

The Utraquist Sanctoral in Sixteenth-Century Czech-Language Graduals

Jiří Žůrek (Prague)

The objective of this article¹ is to present the sanctoral of sixteenth-century Czech-language graduals, and at the same time test certain theses, which have been formulated in the past concerning the veneration of saints during the Bohemian Reformation. First of all, we wish to determine the use of the Utraquist sanctoral in liturgical practice, and to compare the feast days celebrated by Utraquists with the contemporary Roman calendar. Further, we want to know what was the liturgical rank of a given feast day included in Utraquist graduals. Finally, special attention will be devoted to the feast days of Czech saints and patrons, because recently an important hypothesis has been proposed on this question.²

In the course of the research, all existing Czech graduals will be identified. Those surviving only in fragments or otherwise basically incomplete will be excluded so as not to skew the view of the integral Utraquist calendar.

¹ The study was presented at the symposium BRRP 10 in June 2012. The Czech version was published in LF 136 (2013) 315–341. The text was then revised according to the suggestions of BRRP reviewers. One of the most notable changes from the original Czech version is the number of examples of Hus's office added in the appended table. To supplement the twenty-eight graduals with chants for Hus's feast day presented in 2012, I was able to add five more, albeit fragments – sometimes of only a single line of text. Hence the table now contains altogether thirty-three documented occurrences of the office as well as cases in which the office was certainly included in the liturgical text before being destroyed by the Counter-Reformation censors.

² See Ota Halama, "Utrakvistická úcta k českým světcům [Utraquist Veneration of Czech Saints]," in *Světcí a jejich kult ve středověku* [Saints and Their Cult in the Middle Ages], ed. Petr Kubín, with Hana Pátková and Tomáš Petráček (Prague, 2006), 189–197, here 192–195. See also Ota Halama, "Die utraquistische Verehrung der böhmischen Heiligen," in *Die Heiligen und ihr Kult im Mittelalter*, ed. Eva Doležalová et al. (Prague, 2010) 203–213. David R. Holeton, "La célébration liturgique de Jean Hus et de ses compagnions en Bohême à l'époque du pluralisme religieux," in Olivier Martin and Cécile Vincent Cassy (ed.), *La cour céleste: La commémoration collective des saints, entre accumulation des suffrages et communion ecclésiale* (Turnhout, 2014) 51–59. On the basis of research in collections of feast-day sermons and selected (above all Latin) graduals from 1470–1532, Halama maintains that some feast days of Czech saints are occasionally omitted, except for the feast day of St. Wenceslaus. Further he intimates that the theme of Czech saints gradually disappears from the liturgical and homiletical texts of the Utraquist Church during the sixteenth century. To test the results of Halama's research, the Graduals from the entire course of the sixteenth century until Utraquism's decline will be examined.

From the relatively complete graduals, the mentioned feast days of saints will be noted, and a table of feast days constructed. Feast days mentioned in official or quasi-official documents of the sub utraque church, as well as – for the sake of comparison – feast days from documents of the Roman Church, will be added to the table. Agreements and differences will be noted and commented upon.

1. Selection of Graduals.

The criterion for inclusion in the comparative process is the quality of the extant gradual. Where the sanctoral is vestigial, it is necessary to ascertain whether the item in question is only a fragment or a mere torso of a gradual which for example, is evidently the case with the *Jílovský graduál* and the *Convolute* of the fragments of Graduals, held by the National Library (MS Prague NK XVII B 8). It is also necessary to consider whether graduals with missing or very limited sanctorale might have had a (now lost) second volume, which might have contained the offices of saints. This is obviously the case with the *Gradual of pecuniae ecclesiae at St. Vavřinec*, which contains only the temporal and the common of saints (just like one of the two volumes of the *Svatohavelský gradual*). Thus, it is possible that the missing second volume of this gradual contained the sanctoral and perhaps the sequenciary. The same may be true of the *Svatoštěpánský* and *Svatohaštalský graduals*, where we find only offices of saints traditionally included in the framework of the temporal. Likewise the *Chrudimský český gradual* probably had another volume. The fragments of the offices of the sanctoral refer at the end of the volume to a missing continuation. Notable is also the so-called *Mladší litoměřický gradual* because it contains merely the temporal. This volume definitely presupposes yet another volume, because, for instance, f. 125 contains a note in the rubric that the singer should look for another office in other books.

The opposite case of partial preservation is represented by the *Graduál kostela sv. Vojtěcha většího*, which contains only the summer part and the major section of the sanctoral; the winter part together with the temporal is missing.

