann’s equivalence of secondary sources of meaning in the modern world and religion as functional terms. However, his major contention lies in Luckmann’s definitions of religion as both a world view and an individual consciousness or identity, and consequently presents a “functional ipsative definition.” This type of definition “is one in which the specificity, substantive content, and label for a social phenomenon are

---

predicated on the basis of a function identified and categorized by the investigator.”

This gives Luckmann, according to Wiegert, the ability to categorize religion as he sees fit, regardless of whether those involved in the actions he categorizes as religion define their proclivities as religion themselves. This inconsistency goes against Luckmann’s own theories of social reality, Wiegert states, as “the logical application of Luckmann’s model would seem to contradict the definition of socially constructed reality as objectivated and realized knowledge which he espoused with Berger.” This criticism is leveled as decisive by the end of Wiegert’s article, as he states that the natural conclusion of accepting his criticisms against Luckmann is to accept that “such issues as secularization and comparative studies of religion [could] re-emerge more clearly as empirical historical questions.” This criticism, however, is extraneous for the purposes of my research. All individuals and groups I will be studying self-identify as belonging to a religion.

Luckmann’s Later Reflections on Invisible Religion

Luckmann’s analysis of the place of religion in both modern life and society clearly predominated as one of the themes of his academic research. He later addressed similar themes, building on his previous work and adding levels of theory and evidence. His 1990 paper, “Shrinking Transcendence, Expanding Religion?” clearly elucidates this topic in his work. The paper itself reiterates its debt to the whole of his own thought, as he states that “there will be no radical departure from my previous thinking in this presentation” as well as acknowledges that “a very early publication treating this subject

---

38 Wiegert, “Whose Invisible Religion?”, 185
is my *Invisible Religion*, New York, 1967." However, though much of the arguments reaffirm his previous assertions, the major difference found in this paper is the added paradigm of the "span of transcendence." Seeking, presumably, to more clearly describe aspects of religiosity in society, Luckmann divides religious (and non-religious) activity into the "experiences of the ‘little’ spatial and temporal transcendences of everyday life, the ‘intermediate’ transcendences of fellow human beings, and the ‘great’ transcendences of life and death." These various transcendences are "only transcendent with respect to something that is ‘immanent’," that is, they gain their meaning from their deviation from daily life. Luckmann introduces these categories at the beginning of his paper, proceeds to lay out his arguments in similar terms as he did in his previous paper and monograph, and then returns to the significance of "transcendence" at the end. Though he previously argued for the centrality of the individual in modern life, and certainly continues to do so here, he combines the notion of autonomy with the new paradigm of transcendences, evaluating the many secondary forms of religion in terms of ‘little’, ‘intermediate’ and ‘great’ transcendences. The effect is a tempering of his previous assertions. The ‘great’ transcendences of previous incarnations of religion are no longer found in the modern economy of myriad secondary religions:

The products convey a set of meanings (and, occasionally, techniques) referring to minimal, to ‘intermediate’, and, rarely, to ‘great’ transcendences. The set can be ‘bought’ and kept for a shorter or longer period. It can be individually combined with elements from other sets. Of course, the sets are not obligatory models fully analogous to the ritual, ethical and doctrinal models characteristic of older social forms of religion.

---

Additionally, this newfound descriptive tool of transcendence allows Luckmann to identify two particular cases which do and do not embrace this economically-termed “syncretism.” The New Age movement embraces a host of what Luckmann would call religious aspects and then “offers them for individual consumption and further private assembly.”44 Conversely, fundamentalism is “diametrically opposed to bricolage” and is instead “characterized by the search for a new ‘wholeness.’”45 Luckmann does not see this counter-example as a threat, however, and asserts that “‘privatized syncretism’ rather than the fundamentalist options seems to have a better chance to become established as a social form of religion.”46 He ends his paper with a last defense of his theory against claims of secularization: “The shrinking of transcendence thus does not mean a loss of the ‘sacred.’”47 This does seem to be at the heart of Luckmann’s aims, and perhaps with good reason.

One additional paper, on “Moral Communication” and published in 2002, echoes Luckmann’s earlier work on religion but takes his concepts in a new direction. This aspect of his work is of only minor importance to my research. Luckmann here asserts that he assumes “there is a universal human source of morality” much in the same way he found a universal source of religion in the autonomy of the modern age. Additionally, “it is to be found in a constitutive feature of human intersubjectivity, the reciprocity of perspectives.”48 This claim echoes Luckmann’s theories on the origins of religiosity, arising in the interactions between individuals and growing based on subjective agreement on the nature of reality. Another parallel with his argument for non-

45 Luckmann, “Shrinking Transcendence”, 137.
46 Luckmann, “Shrinking Transcendence”, 137.
secularization is found in his general position in the argument, that is, against the “main sociological theories” which posit that “morality has largely disappeared from the social structure of modern societies.” Though this current morality “may not be the kind of morality which traditional moral authorities might have liked us to have,” he asserts that “it is a reasonably coherent view of the good life nonetheless.” These equivalencies give an indication of Luckmann’s attitude toward the established view on the society of religion in general, and his goals in re-establishing a more useful framework with which to move forward.

A Framework for Moving Forward

I plan to utilize Luckmann’s description of religious developments within society and his final assertion of the autonomy of the individual in modern religion. These will be heuristic devices for gaining new ground in the examination of two ecclesiastic controversies: the Bohemian Reformation and, more centrally, the current machinations of schism within The Episcopal Church (TEC). In order to accurately and succinctly operate within Luckmann’s framework, I have developed contours on which to place the historical evidence gathered from these two periods:

(1) the degree to which the situations can be perceived as modern, and thus applicable to Luckmann’s modern model.

(2) the degree to which the situations can be perceived as derivative of their environments, and thus applicable to Luckmann’s assertions regarding the necessary interconnectivity of human religiosity and society.

---

(3) the degree to which the situations can be perceived as indicating individualistic concerns, and thus applicable to Luckmann’s primary interest in autonomy.
Chapter Two: The Bohemian Reformation

Introduction

The Bohemian Reformation, an encompassing term which includes events and people spanning the 13\textsuperscript{th} to the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, was a temporal if not causal theological precursor to the Protestant Reformation. Regardless of its direct link to the Protestant Reformation, the era of reform which it began seems to coincide with a gradual awakening of the individual consciousness in the European world. The possible connection between the start of the reform era and the origin of the individualistic worldview, which will be explored in this chapter, reflects Luckmann’s theories regarding the cycle of religious institutions in the modern world and the role of religion in societies marked by individualistic thought.

In evaluating the Bohemian Reformation as the start of this early modern individualistic period, I will evaluate Luckmann’s usefulness as a template for understanding the process of expanding sacramental rights.

John Wyclif

The origin of many of the ideas which would fuel the Bohemian Reformation is found in the writings of Oxford scholar John Wyclif. Born in the first quarter of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, Wyclif firmly dissented from the Roman Catholic Church, denounced the power of the papacy and asserted claims of individual lay pietistic importance.

Wyclif, living and writing during the Great Schism as three possible papal successors asserted their claims, considered this period of tumult to be fated by God with the purpose of ridiculing the office of the papacy: “‘Blessed be the God of Truth who has
ordained this dissension, that the truth of this belief might shine forth!’”50 The pope was the central figure of what Wyclif considered a broken system, one which presumed to know the will of God and claimed its manifestation on earth. Rather than a visible Church which was corrupted by man in the insistence of its purity, Wyclif pushed the impossibility of knowing who precisely makes up the church, other than the unknowable-to-all-but-God “predestined.” This concept led to his reformulation of the Church as the “the congregation of these predestined to salvation – past, present, and future,” a claim which he asserted was possible to know “approximately” through the study of behavior.51 Though the problem of judging behavior was one which carried over from his dissension from the Roman Catholic Church, he certainly knew many behaviors which were not “godly”; the practice of simony, the selling of indulgences, and the lavish life of many clerical servants. These more concrete claims against the church were echoed by later reformers, and reflect the immediate problems Wyclif and his followers had with the Church during their lifetime. Still, his earthly grievances against the Church were manifested in his abstract theological goal for a redeemed Church: “The Body of Christ is the ‘totality of the predestined’ or simply all of the elect. The true church is universal and invisible; it is a spiritual reality that is more real than its visible expression.”52

This new spiritual reality which Wyclif envisioned was concerned with the lay as well as the ordained. This “claim to recognition of lay piety and spirituality” was a somewhat new idea in the Medieval Roman Catholic Church, which had long built up the

---

hierarchy that reformers now maligned.\textsuperscript{53} This intersection of the spiritual and the secular, Howard Kaminsky argues, was growing more closely intertwined, and this immersion of the two spheres necessitated the acknowledgment of lay spirituality. As Kaminsky writes:

> Usually accepted as a matter of course in the high Middle Ages, this scheme could not survive intact into the later centuries, when the laity and, indeed, the whole secular sphere had absorbed much of the spiritual. Thus Wyclif could argue that the two powers, though distinguishable, were not separate, for every Christian, cleric or lay, had spiritual power, as the means of sanctifying himself, while every secular activity had a spiritual significance, determined according to the Law of Christ – the Bible – which was the all-sufficient norm for all of human life.\textsuperscript{54}

This explanation for the increased attention to individual lay piety argues opposite Luckmann’s assertion; rather than the spiritual and the secular spheres separating, Kaminsky sees them converging. Both Luckmann and Kaminsky see an increased attention to individual piety in the face of the hierarchical and institutional Church, but they disagree as to the social-spiritual condition which initiated such a move. This deviation from Luckmann’s theory must be investigated for legitimacy and implications.

Yet the promotion of individualist lay piety, regardless of secular-spiritual conditions, resulted in a destabilizing of the hierarchical church and the society in which it was intertwined. Though not entirely attributable to Wyclif, and occurring after his death, increased discontent in England at this time led to an upsurge of mob violence which culminated in the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Wyclif, for his role in the threats against the Roman Catholic Church, was condemned at the same Council of Constance in 1415 that condemned Hus; but Wyclif, dead since 1384, found his bones burned posthumously.

\textsuperscript{53} Kaminsky, History, 31.
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Wyclif’s Ideas Coming to Prague

The transfer of Wyclifite ideas to Prague occurred naturally given the political connections between Bohemia and England. As the seat and center of the Holy Roman Empire following Charles IV’s ascension to the throne in 1316, Prague had been transformed into a major intellectual capital. Charles established his university, known alternately as Prague University, Charles University, or Univerzita Karlova, in 1348 and helped to elevate it: “In 1367, not quite twenty years after its foundation, a statute was issued, by which bachelors were allowed to lecture only in agreement with the discourses of well-known Parisian and Oxford professors; only doctors and masters were allowed to lecture at their own discretion.” This connection with established centers of learning helped ensure the prominence of Charles University, but also guaranteed the Reformation which was to come: “In the University of Prague many of Wycliffe’s views found their home where they were suppressed in England, and from Prague they spread in Central and Eastern Europe.”55 The creation of Charles University in the center of the Holy Roman Empire brought the attention of Europe to several reformers who, before Hus began the fight of the Bohemian Reformation in earnest, brought key theological issues to light. I will evaluate the sacramental and liturgical concerns of Milič of Kroměříž and Matej of Janov in terms of sacramental exclusivity, and I will finish with the legacy of Jan Hus and Jakoubek of Stribo. Using these reformers’ ideas in light of Luckmann’s work, I will discern the place of the Bohemian Reformation in terms of its applicable modernity, environmental derivation, and individualism.

Arguing for the Time

The Bohemian Reformation as a concrete set of historical events is often considered to span the period from 1420 to 1620; that is, from the beginning of the Hussite wars to the final Battle of White Mountain, or Bila Hora. This approach assumes an interest primarily in military history, as the period of violence neatly encapsulates the period of reform. However, in my desire to understand the forces of reform, this period is of less use than the years directly preceding it. The first Hussite wars resulted in the drafting of the Four Articles of Prague, a culmination of moderate Hussite and Utraquist theological goals; yet the more radical theology that pervaded during the earlier years of Charles IV’s reign presents a more lucid picture of the conditions leading to reform.

In investigating the aspects of modernity, environmental derivation, and individualism present in the theological set-up to the Bohemian Reformation, I have chosen to begin with the reign of Charles IV in 1355 and to end with the Prague Articles of 1420. This pre-Reformation period will allow me to fully investigate four actors who shaped the theology of the Bohemian experiment: Jan Milič of Kroměříž, Matej of Janov, Jan Hus and Jakoubek of Stríbo. The end date of 1420 will abbreviate my treatment of Stríbo, but the militaristic escapades of the years after 1420 do not inform my examination of sacramental exclusivity save for the display of passion which accompanied these theological goals.

Lastly, my exploration of the Bohemian Reformation must open with the acknowledgement that this time of reform and struggle has long been considered merely an experiment. The Battle of Bila Hora concluded with the subjugation of the Bohemian
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forces by outside Catholic forces, and the aftermath included the deaths of many leaders of reform and a complete routing of reformed policies after a full two centuries of accepted pluralism within the Bohemian lands. Though this failure has lead the Bohemian Reformation to be regarded as merely a precursor to the Protestant Reformation, I will argue that the struggle for frequent Eucharist under both kinds displays a unique insistence on the extension of sacramental rights in the early modern era of the Western world.

Jan Milič of Kroměříž

Jan Milič of Kroměříž, known by some as the father of the Bohemian Reformation, emerged out of the bureaucratic religious offices of the Holy Roman Empire as a formidable figure in the Roman Catholic Church. In the 1360s, four decades before Hus but as a contemporary of Wyclif, Milič of Kroměříž resigned from his posts as “a canon of Prague’s cathedral and former member of Emperor Charles IV’s chancery”; these positions, appointed by the Emperor, were paid for through the acquiring of benefices, or income through the custodial care of a church. Though most benefices were occupied by elites who had no intentions of providing any services to the parish or parishes from which they received sizeable sums of money, Milič’s connection to St. Vitus cathedral in Prague motivated him to leave the royal service and genuinely work in the Church.

Though this move from “secular to religious life” was not uncommon, Milič chose to embark on a homiletic career rather than enter a monastic order: “Milič began to

58 Kaminsky, History, 9.
preach publicly, regularly crisscrossing the city to deliver sermons in Czech, German and Latin.”59 The use of Czech and German, which allowed the laity to fully understand the power of his damning sermons, “created a sensation” as he “harshly criticized the moral life of the clergy.”60 Milič was concerned by the sins and errors of the Church and endeavored to eradicate them with an apocalyptic fervor, focusing specifically on the figure of the Antichrist and the practice of frequent communion.61

For Milič, as for many on the verge of the early modern period, the increasing chaos which governed religious and secular interactions was the result of a separation that had not occurred before:

The late-medieval mind, oppressed by the sense that the old order was breaking up, escaping from any control by religious and moral norms that still claimed validity, often expressed its conviction of total crisis in apocalyptic terms, chiefly the imagery associated with the figure of the Antichrist.62

This assertion by Kaminsky reinforces Luckmann’s theory on the process of the diverging social and sacred cosmoses, and places Milič, Wyclif, and forthcoming reformers on the cusp on a new social paradigm which would require a reevaluation of the role of religious rites. Luckmann described that “the sacred cosmos forms part of the objective social reality without requiring a distinct and specialized institutional basis”,63 as the sacred cosmos separates in the modern world view, “specialized religious institutions” are extracted from secular authority and then must create encompassing systems of meaning for adherents. Milič’ obsession with the Antichrist, which he identified in 1366 as Charles IV, reflects this break in the social and sacred spheres.

60 Atwood, *Always Reforming*, 46.
Where once heads of state identified fully with the institutionalized Church, now they were singled out as a force of evil; though Milič was quickly silenced in his claims against the Emperor, the division still remains an indication of the coming separation of religious and secular spheres.

With an apocalyptic certainty, Milič also began a unique foray into the salvation of souls. As his preaching and message spread in Prague he “attracted a band of preachers who joined him in his poor life” while he also drew to himself “increasing numbers of the laity.”64 Concerned with the immorality of all Christians, Milič’s movement blended Apocalypticism with calls for clerical and social reform. In this spirit Milič established a communal house, called “Jerusalem,” which housed a large number of reformed and reforming prostitutes; he was given this space by Charles IV himself in 1372, as its previous incarnation as a brothel, called “Venice,” was less pleasing to the Emperor than the possibility of a radical Christian community. The literal space of his community grew, he was given properties around him as he expanded his ministry: “By this time the preacher seems to have developed a vision for his new religious community. Former prostitutes were to become religious women. Milič purchased 27 nearby properties with donated money and christened the impressive complex ‘Jerusalem’, a reflection of his continuing eschatological views.”65

Jerusalem, unsurprisingly, created uproar in Prague, and the nature of the liturgical community did not improve its reputation. Milič continued to emphasize the need for individual piety, supported by preaching in the vulgate and the frequent gift of communion. This pattern of individual pietism reflects an acknowledgement of the

64 Kaminsky, History, 12.
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individual as a worthy soul able to discern spiritual truths. Rather than accept the translated sermons of Latin or the infrequent communion of past years, individuals were assumed able to process and appreciate these spiritual teachings and rituals on a personal level.

The frequent communion that Milič supported at this time was not, however, a communion under both kinds; in understanding the arc of historical attitude toward frequent and full communion, a brief explanation of pre-Miličian conditions will help to illuminate the coming importance of the restoration of the chalice.