The comparative table, therefore, excludes the following:

- Graduals which apparently had a second volume, now lost:
- *Svatoštěpánský*, both volumes, which are now held by the museum in Chrudim (*Chrudimský český a Graduál kůru sv. Jiljí*), *Graduál záduší sv. Vavřince*, *Svatohaštalský* and *Mladší litoměřický*
- Graduals, which were preserved as authentic torsos: *Příborský*, *Jílovský*, *Graduál kostela sv. Vojtěcha většího* and *Konvolut* of gradual fragments.

- Songbooks, which contain only several choral offices attached to another kind of liturgical book: the *Kolínský kancionál* and the *Kancionál* used in the church of *Kunětice*.

Among newer Graduals, the *Českoskalický gradual* is somewhat problematic, in which the sanctoral is much reduced. However, it cannot be simply regarded as a fragment, because offices which follow one another by date were often written on the same page. It was, therefore included in the table.

Thus, there are altogether forty-three graduals included for comparison.

2. Utraquist and sub una Calendars

The question emerges regarding with what to compare the contents of Utraquist graduals, as to their recorded feast days of saints. There is therefore a need for official texts of ecclesiastical authorities, which would establish the criteria for the celebration of the feast days of saints and offer there the most precise enumeration possible. For the early period we can excerpt rubrics from the Prague missals and from the statutes of Arnošt. The latter can represent for our research a kind of commencing historical state. Then, for the sixteenth century, we have the more or less official lists of feast days in sources, which we shall gradually enumerate and briefly characterise; first of all sources of sub una provenance, then the rest.

*The Statutes of Arnošt*³ and the rubrics of Prague missals from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries – as far as the sanctoral is concerned – were researched by Josef Beran.⁴ Among his sources⁵ he lists the following Prague missals: incunabula from 1479 and 1498, both printed in Nuremberg; an example from 1507 printed in Venice; and a missal of 1522, printed in Leipzig. The data derived from the investigation of the missals are compared by Beran with *The Statutes of Arnošt*. He determines that the calendars of the missals usually have more feast days marked in red (hence, with a higher rank of celebration [feriace]), than the number of holy days of obligation in *The Statutes of Arnošt*. The discrepancy affects the following feast days:

³ *Statuta metropolitanae ecclesiae Pragensis anno 1350 conscripta*, ed. Antonius Podlaha (Prague, 1905).

⁴ See, Josef Beran, *Mešní liturgie* [Liturgy of the Mass] *secundum rubricam ecclesiae Pragensis ve st. XV. a XVI. Příspěvek k vývoji liturgického práva partikulárního v Čechách* [Contribution to the Development of Particular Liturgical Law in Bohemia] (Prague, 1931). On issues of the calendar, see especially, 24–77.

⁵ See Josef Beran, *Mešní liturgie*, 8–9.

- 2 and 8 January: first and second translation of relics⁶
 25 January: The Conversion of St. Paul
 22 February: The Chair of St. Peter
 9 March: Sts. Cyril and Methodius⁷
 5 August: Our Lady of the Snows⁸
 19 November: Elisabeth *electae* [of Hungary]
 21 November: Presentation of the BVM
 8 December: Immaculate Conception of the BVM
 28 December: The Holy Innocents.

The Statutes of Arnošt do not recognise any of these as holy days of obligation. In addition, *the Statutes of Arnošt* make more precise celebration of other feast days, specifically the feast days of Sts. Mark, Luke, Gregory, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, which were placed in a special group: the faithful, after the obligatory hearing of mass, could labour as on a week day.⁹

Further it is necessary to note that, according to the missals and *The Statutes of Arnošt*, a holy day of obligation for the Feast of Dedication of a Prague church can be found below our table of commons (*commune*). Finally, one must remember that, for practical reasons, (limitation of space), one holy day of obligation was not placed into the table, namely, the feast of the Five Brothers (*Quinque fratrum*) on 12 November. The reason is that this holy day never appears in Czech graduals. The reason for this is found in *Konstituce* from 1559, which inform us that this holy day was obligatory only in the Prague Cathedral, so that outside of this church it was not obligatory.¹⁰

Constitutiones venerabilis capituli ecclesiae metropolitanae Pragense, in

⁶ The Statutes of Arnošt naturally do not contain the Translation of Relics on 2 January, because the feast was introduced only in 1355. See: Jaroslav V. Polc, "Kapitoly z církevního života Čech podle předhusitského zákonodárství [Chapters from the Ecclesiastical Life of Bohemia according to Pre-Hussite Legislation]," in *Pražské arcibiskupství 1344–1994*, ed. Zdeňka Hledíková and Jaroslav V. Polc (Prague, 1994) 30–57, especially 33.