Jan Hus’s early biographer, Ezra Hall Gillett, traces the theological justifications for the Eucharist of bread alone. The restriction of the cup in the Eucharistic feast had found plausibility in the belief, attributed early on to Thomas Aquinas, that “the body and blood of our Lord are found in each”,66 that is, both the bread and the wine, which in some theologies represent the body and blood of Christ respectively, contain the substances of both body and blood regardless of what the outer accidents of bread and wine may imply. This distinction by Aquinas may have been motivated by a practicality in distributing wine to the masses, as Gillett notes that Saint Bonaventure further “advises the withholding of the cup from the laity.”67 The Bohemian Catholic churches at the time of Milič were acting on the assumption that “the church had the right to make or adopt such changes in the sacraments as she deemed fitting.”68 The church itself, rightly or wrongly, endowed these decisions with a spiritual certainty; the mere act of repeating a decision over time, and turning it into a tradition, gave it solidarity in the face of reformers’ cries for change. This emphasis on tradition governed a large aspect of single

67 Gillett, The Life and Times, 85.
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species and infrequent Eucharist, though some instances of full Eucharist kept the ritual alive for reformers, as “Charles IV, and Blanca his wife, at their coronation in 1347, had been allowed to partake of the communion in both kinds.”\textsuperscript{69} This exceptional instance, however, may only serve to highlight the inequality that laity faced at this time.

For Milič, however, frequent communion of bread alone was enough to impart the feverish tenor of necessary moral life as the \textit{eschaton} approached. The extension of frequent communion to his community of dozens if not hundreds of reformed prostitutes and radical preachers was no small act: “And then there was his heretical and dangerous teaching, most notably his demand for frequent communion by the laity and the condemnation of priests who derived income from rents or who merely possessed private property.” Milič’s many controversial teachings, including the assertion that he had “achieved much more and converted many more than Christ himself,”\textsuperscript{70} rebutted the authority of the Church in matters of individual piety and stressed the necessity of “daily, or at least twice a week Eucharist.” His character may have placed the restoration of the cup on a radical plane, one that would not gain favor with the ruling authorities while its major proponent argued there existed “no truth” among any of the Catholic hierarchy.\textsuperscript{71} Milič certainly found no favor among his fellow Prague clergymen, as he delighted in calling out their various excesses.

**Matej of Janov**

If Milič popularized the idea of frequent communion among the lay populace, his disciple, Matej of Janov, brought the idea to the theological academy. Matej studied at
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the University of Paris from 1373 until 1381, eventually earning the title “master Parisiensis.” Matej met Milič in 1372, before his time in academia, but carried his Miličian ideas with him to Paris and back. His contributions to the period are repeatedly characterized as an academic justification for the populism of Milič, and as such his major work, *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti* or *The Rules of the Old and New Testament*, is considered one of the founding treatises of the Reformation movement.

Matej’s concern for frequent communion includes all Christians, as he asserts that “the sacrament must be received frequently by the laity, including both women and those living in the married state”; this insistence on communion for all in the Christian community “resound[s] frequently and loudly throughout the entire structure of his *Regulae* so that it can be regarded as the principal thesis of his work.” This belief in the extension of the sacrament of the Eucharist to all was a central aspect of Matej’s work, and he echoed the sentiment in his career as a preacher in Prague. However, this vocal assertion resulted in a forced retraction after Matej was summoned in 1389 before the Prague Synod.

Yet just two years later, in 1391, the Synod “permitted lay people to receive the sacrament of the altar as often as it was appropriate to their perceived spiritual needs.” This turnaround, attributed to the legend of an archbishop’s deathbed recovery following the healing power of the Eucharist, is all the more radical considering the “background of the current practice in fifteenth-century Bohemia of annual communion at Easter as

---

72 Odlozilik, “Wycliffe’s Influence”, 637.
provided by canon 21 of Lateran IV.\textsuperscript{76} This insistence on individual spiritual
discernment highlights the decisive move towards individual piety that emerged within
Bohemia; the decision of the Prague synod gave the defined geographic area a new
paradigm regarding the frequency of Eucharist. Yet this decision also highlights the
nearness of the goals of the Church and the reformers, and demonstrates the range of
dissension that was available within the Roman Catholic Church.

In view of Luckmann’s theory, the gradual adaptation of frequent communion
represents an emphasis on individuality which may be considered derivative of the
external desire for reform. Further reform efforts came to fruition in the establishment of
the Bethlehem Chapel in 1391, which promoted the vulgate preaching of Matej and
others in their constant labor towards a true transformation of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{77} It is
into this tradition of evocative preaching in Prague reform communities that Jan Hus
would come to represent the beginning of the period truly known as the Bohemian
Reformation.

\textbf{Jan Hus}

Jan Hus, who united the eponymous Hussite movement most compellingly after
his death in 1415, began his career in the same Bethlehem Chapel that resulted, albeit
indirectly, from the theological forerunners of Milič and Matej. Though the figure of Hus
has been tied into the later quest toward the restoration of the chalice, the majority of his
work and writings ignore the question of full communion for the laity; it was only until
his end days in a German ecclesiastic prison that he adopted the cause of a full Eucharist

\textsuperscript{77} Kaminsky, \textit{History}, 23.
for the entire Christian community. In this sense he can be thought of as straddling the
two major sacramental rights issues of the Bohemian Reformation, and providing, in his
death, the impetus toward revolution that would carry the Bohemian region into two
hundred years of religious reform and military upheaval.

Hus began his theological career with training in Prague, graduating in 1396 as a
master of arts and in 1400 as an ordained priest; by 1402 he was preaching in Bethlehem
Chapel.\(^78\) His studies and subsequent employment at Charles University brought him
into contact with Wyclifite ideas, from which Hus borrowed extensively as he wrote his
most influential and inflammatory indictments of the Church. His involvement in radical
reform coincided with the general sentiment of contemporary Bohemian scholars, though
not with scholars from other areas of Europe.

Before the decree of Kutna Hora in 1409, Charles University was divided, for the
purposes of teaching and governance, into four “nations.” These nations each received
one vote to cast in matters of academic and bureaucratic importance, and the votes were
divided ethnically: one vote for the Czech nation, one for the Bavarian, one for the
Polish, and one for the Saxon. In the early struggles against Wyclifian ideas at the
university, Dvornik notes that the non-Czech nations were “under the lead of the German
members of the university”;\(^79\) this undoubtedly lead to conflict as the Wyclifite Czechs
grew more and more determined in their defense of the “twenty-four articles” outlined in
Wyclif’s works, which the non-Czech nations considered heresy. These three nations
succeeded in eliminating Wyclifite ideas from the university in 1403, but in 1409, after
King Wenceslas saw the political expediency of eliminating oppositional extra-nationals

\(^{78}\) Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1962),
189.

while navigating the possibility of two papal options, he granted the Czech nations three votes and eliminated the votes of the international nations. This transformation of the political, academic and theological environment is considered a major event in the international stature of Prague and its university; for the purpose of this investigation, however, it simply illuminates the increasingly closed theological system in which Hus and his contemporaries were operating.

Out of this closed system it is easier to understand the willingness with which Hus eventually traveled to Constance, Germany, to defend his Wyclifian accusations against the Church. Trusting in the safe passage that was granted to him by King Sigismund of Germany, he traveled to the Council of Constance “hoping rather naively that he would be able to defend his teachings in public hearings in the presence of conciliar fathers.” His imprisonment upon arrival, then, should have warned him of the mood of the council, but he continued in his “expectation that he would be allowed to expound his views and be convinced of errors only by quotations from Holy Writ.” His oratorical skills were of no use in Constance, and he was eventually sentenced to death and burned at the stake on July 6, 1415.

*Jan Hus and the Cup*

While the death of Jan Hus served as a potent impetus for the reformers of Prague, his writings while imprisoned in Constance provide more insight into his sacramental beliefs. In general, these letters to friends and theological associates show no strong desire for the extension of the full sacrament of Eucharist to the laity; rather, he
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treats the restoration of the chalice as the natural progression of radical activities, imbued with power as a result of their reformed nature and not due to the necessity of wine in the full sacramental Eucharist.

The first mention of the sacramental cup in Hus’s letters comes in Letter 18, one of many letters written home to his “benefactors” regarding his status in Constance. He counsels these benefactors on ways to live a Christian life, especially in regard to the tumultuous circumstances surrounding papal and church authority at the time:

You know of what description are these spiritual princes who call themselves the true vicars of Christ and his Apostles, who proclaim themselves the Holy Church, and the very Sacred Council that is infallible; and which, nevertheless, transgressed in adoring John XXIII, and in calling him most holy, when they knew him to be a manslayer, impure, a simonist, and a heretic, as they have declared him to be in the sentence that condemns him.83

This disdain for the Council’s decisions comes through as Hus describes their handling of his case, in which the conciliar fathers “erred several times in erroneously rejecting some articles from my books.”84 The failure of the Council to recognize Hus’s supposed truths confirms that “Jesus Christ, the infallible judge, will not sanction all that has been done and said at this Council.”85

Having established the Council’s errors, Hus takes over as the moral leader once again. He cautions his benefactors “to avoid bad priests, and to love good ones, according to their works.”86 The Council has shown itself to produce bad works, in its previous adoration of John XXIII and current ignorance of Hus’s truth, and so Hus feels comfortable in condemning their views on the Eucharistic cup as well. Hus laments, with
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a sardonic pity for the confused Council and wider Church, the “madness” of rejecting “the example of Jesus Christ himself, of his apostles, and of the other saints, in condemning the Communion of the Cup of our Lord, instituted for all adult believers.”

With the knowledge that growing contingents of Bohemian priests are practicing Eucharist under both kinds, he subtly links their actions with his own situation at Constance: “And if a priest presents them this Cup to drink of, he is reputed in fault, and, should he persist, is condemned as a heretic!”

In linking his own “heretical” activities with what would become revolutionary and reformative activities back in Prague, Hus asserts control and leadership over an extension of sacramental rights that he had not previously championed; he sets up followers with a schismatic zeal, proclaiming that “already the custom of the Romish Church opposes the accomplishment of thy Word!”

That Hus would later be associated with a sacramental movement that he advocated only in his later months is unsurprising given the 18th letter’s fervor. More than that, however, subsequent letters show the power Hus had in persuading the populace, even in this aspect of reforming sacramental activities in which he had previously shown little interest. Though Hus seems, in Letter 18, to be positioning himself in alignment with the more radical priests still in Prague, Letter 26, from Jan Chlum to Hus, overtly displays the popular sway Hus enjoyed. Jan Chlum candidly petitions Hus: “We pray you earnestly to consign to paper your final opinion relative to the cup, and your reasons therefor [sic], in order that it may be communicated to our friends in proper season; for there exists some difference of opinion on the subject amongst the brethren, and many are troubled thereby. They refer the matter to you and
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your writings." This request confirms that Hus’s opinion of the extension of the Eucharistic cup was not well known in Prague, and it simultaneously solidifies Hus’s dominant position in evaluating and justifying theological points of reform.

In his reply, however, Hus apparently feels no need to elaborate on previous writings: “As to what touches the communion of the cup, you possess the writing in which I have advanced my opinion on the subject, and my reasons for holding it. I have nothing farther to say, except that the Scripture and the Epistles of Paul prescribe this practice, and that it was in use in the primitive Church.” From an examination of this book of letters, the formerly discussed Letter 18 could very likely be the previous writings that Hus assumes sufficient; no other letters mention the cup.

Yet this apparent assertion of Hus’s support still retains the operative aspect of this theological claim; Hus wants the cup extended if it is possible, and it if will aid in the overall reform goals. “If possible, obtain permission for those who are anxious to partake of it from religious motives, to do so; but be guided in your conduct therein by circumstances,” far from a revolutionary cry, this pragmatic approach speaks to the utility Hus saw in full communion as a possible addendum to reform. His meaning, obscured by both a measured practicality and what is noted as an unclear translation, still communicates a conditional approach to full communion.

Finally in Letter 39, in the final mention of the Eucharistic cup in Hus’s letters from prison, Hus exhorts a Lord Haulikon to “not oppose the administering of the Cup, it
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being a sacrament of Jesus Christ and his disciples.”

This short letter, focused solely on urging Haulikon toward full communion, again expresses Hus’s expedient interest in the extension of the sacrament. He acknowledges the truth of the cup had been forgotten: “No text of Scripture is opposed to it, but only custom; and I think that this was established only through negligence and forgetfulness.” Hardly a radical fervor, but Hus goes on to warn Haulikon that he must “prepare...to suffer for the Communion of the Cup.”

Alluding to his own imprisonment and impending death at Constance, as the editor notes, he wrote this letter “in irons.” Hus again connects the Eucharistic cup to his own theological reform when it serves to create a common narrative of suffering at the hands of an ill-governed Church.

This brief letter expresses a final request of Haulikon: “not to attack Master Jacoubel, that there may not be any division amongst the faithful, and that Satan may not find a new subject for joy.” Referring to Hus’s contemporary, Jakoubek of Stříbo, this appeal displays the connection between the martyred Hus and his successor. Even from a distant Constance jail, Hus’s final correspondences effectively passed on the mantle of the reform movement to Jakoubek, a more radical figure and a more definite supporter of Eucharist under both kinds. Though Hus’s relationship toward the sacrament of the cup was marked by the efficacy of the theology, the resulting Hussite movement focused on the Cup with a fervor supported by Jakoubek of Stříbo.
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Jakoubek of Střibo

Before continuing with the narrative of reform, a short definition of terms seems applicable: Utraquists were those who supported Eucharist *sub utraque species*, “under both species/kinds,” and insisted on the lay reception of both bread and wine; Hussites were those disciples of Hus following his death in 1415 who incorporated Utraquism to a degree in their wider reform of the Church. However, the two terms are used interchangeably in some earlier sources, as Hussitism had a pejorative connotation in particular milieus; it linked the movement to the martyred, and thus disgraced, Hus. Somewhat less often “Calixtine” is used, as a reference, again, to the cup. Utraquism, as a noun, specifically refers to the celebration of mass using both species, and is sometimes used to refer to acts outside of the Utraquists’ historical period. For the purposes of this thesis, I will be using “Utraquist” to refer to those reformers gathering under the guidance of Jakoubek; he stressed the importance of full communion, and the sacraments remain my central focus in the wider picture of the Bohemian Reformation.

When, in 1415, Jakoubek of Střibo assumed leadership of the burgeoning reform movement following Hus’s death99, he had already begun his public work in favor of the Eucharist under both species. As is quoted by Kaminsky and attributed to “the Prague town secretary, Master Laurence of Březová”: “In the year 1414 the venerable and most divine Eucharistic communion in both kinds – that is, of bread and wine – to be given to the faithful laity, was begun in the noble and glorious city of Prague by that venerable and outstanding man, Master Jakoubek of Střibo, Bachelor of Holy Theology, and by some others helping him in this matter.”100 Jakoubek’s interest in full communion

remains somewhat obscured, but despite competing theories regarding the origin of his Utraquism the more pertinent fact remains that he is largely credited with Hus’s late in life conversion to the Utraquist cause.\textsuperscript{101}

That this movement toward Utraquism would be yoked with Hus’s larger ideas of reform in the Church is not surprising, given the apostolic tradition of Eucharist in the last supper, but multiple sources comment on its subsequent dominance. The Hussite movement came to be symbolized by the chalice, and thus by the cause of Utraquism; this was despite Hus’s lack of enthusiasm, and “even when he agreed to it in a letter written from Constance, he regarded it only as useful for the increase of piety, but never as necessary for salvation.”\textsuperscript{102} Similarly, as Jakoubek and the cup evolved into powerful iconography, Kaminsky notes that “it seems at first something of an anticlimax that the radicals who rejected the claims of the Roman ecclesiastical institution on so broad a front of doctrine, emotion, and action should have encapsulated their secession in the theory and practice of Utraquism – giving communion to the laity in both kinds, bread and wine.”\textsuperscript{103}

This question of the efficacy of sacramental rights in relation to larger reform goals is significant, especially for historians attempting to understand the course of the events of the Bohemian Reformation. From a sociological standpoint, however, the preeminence of the cup, even to the detriment of more practical goals such as “free preaching of the Word of God, secular dominion over church property, and the extirpation of public sins,”\textsuperscript{104} coincides with the movement for frequent communion in
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the years leading up to open revolt. Emphasizing the cup above all else, the central symbol of the Eucharist allowed for a cohesion within the movement. This arch of sacramental rights emerges as a dominant theme in the Bohemian Reformation, a theme which gained importance precisely because of the symbolic nature of the sacraments.

Rather than focus on the divergent and complicated questions of the interaction between the deviating spheres of church and state, the ingestion of the sacraments remained of immediate consequence to the laity of Bohemia. Though the reformers who had been positioning the Bohemian church for reform over the past centuries presumably had encompassing notions for that reform, the theme of the extension of sacramental rights remained a central aspect of the call for reform because of the power these sacraments had to distill the many meanings of reform into a single liturgical action. As quoted by Kaminsky and attributed to modern scholar Vlastimil Kybal:

Nevertheless, it is impossible not to recognize an organic and developmental connection between the two symbols of the Bohemian religious movement in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. What frequent communion was to the followers of John Milič in the fourteenth century, the chalice was to the Hussites and utraquists [sic] of the fifteenth. Both symbols accurately characterize the religious nature of their times.\(^{105}\)

This encompassing view of the sacramental theme goes further in its assertion, and echoes Luckmann in the contention that individual-centric religious movements are derivative of their external environments. As Luckmann argued for a modern religious landscape which negotiated with the external environment, the succession of first frequent and then full communion suggests a building up of external support for internal reforms. The recognition of frequent and full communion as two stages of one sacramental process is the first step, and gives a very linear example of the steady
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extension of sacramental rights. The further recognition of the symbolic role of the expanding sacraments as liturgical stand-ins for individualism pushes the exploration of the Bohemian Reformation into line with Luckmann, and continues to evidence the proliferation of individualistic religious movements as the early Modern period dawned in Western culture.