⁷ The feast was introduced only toward the end of the fourteenth century. See Jaroslav V. Polc, "Kapitoly z církevního života Čech," 34.

⁸ The feast was introduced in 1385. See Jaroslav V. Polc, "Kapitoly z církevního života Čech," 33.

⁹ See Josef Beran, *Mešní liturgie*, 64–65.

¹⁰ During the long hiatus separating Arnošt's *Statuta* from the *Constitutiones* of 1559, above all, at the end of the fourteenth century, there were many changes in the celebration of holy days, but these we ignore because our interest is the resulting state of affairs that is especially reflected in the *Constitutiones*. Thus our table does not cover the feast of the Lance and Nails introduced in 1355, nor Our Lady of the Snows from 1385 and others. On the other hand, the feast of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, introduced in 1386, is included, because it occurs in the graduals of the sixteenth century. A more detailed account of changes in the calendar from the turn of the fourteenth century – mostly without specifying the degree of feriation – can be found in Polc, "Kapitoly z církevního života Čech," 30–57. See also: Michal Dragoun, "Neznámé články synodálních statut pražské arcidiecéze? [Unknown Articles of Synodal Statutes of Prague Archdiocese?]" in *Facta probant homines*, ed. Ivan Hlaváček and Jan Hrdina with the assistance of Jan Kahuda and Eva Doležalová (Prague, 1998) 149–164.

visitationibus Anno 1555 propositae et nunc recognitae (Prague, 1559). The Constitutions are ordinances of the Prague Metropolitan Chapter from the mid-sixteenth century. The conclusion of the thin volume contains a list (*cathalogus*) of obligatory feast days, fasts, and vigils that, as the authors write, had been celebrated in the Prague Archdiocese since times immemorial and should still be kept.¹¹ Three kinds of feast day are distinguished: *summa*, *celebria*, and *chori*. The first two denote feast days of obligation; in the table they are marked by the letter Z. The first category covers feasts of the Lord, four Marian feasts as well as the feast of All Saints. All other obligatory feast days of male and female saints belong to the second category. The third category includes feast days that are not obligatory; these are marked in the table by the letter X. As in the previously mentioned statutes, the non-obligatory Marian feast days are the Presentation and the Conception.

Synodus archidioecesana Pragensis, habita ab ... Sbigneo Berka ... Anno M. DC. V. in festo S. Wenceslai (Prague, 1605). The Synod of Berka is usually cited in connection with the introduction of the Tridentine reforms in the church to Bohemia.¹² The statutes, promulgated by it, however, also contain a list of feast days of obligation (p. 32–38). The introduction to this section contains a complaint that the holy day rest is violated by servile labour (*servilibus operibus*) and other duties (*officiis*). There is, therefore, a reminder of how to celebrate a holy day of obligation. During the preceding evening (vigil) the faithful should fast, devote themselves to devout prayer, and examine their conscience. On the day of the feast itself, they are expected to take part at mass, and that should include the domestic servants. After confession let the faithful receive the eucharist. They should not skip the sermon. They should also take part in the offices, above all, vespers. The authors urge a more generous distribution of alms and recommend visits to monasteries. Especially, they remind everyone to abstain from servile labour, and the performance of any of the illiberal arts, such as trading, except for what was needed for the sick. Let stores and workshops be closed. Let people not do anything that distracts from Christian piety.

In addition to the feast days that are explicitly mentioned, it was also necessary to observe the feast days of the patrons of the town, the church, or the parish, and moreover those which were observed by local custom. In conclusion there is a reminder not to commemorate the memory of those who are not catholic saints – obviously meaning thereby mainly the feast day of Master Jan Hus.

Here ends the enumeration of Roman Catholic sources. The following documents are of all Utraquist provenance, except that – in the last case – which is Lutheran.

¹¹ *Cathalogus summorum, celebrium et chori festorum, nec non vigiliarum et ieiuniorum ab Ecclesia Dei indictorum, quae in Archiepiscopatu Ecclesiae Pragensis, olim magno ardore animi servabantur, et etiamnum a Christi fidelibus servantur et servari debent* (B iii).

¹² See František Vacek, “Diecéšní synoda pražská z r. 1605, Život církevní v Čechách s počátku sedmnáctého století [The Prague Diocesan Synod of 1605, Ecclesiastical Life in Bohemia at the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century],” in *Sborník historického kroužku* 5 (1896) 25–45.