Utraquists and Taborites

From Hus’s death in 1415 to the first violent skirmishes of the Bohemian revolt in 1420, this focus on the cup as a symbol for all of Hussitism/Utraquism reflected the emergence of another, larger theological divide. Some, including Jakoubek, were willing to work within the system for a more modest reform and full communion; other, more radical elements were prepared to move outside the Church both geographically and theologically.\(^{106}\) This divide, between mostly Prague-dwelling Utraquists and mostly rural Taborites, further evidences the importance of the external environment, as the day-to-day experience of these two groups allowed for the radical difference in the means of reform. Kaminsky notes that “more militant radicals in Prague were unwilling to give up their gains or their freedom to propagate their ideas, while the radicals in the provinces, often unable to enter their parish churches unless they renounced utraquism [sic], were virtually forced to resist.”\(^{107}\) The Taborites moved, eventually, to their own utopian community in the hills outside of Prague, and there conducted reform external to the Church.
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The radical Taborites are of much interest for the bloody military history of hard-
earned reform that lasted until 1620, but the force of their utraquism pales when
compared to their many apostolic reforms; the full intrigue of their story is not for this
narrative. However, the turbulent interplay of religious and secular forces would not
allow for a strict separation between the Utraquists and Taborites. In a “crusade against
heretical Bohemia” organized by King Sigismund, Holy Roman Emperor, the coalition of
Utraquists and Taborites lead by Taborite general Jan Žižka defeated the advancing
armies and established a strong base of support within Bohemia in 1420. Though the
Taborites would remain radical outliers, the two groups came together to author the Four
Articles of Prague, a “famous charter of the Hussite faith.”

This document, which
would hold in some form until the 1620 Battle of Bíla Hora, illuminates the moderate
goals of wider reform, as well as the sustaining importance of the restoration of the
chalice.

The Four Articles of Prague

The Four Articles, or Prague Articles, united the Taborites and Utraquists in their
moderation:

The first article proclaimed that the Word of God should be freely preached by
priests in the kingdom. The second stressed the dispensation of Holy Communion
in both kinds. The third attacked the earthly possessions of priests and monks,
who were urged to live model lives. The fourth demanded that all mortal sins,
especially those committed publicly, should be punished by competent
authorities.

This paraphrase of the material by Francis Dvornik is useful in its brevity, but
Kaminsky’s rendering of the articles retains some of the language of opposition.
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Kaminsky’s translation begins three of the four articles with “we stand,” an affirmation of the tenuous but influential union of the two groups. Additionally, the nationalistic character of this reformation is evident in Kaminsky’s translation, as the exhortation against public sins retains its immediate geographic intensity: “and for the cleansing of the Bohemian realm and nation from false and evil slander; and in this connection, for the common good of our land.”\textsuperscript{110} The Utraquist article is listed first in Kaminsky, and cites both the apostolic heritage, important to the Taborites, and the precedence of Catholic orthodoxy, important to the Utraquists: “We stand for the ministering of the body and blood of the Lord to the laity in both kinds, for…this was Christ’s institution and…that of the first apostles and of the holy Primitive Church…, as the Council of Constance admitted to us.”\textsuperscript{111} This dual nature acknowledges the primacy of the Eucharistic sacrament for both groups, even as one actively pushed towards the contemporary realization of a “Primitive Church” while the other remained content with utraquism alone.

The final victory of full and frequent communion as it remained in Bohemia for 200 years reflects a long tradition of sacramental extension as a necessary aspect to reform. As this reform emerged in response to external motivators of individualism, the sacramental response reflected that individualism and widened the sphere of sacramental rights for the laity.

\textsuperscript{110} Kaminsky, \textit{History}, 369.
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Chapter Three: The Episcopal Schism

Introduction

Though the current Episcopal Church in the United States is removed from the Catholic Church of the 15th and 16th centuries, it operates within a worldwide Anglican Communion under the guidance, but not the binding authority, of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Episcopal Church’s historic episcopate, a continuing lineage of bishops ordaining bishops which could ostensibly be traced back to the early church, further ties together the two periods of reform. As a “church claiming the historic episcopate”\(^{112}\), the Episcopal Church echoes the claims of Catholicism and evidences the premium adherents place on the sacraments.

Though the Catholic Church in 15th and 16th century Bohemia and the Episcopal Church in 20th century America differ greatly, their universal use of the sacraments ties them to a common value system. Regardless of what values they affirm, the use of the sacraments is an evaluative system for designating norms and ethics. My treatment of the Bohemian Reformation focused on the sacrament of the Eucharist, but in looking at the current Episcopal schism I will be evaluating sacramental inclusion based on the sacrament of ordination. The Episcopal Church identifies two “great sacraments given by Christ to his Church...Holy Baptism and Holy Communion”\(^{113}\) yet “other sacramental rites which evolved in the Church include confirmation, ordination, holy matrimony, reconciliation of a penitent, and unction.”\(^{114}\) These five minor sacraments


\(^{114}\) *The Book of Common Prayer*, 860.
differ from the others in that they “are not necessary for all persons in the same way that Baptism and the Eucharist are.”\textsuperscript{115} The ordination of minority groups within the Church, while certainly defining the discourse of the past fifty years, also represents the contemporary frontier of sacramental inclusion. All baptized Episcopalians take part in the Eucharist; not all baptized Episcopalians, in the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century, could be ordained into the priesthood.

The current schismatic activities occurring within The Episcopal Church (TEC) derive primarily and most recently from the ordination of Bishop Gene Robinson in 2003. However, Bishop Robinson’s ordination was made possible by the groundbreaking extension of sacramental rights that evolved out of the reformation period beginning in the 1960s. In this section, I will examine the extension of the sacrament of ordination to both female and homosexual Episcopalians, attempting to evaluate the degree to which modernity, environmental derivation and individualism have permeated the reform process. As we have seen in the Bohemian Reformation, the use of Luckmann’s theory as a heuristic device will help discern patterns of transmitted values.

\underline{History of the Women’s Ordination Movement}

The women’ ordination movement emerged in the 1960’s with debate within TEC over the role of women within the church. Reports about this time repeatedly allude to outside cultural forces as the impetus for such reform: “The social ferment of the 1960s, however, made the question of women’s equality more urgent”;\textsuperscript{116} “Within the United

\textsuperscript{115} The Book of Common Prayer, 860.
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States, the women’s movement had been gaining strength since the early 1960s”, 117 “It was Betty Friedan and the National Organization for Women that changed the Episcopal Church.” 118 These external cultural motivators reacted forcefully with members of TEC who had been attempting to gain seating for lay female deputies at the triennial legislative body of TEC, General Convention (GC), since the immediate postwar period. 119 As these attempts at inclusion failed over a period of 21 years, women gained the right to influence the national legislative body of TEC only in 1970, four years before women’s ordination would take place.

The inclusion of women in the lay House of Deputies at GC transpired amidst general arguments against gender inequality. “The truth of the matter is that men and women are equally loyal communicants of the church and the practice of segregation by sex is no more admirable than that of segregation by race or color,” asserts the president of the House of Deputies in 1964; 120 tying the struggle for gender equality to the cotemporaneous struggle for civil rights exhibits the inextricably linked societal nature of these movements, a bold move that Luckmann’s theory anticipates.

Luckmann’s Invisible Religion is especially valuable to note at this juncture, as this is presumably the same world out of which his theory was crafted in the years preceding its 1967 publication. His descriptions of increasingly unrelated secular and sacred spheres seem to be both affirmed and negated in understanding the early women’s ordination movement. Separate spheres, yes, in that TEC operates autonomously, outside
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of government interference in a way that does not compare with the conditions of the
Bohemian Reformation; but yet the sacred sphere is undeniably affected by the secular
world, influenced by the external culture. Luckmann uses this language to refer to the
first, more historical approach to understanding the intersection of religious and secular
worlds. Yet his assertion of increasing religious individualism, with elements chosen out
of the surrounding culture, seems to necessarily borrow from the second notion.

However, here it may be necessary to reiterate Luckmann’s assertions regarding
individualism and sacred/secular spheres; individualization is a process, according to
Luckmann, that emerges out of the separation of the spheres and does not reflect a
circular pattern of returning to an integrated sacred/secular cosmos. The new
individualization of religion, displayed in the early women’s ordination movement in its
overt ties to wider secular movements, does not represent an overlapping of spheres or a
regression to a previous sacred cosmos. Instead, the inclusion of theological justification
by way of cultural rights movements indicates a disparate body from which to take
inspiration.

Despite the seating of women at GC, a simultaneous contention for ordained
recognition was needed in the struggle toward women’s ordination. Within TEC, men
were ordained to the priesthood through a two-step process. First, an ordination into the
diaconate; an end in itself, many adherents with full-time jobs chose to take on this
increased responsibility. Secondly, ordination into the priesthood, which occurs only after
the first ordination as well as further examination by “appropriate committees and
boards.”121 Being barred from full ordination, women had also been barred from the full
diaconate. Though deaconesses had existed in TEC beginning in the 19th century, they
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were not equivalent to male deacons, a “first level of ordained ministry, still reserved exclusively for men.”

Beginning in 1964 and struggling through until 1970, proponents of women’s ordination fought to legitimize the vocation of deaconess fully, without equivocations or denigrations to the nature of the office. With the acceptance of deaconesses as something like full members of the diaconal priesthood, the natural progression toward women obtaining the right to full ordination became the dominant narrative.

As the acceptance of women as deacons in the GC of 1970 had not conceded the second ordination, the issue of women’s ordination emerged again at the GC of 1973. Though the overall quantity of the vote came through in favor, the technicalities of the GC voting rules resulted in the failure of the legislation: “Although a majority of both clerical and lay deputies approved the motion, it was defeated because of parliamentary rules that counted divided votes from diocesan delegations as negative votes.”

In the wake of this decision, plans arose among some of the female diaconate “to develop a strategy for gaining ordination without the approval of the General Convention.” This consisted, in its most basic form, in obtaining the proper ritual of vows and laying on of hands by a willing bishop, so as to continue the “historic episcopate” and force the national church to recognize this sacramental right as asserted by female Episcopalians.

Though the canons of the church are binding, the women’s ordination movement eventually found the requisite three bishops needed to complete the ordination service;
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Daniel Corrigan, Robert DeWitt, and Edward R. Welles II. Known as the “Philadelphia 11,” 11 women were ordained to the full priesthood of TEC on July 29, 1974. Though many bishops had expressed support, and one had even attempted an ordination previously, the Episcopal tradition of recognition and respect for the legality of communal decisions had proved dominant among the bishopric. After the ordination, an “emergency meeting” of the House of Bishops nullified the ordination of the Philadelphia 11, instead asking “Episcopalians not to recognize the 11 women as priests until the next General Convention could decide on their ecclesiastical status.” This contrasts with a previous vote in favor of the “principle” of women’s ordination, and only further exhibits the sovereignty of unified decision making within the value system of the TEC.

Those who stood with the reformers, however, rejected such legalistic concerns and again employed civil rights analogies in speaking about the importance of acting on women’s ordination: “‘As blacks refused to participate in their own oppression by going to the back of the bus in 1955 in Montgomery, women are refusing to cooperate in their own oppression by remaining on the periphery of full participation in the Church in 1974 in Philadelphia.’” One of the Philadelphia 11, Betty Scheiss, echoed this sentiment in her memoir: “Bishop Barbara Harris, the first black woman bishop in the Episcopal Church (in fact, the first woman bishop), once graciously said that those women ordained after us are kneeling in gratitude to us. If that is so, it is also true that those of us ordained in 1974 and 1975 are drowning in gratitude to blacks.” Though proponents
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of women’s ordination used religious language to describe motivations in their pursuit of expanded sacramental rights, the simultaneous use of civil rights language and motivation seems to indicate that non-religious cultural movements profoundly impacted the reform abilities of religious institutions.

Wider sociological studies of movements for ecclesiastical gender equality support this contention. In an examination of women’s ordination conflicts pre- and post-1970, Mark Chaves and James Cavendish argue that the external environment of 1970s America played a vital role in the success of post-1970 movements. Arguing essentially that “women’s ordination conflicts are very responsive to cultural and social developments outside of denominations,”¹³⁰ they note specifically the increased extra-institutional locality of the core of these movements after 1970. Using the Episcopal Church as an early example, they identify the pre-1970 movement as “requests for gender equality” by the internal group Episcopal Church Women and label them as “largely ineffectual”.¹³¹ These early assertions represent the same traditional respect for communal decision making, and are acted on by what they call “denominational elites.” The post-1970 movement, however, “had grown out of the secular women’s movement,” and “the push for women’s ordination to the priesthood thus came from women other than those involved in the ECW.”¹³²

These declarations clearly place the effective locus of the women’s ordination movement outside of the church. Derivative of their external environment, the women’s ordination movement in the 1960s and 1970s in TEC represents an individualism which
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¹³² Chaves and Cavendish, “Recent Changes”, 577.
was evaluated by marginalized members to be more worthy than that of the common Church teaching. This aspect of the reforming pattern, which always persists, seems especially lucid in the case of the Episcopal Church. With a complex and canonically binding national legislature, the will of the religious community can be accurately evaluated and subsequently put in place. When the goals of individuals contrast with the stated opinions of the institution, however, the assertions of Luckmann come into play; these members, even within an institutionalized church, choose obedience based on individualistic preferences.

The “irregular” or uncanonical ordination of the Philadelphia 11 displayed an increased value placed on the importance of individual sacramental rights, even (or especially) when those individuals make up an under- or unrepresented minority of the larger group. In the aftermath of these “irregular” and unauthorized ordinations, the national Church found it necessary to confront the issue at the next GC. In 1976, “both houses voted to recognize (effective on January 1, 1977) the eligibility of women to serve in all three orders of ordained ministry – the diaconate, the priesthood, and the episcopate.”\(^{133}\) This official extension of the sacramental right of ordination to women demonstrated a clear victory for the proponents of the women’s ordination movement; yet even in the institutionalization of one set of minority sacramental rights a new minority emerged. Those bishops, and by extension dioceses, opposed to female clergy members remained able to abstain from ordaining women: a “conscience clause has allowed bishops to refuse to ordain women if they so choose.”\(^{134}\) This preservation of individual rights displays even more fully the individualization of the Church; with the acquisition

\(^{133}\) Hein, *The Episcopalians*, 142.

\(^{134}\) Holmes, *A Brief History*, 168.
of rights for some minority members, other minority members are protected in their dissent.

Minority Rights and Women in the Clergy

The ability to straddle an extension of sacramental rights to one minority group while acknowledging the rights of another dissenting minority may characterize the modern Episcopal schismatic struggle. In the case of women’s ordination, the ensuing struggle for acceptance illuminated divisions within the church which would continue to fester as further extensions of sacramental rights arose.

In direct response to the actions of the 1976 General Convention, those Episcopalians who disagreed with the ordination of women, originally called “The Fellowship of Concerned Churchmen,” gathered in St. Louis in September of 1977 and resolved, among other things, to emerge as a splinter group known as the “Anglican Church of North America” (ACNA). Rejecting what they regarded as “unlawful attempts to alter Faith, Order and Morality,” ACNA explicated its beliefs in the Affirmation of St. Louis. Though the historian Sumner cites a source that acknowledges “anger came from a hundred different directions,” the ordination of women as a flashpoint suggests that it was the extension of sacramental rights to a new, nontraditional and potentially unbiblical group that allowed other critiques to emerge.

In asserting a separate legitimacy, ACNA in many ways asserts the individualism of the modern period: the structural church does not bind, only the individuals (and constituent beliefs) do. Overall, the ability of the Episcopal denomination to allow
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separating factions points to a belief in religious agency. Though the theological beliefs of the movement are important, what remains more important from a sociological standpoint is the ability of minority members to form a dissent from within, members perceive an ability to separate, a value in their own individual judgment of theological beliefs against ecclesiastical reality. It is important to recognize that both the proponents of women’s ordination and the members of ACNA want to claim the continued heritage of the Episcopal Church; the Affirmation asserts that “We do nothing new. We form no new body, but continue as Anglicans and Episcopalians.”

In this origin of schismatic activities, desire to continue to align orthodoxy with individually-discerned belief systems places this type of schism in line with the reformers of Bohemia. Individuals in both movements sought to continue to be associated with the Church while simultaneously changing the Church to conform to the externally-motivated and individually-justified beliefs of the reformers. The sacramental rights for which these reformers fought were most powerfully applicable within the Church, and these reformers valued their places within the Church.

In order to reform from within, these actors are using Luckmann’s assertion of increased individualism and influence from societal secondary sources without also losing their designation as participants in an institutional church. This nuance, which would benefit from further study, suggests that Luckmann’s emphasis on individuation from external modern environments, while accurate, does not yet fully account for the willingness of these groups to remain within the previously defined structural church.
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History of the Gay Ordination Movement

The desire of reform groups to continue to align with an institutionalized church, which perhaps presents an aberration for Luckmann, remains commonplace in the modern history of the Episcopal Church. In the context of the historical push for the ordination of openly gay men and women in the Episcopal clergy, it should be noted that gay men must always have been ordained in the historic Episcopal Church. The modern extension of the sacrament of ordination to previously unrecognized or unapproved groups exists as a further statement of individual theological and political beliefs regarding the sacramental rights of minority groups.

Both women’s ordination and homosexual ordination reflect changing Episcopal assumptions about the role of gender and the morality of sexuality; even when gay men served as Episcopal priests previously, they did so while living either chastely or discreetly. As male heterosexual clergy were allowed to marry in the Episcopal Church, the celibacy of priests was not the issue. In opening up the sacrament of ordination, the Episcopal Church effectively opened up the conversation on gender and sexual mores – a conversation occurring in wider society.