The Candlemas Day Articles of 1524: At the Prague Candlemas Day Convocation of the party *sub utraque* there were discussions about the celebration of feast days besides many other matters. The protocol (minutes) of the resulting articles is preserved in the *Chronicle* of Bartoš the Scribe (písař).¹³ In the twentieth article¹⁴ the diet orders the observance of the following feast days: New Year's, Epiphany, Candlemas, Annunciation, Assumption, All Saints, and the feasts of the apostles (which are based in Scripture), John the Baptist, Mary Magdalene, Lawrence, Jan Hus and other Bohemian patrons. Of major importance is the following note that: "lidé robotní v živnostech svých nehynuli a skrze zahálení aby příčin hříchův a mnohého zlého uvarovati se mohli [working people should not suffer loss in their trades and would avoid the causes of sin and much evil from idleness]."

This note enables us to express an important hermeneutical rule, as far as catalogues of holy days of obligation are concerned. The commentary, accompanying the enumeration of holy days in a given document, clearly indicates the purpose of these lists: it was necessary to delimit the extent of non-working days. The nobles and enterprising burghers, of course, were greatly interested in as many working days as possible, or conversely in reducing the number of holy days, hence the effort to limit the number to as few as possible holy days of obligation.¹⁵ It was not, therefore, primarily a liturgical or theological document, determining which saint should be commemorated, and which one not. Thus, the economic dimension prevailed in determining when common people should work, or when they should abstain from labour. The ecclesiastical authorities did not try to prevent lesser clerics from venerating any other saint as long as they transferred the feast to a Sunday – which was a day of rest in any case.

Instrukcí z strany Religionu (pro Kadaň), 1548. The instructions of the Prague Utraquist Consistory also contain a short list of holy days.¹⁶ Unfortunately, some of the holy days are listed only in a summary fashion (such as Marian or Apostolic) and are designated in the table by the letter Z in parentheses. As a result the list does not offer an exhaustive account. For instance, it is not clear whether holy days like Conversion of St. Paul or the Sending of the Apostles, can be included under the designation of "Apostolic Holy days." Moreover, the inhabitants of Kadaň were also exhorted to observe other holy days that were traditional in the town. This makes a determination of the actual holy days even less precise.

¹³ FRB IV (1907), 21–25.

¹⁴ For an assessment of the theological significance of the Candlemas Articles, see, for instance David, *Finding*, 64–69.

¹⁵ See Polc, "Kapitoly z církevního života Čech," 32. See also the note of Josef Beran about the efforts of rulers, even in the eighteenth century, to have the pope reduce the number of the holy days of obligation; Beran, *Mešní liturgie*, 66.

¹⁶ See *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře katolické a utrakvistické, Akta konsistoře utrakvistické* [Protocols and Letters of the Catholic and Utraquist Consistory, Acts of the Utraquist Consistory], ed. Klement Borový (Prague, 1868) I: 230–231.

*Dopis pražských kněží podobojí králi Ferdinandovi, 1549.*¹⁷ The Utraquist Consistory evidently reacted with the letter to the preceding communication of Ferdinand I, so that the enumeration of holy days in point 5 expresses the king's idea concerning the holy days of obligation. Thus, this enumeration does not include, for instance, the feast of Jan Hus, to which the Consistory responded by a humble petition for an addition of that holy day.¹⁸ On the other hand, it is remarkable that a Roman Catholic king did not prescribe for his subjects the observance of the feast of St. Stephen nor either of the feasts of the Holy Cross.

*Agenda česká, to jest spis o ceremoniích a pořádcích církevních ... 1581 ... v Lipště.*¹⁹ The Agenda is clearly influenced by contemporary German Lutheranism. It is included in the comparison specifically because of its deviant character: in the enumeration of holy days and shows graphically how traditional Czech Utraquism differed from the Lutheran concept of holy days. The authors,²⁰ however, explicitly state that they recorded more holy days in the calendar than was customary in the contemporary German Lutheran agenda on which they drew.²¹ These days were three: Master Jan Hus, the Sending of the Apostles, and the Transfiguration of the Lord. They apologise in the preface for this concession and extension, giving as their reason the universal observance of these feasts throughout the entire Bohemian Lands.²²

The *Agenda* differentiates greater holy days (designated in the table Z), which are almost exclusively feasts of the Lord, and lesser holy days (designated X). Some Marian feasts, however, were reinterpreted Christologically. The Purification of the Virgin Mary and the Annunciation belong among the greater feasts, but they are entitled the Presentation of Christ the Lord in the Temple and the Incarnation of Christ respectively. The one holy day, which does not belong among the feast days of the Lord and, yet was included among the greater holy days, is the feast of the Holy Angels of God [Michaelmas]. Perhaps, this was based on the theological reason that incorporeal beings deserve a higher degree of glorification than ordinary mortals.