The influence of the wider gay rights movement of the 1970s “challenged all the traditional assumptions about homosexuality being sinful and contrary to Christian norms.” The 1976 General Convention affirmed the positive role of homosexuals in the Christian community, considerably distancing themselves from the idea of sin: “it is the sense of this General Convention that homosexual persons are children of God who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and pastoral
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concern and care of the Church.” This confirmation was coupled with an officially sanctioned inquiry into the open ordaining of homosexual clergy, a call to “study in depth the matter of ordination of homosexual persons,” which could then be addressed at the next triennial gathering.  

Resolutions passed at General Convention reflected a widespread awareness of the contested role of homosexual persons in the church. The group Integrity, which now operates under the motto “working for the full inclusion of all the baptized in all the sacraments,” emerged in 1974 under the leadership of Dr. Louis Crew. Holding a first national convention in August of 1975, they advocated for the open and acknowledged inclusion of homosexual persons in the life of the church. Not two months later one of the co-presidents of Integrity, Ellen Barrett, received ordination to the diaconate; this transitional ordination, which led to a full ordination in 1977, was blessed by the Bishop of the Diocese of New York, Paul Moore, who “did not believe that her sexual orientation alone was sufficient to bar her from the ordained ministry.” Recognizing her sexuality as a part of individuality reflects Luckmann’s concepts; opponents of homosexual ordination view non-heterosexual sexuality as an invalidation of an individual’s right to the sacrament of ordination.

The 1979 General Convention agreed with opponents of homosexual ordination and effectively halted the ordination of openly homosexual persons to the priesthood. The guidelines requested in the 1976 Convention were returned; although they
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acknowledged that “there should be no barrier to the ordination of qualified persons of either heterosexual or homosexual orientation whose behavior the Church considers wholesome,” the standards of wholesome behavior for homosexual persons required, essentially, celibacy. In affirming “marriage, marital fidelity and sexual chastity” as traditional values of the church, the General Convention asserted that “it is not appropriate for this Church to ordain a practicing homosexual, or any person who is engaged in heterosexual relations outside of marriage.”

This act of the convention effectively ended the push for open ordination of homosexual persons as approved on a national level, though the debate still simmered. Resolutions emerged throughout the 1980s upholding a commitment to the civil rights of homosexuals, for instance, or attempted to revisit issues of human sexuality. In 1991, a resolution was passed which affirmed:

Physical sexual expression is appropriate only within the lifelong monogamous ‘union of husband and wife in heart, body and mind’ intended by God for their mutual joy; for the help and comfort given one another in prosperity and adversity and, when it is God’s will, for the procreation of children and their nurture in the knowledge and love of the Lord’, as set forth in the book of common prayer.

Though aimed at all Episcopal communicants, this standard of behavior was evidently intended or received as a barrier against those who would enter the priesthood. Another resolution, perhaps a responding resolution, failed; it attempted to give an equivalent level of marital commitment to homosexuals and thus allow them both an approved sexuality and the opportunity to the priesthood. The text does not remain in the Blue Book of actions at the 70th General Convention, as it did not pass, but the abstract reads,
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“The 70th General Convention rejects the resolution encouraging the deployment of monogamous homosexual priests within limitations.”

Though the national church did not give approval to the ordination of openly homosexual persons, some bishops still exercised their conscience and ordained homosexual candidates. Bishop John Shelby Spong of the Diocese of Newark ordained Robert Williams in 1989, but removed him from the post after Williams “ridicul[ed] gays living in monogamous relationships, calling them traitors to the gay liberation movement.” In his autobiography, Bishop Spong writes that:

The very basis upon which the Commission on Ministry and the standing committee had endorsed his application for ordination was that he could model a committed monogamous relationship as an alternative to promiscuity, on one side, and to mandatory celibacy, one the other. On no other basis would we have been willing to support his ministry.

Spong, in attempting to present an equivalent to marriage in order to give validity to homosexual ordination, reflects the movement to continue to extend the sacramental right of ordination to homosexual persons while still allowing them the sexual expression of their heterosexual counterparts. This push for sacramental rights, like women’s ordination before it, seeks to recognize a wider view of individuality in modernity. As Luckmann identified the dominance of the individual in religious agency in the modern world, the Episcopal Church in the second half of the 20th century acknowledges that agency by expanding the definition of valid individuals to contain multiple expressions of sexuality.
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Further ordinations of homosexual persons by individual bishops were maintained following the heresy trial of Barry Stopfle, another homosexual man ordained in the Diocese of Newark. In the resulting opinion, which did not find him guilty of heresy, the ecclesiastical court “drew a distinction between ‘core doctrines’…and mere ‘doctrinal teachings’ that change over time, such as the church’s views on social issues.” In effect acknowledging the ability of environments to change the context and thus the application of religious value judgments, the court “ruled…that Righter [asst. Bishop of Newark] had not violated any core doctrine of Christianity when he ordained Stopfle.”

Giving Bishops the authority to judge these “doctrinal teachings” within their own dioceses, this ruling essentially laid down a precedent for the 2003 election of V. Gene Robinson to the historic episcopate in New Hampshire. The election of Gene Robinson, covered thoroughly by the press and acting as a flashpoint for yet another look at the unspoken divisions within the Episcopal Church, presents the life of an individual as the focal point for an institutional church’s struggle with individualization and sacramental rights.

Overall, the movement for the ordination of women and homosexuals within the Episcopal Church displays a high level of environmental derivation and individualistic concerns, and emerges in a newly and particularly modern era for the United States. In the divisions that have emerged within TEC, the proponents of expanding the sacrament of ordination have incorporated the individualistic ethos of a changing America. Yet the opponents of these measures have inherited a similar understanding of a powerful individualism, and TEC continues to attempt to balance differing moral judgments within
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a single institutional Church. As the validity of individual moral and religious agency remain constant and supported by the external environment, the individualism that TEC displays reinforces Luckmann’s theory in the modernity, external derivation, and individualism that prevail.
Chapter Four: Synthesis and Conclusion

Institutionalized Churches and Luckmann

In evaluating the heuristic use of Luckmann’s theory on both the expanding Eucharist of the Bohemian Reformation and the expanding priesthood of the current Episcopal Church, I will first address my use of two institutionalized churches as historical examples. Luckmann’s emphasis on the emerging importance of secondary sources of meaning-making for individuals in some ways devalues the institutional church:

First, we may view church religiosity as a survival of a traditional social form of religion (that is, institutional specialization) on the periphery of modern industrial societies. Second, we may view church religiosity as one of the many manifestations of an emerging, institutionally nonspecialized social form of religion, the difference being that it still occupies a special place among the other manifestations because of its historical connections to the traditional Christian ‘official’ model. ¹⁵¹

Luckmann places institutionalized churches on the same level as all other sources of meaning in modern American society, and the loss of primacy would certainly be contested by adherents. Luckmann does not shy away from the possible shock of this assertion: “Despite obvious differences in the public ‘image’, and, less obviously, the economic basis of, for example, Methodism and Playboy magazine, the surviving forms of institutionally specialized religion have taken on the characteristics of what we call secondary institutions.” ¹⁵²

Yet for Luckmann, this secondary status is the only option available for meaning-making in a pluralistic society; there exist no primary religious institutions in the modern

world. Furthermore, his equivalencies, which others had labeled secularization or accommodation, help to locate the changing source of values and beliefs for modern individuals. As the sacred and secular spheres continue to separate, Luckmann’s “invisible religion” seeks to account for the apparently diminishing influence of these institutional churches. Rejecting the secularization theories prevalent at the time, Luckmann views the expanding religious marketplace as a twofold-refutation of the possible loss of religious belief in America. Not only does this expansion of “secondary institutions” help explain declining institutional church attendance, it furthermore describes a populace invested in seeking out individualized value negotiation through myriad sources that individuals legitimate for themselves.

My use of institutional church examples, then, reflects an examination of modern belief constrained by the practicality of research. As all meaning-making in the modern world consists of drawing upon secondary institutions, I chose institutional churches as clear cases for examining the delineation of boundary values as expressed through the sacraments. The more specific use of schismatic churches, then, reflects an interest in outside sources of values; the environmental derivation of these cases seeks to display the inescapable interplay between the sacred and secular spheres that Luckmann describes.

The role of the institutional Church in Luckmann’s world of secondary institutions does deserve further inquiry, as I do not feel my research negates Luckmann’s assertions regarding meaning-making. As I used only institutional churches, I can only evaluate the state of these secondary institutions; furthermore, the inclusion of cultural attitudes toward individualism does support Luckmann’s theories.
The Sacred and the Secular

This separation of the sacred and the secular explains the continuum of individualisms that I have found in my research. The Bohemian Church’s expansion of the Eucharist recognizes the importance of individual participation in the sacrament of Communion; it does not make any distinctions about the makeup or about the beliefs of those who would partake of the sacrament. In 16th century Bohemia, the notion of individual piety was itself radical enough to preclude any particular musings on the moral validity of those enjoying a now frequent and full communion. In the current schism over ordination in TEC, however, the entirety of the debate centers on what individual gender and sexual morality consists of.

This expanding consideration of the makeup of the individual and the accompanying value distinctions as the individual relates to the institutional church reflect the historical progression of both individuality and the separation of the sacred and secular spheres. During the Bohemian Reformation, at the very dawn of the modern era, the potential value of communion for individuals was only just becoming acknowledged as potentially worthwhile or beneficial. The Church, in conjunction, was only just beginning to experiment with autonomy outside of hierarchical religious-political rule. The current pluralism of the United States, in contrast, reflects a multiplicity of religious institutions which continually define their own boundaries in order to interact with a generically but not exclusively Judeo-Christian culture.

In TEC, then, the concern with gender and sexuality points to an institutional church that now, more fully separate from the secular culture, must outline an increasingly detailed portrait of individual morality. Luckmann predicts this
preoccupation in his description of “Modern Religious Themes”: “Another, peculiarly modern, articulation of the themes of self-expression and self-realization is sexuality.” Going further in his assertion of the importance of sexuality to modern individual meaning-making, Luckmann states that “sexuality, in connection with the ‘sacred’ themes of self-expression and self-realization, now comes to play a unique role as a source of ‘ultimate’ significance for the individual who is retrenched in the ‘private sphere.’” As the individual has come to take on a sacred quality, previously covert aspects of the self are given value judgments and included in the evaluation of individual sacred cosmos and belief.

Luckmann also reacts to the perhaps progressive nature of TEC’s ordination of both women and gay men; the controversy over the act of ordination indicates that societal acceptance of these groups as validated individuals remains incomplete. The separation of the public from the private sphere, which now contains the sacred cosmos and to which secondary institutions like TEC now belong, “permits sexual conduct to be governed more radically than in a traditional social order by consumer preference.”

This suggests that, in the modern state of the separation of the public and the private, the sacred and the secular, secondary institutions reflect a widely divergent set of affirmations for individuals. Additionally, this “radical government” reflects the growing sphere of influence of these private, sacred secondary institutions; divergent from the wider culture, perhaps in values and certainly in structure, modern institutional churches must provide a fully encompassing set of meanings for individuals who adhere to their value system.
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It is in this expanding notion of institutional influence that the expanding notion of the individual must be brought back. Diverging cosmos indicate a need for a converging and coherent theory of accepted individuals. In the case of the Bohemian Reformation, the church was experiencing an increase in lay piety, and thus an increase in the church’s recognition of the value and importance of laity in general. The extension of the sacrament of Eucharist to laity emerged as a necessary inclusion of individuals within the Communion of the Church. Rather than a hierarchy which negated the importance of an individual’s spiritual life, the reformative activities of Jan Milič of Kroměříž, Matej of Janov, Jan Hus and Jakoubek of Stříbo gave frequent and full communion to Bohemian Catholics for 200 years. In the case of TEC, an increased attention to the gender and sexual makeup of individuals, and the rights of those individuals as equal to others, led to the push for female and homosexual ordination to the priesthood; not yet accepted by all Episcopalians, the movements still reflect a need to address a more encompassing consideration of an individual.

The Church, in both of these instances, continues to assert its influence in the delineation of values of those within its bounds. The sacraments act as the boundaries of the faith, and the values of those included individuals reflect the values of the wider church. In the expansion of sacramental rights since the dawn of the modern age, a wider view of the individual has produced a wider view of accepted morality. The individualism of the Bohemian Reformation, then, is markedly different from the individualism of the current Episcopal schism; however, both of these notions of individualism, and the expanding notions of sacramental exclusivity that accompany them, reflect an affirmation of Luckmann’s theory.
Evaluating Luckmann’s Theory in Retrospect

Luckmann summarizes his work at the end of his monograph: “We tried to show that the structure of the modern sacred cosmos and its thematic content represent the emergence of a new social form of religion which, in turn, is determined by a radical transformation in the relation of the individual to the social order.”\textsuperscript{156} Though many other theorists have worked to describe the social aspects of religion, Luckmann’s central focus on the modernity, environmental derivation and individualistic concerns of this “new social form of religion” presents a solid basis for my examination of the Bohemian Reformation and the current Episcopal schism. I have found my research to affirm Luckmann’s theory, though it does not exclude other theoretical possibilities and does have its own limitations.

In terms of modernity and individualistic concerns, I consider the two historical milieus operational as case studies for the span of the modern era. Though the Bohemian Reformation falls before Luckmann’s assertion that the individual “received its first modern articulation in the Romantic era,” the emergence of lay piety points to an increased, albeit not ideally realized, individualism.\textsuperscript{157} Milič of Kroměříž, in his exploration of lay Eucharist in the Jerusalem experiment, epitomizes the impetus toward individualism that would continue throughout the advance toward frequent and full communion for all laity in Bohemia. Though the success was short-lived and geographically confined, the individual consciousness that was awakened represents the earliest of stirrings of modern individualism.
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The current Episcopal schism, beginning with the movement for ordination of women in the 1960s, aligns with a national re-assertion of the importance of the individual and thus establishes a similarly modern sensibility. Emerging from the solidarity required for two World Wars, the individualizing climate of the 1960s in the United States gave credence to the recognition of an expanding individual consciousness. Separating from public assumptions regarding acceptable expressions of gender and sexuality, the women’s and homosexual rights movements of the era accentuated the importance of considering the whole individual when recognizing individual rights. The individual, as the concept gained strength in modernity, gained strength in the social order and helped to negotiate the continued relevance of the Church to society.

The environmental derivation of the Bohemian Reformation may be evident in the distinct geographical confines of the movement. Emerging exclusively within the city of Prague in Bohemia, the radical theological groundwork of Milič of Kroměříž and Matej of Janov allowed for the centralization and achievement of liturgical goals under both Jan Hus and Jakubek of Stříbo. The progressive nature of these theological and liturgical goals displays the fertile environment of Prague: the expansion of frequent communion for the laity led to full communion for the laity, one expansion of sacramental rights leading to the next. The final production of the Four Articles of Prague testifies to the success, however short-lived, of the venture, a success that only Bohemia enjoyed.

The extension of the sacrament of ordination to women and homosexuals within TEC owes much to the external culture of a changing America, but the continuing process has in some ways outpaced the cultural environment. Chaves and Cavendish attribute much of the success of TEC to the external environment of the 1970s, but the
further expansion of sacramental rights to gay priests in more recent years can be attributed more directly to individual actors within the church.\textsuperscript{158} Therefore, though the origins of the movement required external motivations and conditions, further momentum was gained within the church as an institution.

**Use of Luckmann: Limitations and Further Study**

As an early theorist working outside the assumption of secularization, Luckmann’s most basic assertions about the present and future state of religion remain the most important aspect of his work. I found Luckmann compelling in his refutation of secularization and his assertion of individualism at the heart of the modern form of religion; this, more than anything else, seemed to be echoed clearly in the events of the Bohemian Reformation and the current Episcopal schism. It is certainly possible that his view of American religious life in the early 1960s requires editing for the current context, but contemporary sociological studies affirm the primacy of the individual and the resulting “religious agency” of believers in the U.S.\textsuperscript{159}

My use of Luckmann as a structuring device for my inquiry worked well as a basic sociological lens; I found Luckmann to be operational for historical research but by no means the only theoretical possibility. Further study of either of the historical milieus would undoubtedly prove fruitful; many more recent theorists’ work could be used in understanding the expanding sacramental exclusivity of modern churches.

Further inquiry into the willingness of reformers to stay within institutionally-defined churches would add considerably to my research, and has been taken up by some
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modern sociologists. Though the motives of the Bohemian reformers may be difficult to ascertain in retrospect, current attitudes of marginalized groups toward the institutional Church are available and informative\(^{\text{160}}\). Why reformers choose to remain within Luckmann’s institutional secondary sources, rather than abandon the structure for the possibilities of extra-institutional meaning-making, remains an applicable and instructive question.

A few possibilities for further research into 20\(^{\text{th}}\) and 21\(^{\text{st}}\) century sacramental exclusivity deserve specific mention. In the later stages of my research I learned more about the modern history of the Eucharist; specifically, the Catholic reinstitution of the wine with Vatican II reforms in the 1960s, and the discussions of open versus closed Eucharistic tables in many of the mainstream denominations. The even more radical move towards completely unrestricted Eucharist, administered to whoever wants to partake regardless of baptism or affiliation, would involve the most modern research. The implications of these extensions of sacramental exclusivity at the dawn of the modern conception of the individual certainly deserve further inquiry, and seem to support a continued search for and understanding of the extension of sacramental rights.

The Bohemian Reformation in particular deserves further inquiry. Much of what is available in print on the Bohemian Reformation is dated; fresh scholarship does exist in the Czech Republic, especially through online journal publication, but English scholarship or translations are limited. The most worthwhile further study would be conducted with knowledge of the modern Czech language as well as the Medieval Latin of the Reformation period.
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