¹⁷ See *Jednání a dopisy*, 260–265, esp. 262; also Ota Halama, “Utravistická úcta,” 194.

¹⁸ See also *Jednání a dopisy*, 264.

¹⁹ *Knihopis*, Nr. 79.

²⁰ The preface is signed by Church Administrators, Preaching the Word of God in Its Purity in the Kingdom of Bohemia. (*zprávcové církevní Slovo Boží v čistotě kázání v Království českém*). Who they were concretely, can only be guessed at. Ferdinand Hrejsa carefully concludes that they may have represented a circle of priests, led by the parish priest of Pacov, Jan Laetus Čáslavský. The only, and rather weak argument for this is the fact that Čáslavský published another book with the same publisher (Georg Deffner in Leipzig). See Hrejsa, *Česká konfese* (Prague, 1912) 355–356.

²¹ Selected aspects of the relationship between the *Agenda česká* and contemporary German agenda were recently discussed in Matthias Thiele, “Stopy eucharistické modlitby v Agendě České z roku 1581?” [Traces of Eucharistic Prayer in the *Agenda česká* of 1581?], in *O felix Bohemia! Studie k děninám české reformace*, ed. Petr Hlaváček et alii (Prague, 2013) 224–232.

²² See *Agenda česká*, Latin Preface B iij v.

The other saints are included in the lesser holy days. These are, of course, only personages who are mentioned in Scripture (the apostles, John the Baptist, Elizabeth, biblical events). In this regard, the one exception is Jan Hus. It comes as a surprise that the Transfiguration of the Lord is included among the lesser holy days. It is one of the holy days that the authors included by their own decision. It seems that they were not aware of the criterion of distinguishing the two types of feasts. If this were so, it would also indicate that their Lutheranism was not sharply defined. Thus, it might also indicate the vagueness of religious differentiation on the margins of Czech Utraquism.

3. Comparison of the Sanctoral in the Above Cited Sources

From the first columns of the comparative table which list the holy days from the earlier mentioned ordinances, it follows that the Utraquist calendar *in genere* was almost indistinguishable from the Roman Catholic one. Some specific deviations, however, are noticeable in particulars: Utraquists give a higher rank (*feriace*) to certain feast days (further marked as a difference *per excessum*) or on the contrary a lesser rank (difference *per defectum*). The differences can be summed up in the following way:

Conversion of St. Paul – *per excessum*.

St. Vítus – *per defectum*.

M. Jan Hus – *per excessum*.

Sending of the Apostles – *per excessum*.

Transfiguration of the Lord – *per excessum*.

Exaltation of the Holy Cross – *per defectum*.²³

St. Stephen – *per defectum*.²⁴

²³ This holy day reveals the economic pressure toward the limitation of holy days of obligation. The synod of 1555 still records it as obligatory, but not a single Utraquist document mentions the holy day and Berka's Statutes abolish its obligatory character. It is clear that the reason was not liturgical, but, instead, economic. The office was notated in virtually all the Czech graduals, so that a liturgical observation could not be doubted, even though according to the official documents the feast day did not belong among those of obligation. After the morning liturgy, the faithful were obviously expected to return to their work.

²⁴ It is a fact that the Christmas sanctoral is missing in roughly one quarter of the Graduals. It is also remarkable that the Graduals of Jan Taborský entirely omit the feast day of the Holy Innocents. The feast day, however, was not traditionally obligatory so its absence need not surprise. It is curious, however, that the *Staroměstský graduál* lacks propers for Sts. Stephen and John so that in the Christmas sanctoral, on the contrary, only the Holy Innocents remain. The reason might be the keeping of the Innocents' relics in the Bethlehem Chapel, to which the gradual is attributed by Martina Šárovcová, "K provenienci Staroměstského a Křižovnického graduálu [Towards the Provenance of the *Staroměstský* and *Křižovnický* Graduals]" *Umění* 53 (2005) 323–334. Two days, following 24 December, are mostly regarded as an extension of the feast day of the Lord's Nativity (the period of so-called "poprazdenstvo" in the Eastern Churches), similar to the celebrations of the Resurrection and Pentecost, so that December

It is worthwhile noting also some special cases of vacillation: St. Adalbert, the Invention of the Holy Cross, St. Procopius, St. Margaret, St. Ludmila, and St. Nicholas. An illustrative example is the feast of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, because the frequent occurrence of the officium in the Graduals indicate that Utraquist parishes celebrated the feast day consistently during the sixteenth century, regardless of whether or not it was officially listed among the holy days of obligation. The feast day was introduced in 1386 as one of obligation, but permitting servile labour afterwards. The *Konstituce* of 1559 lists it among the holy days of obligation, but the statutes of Berka's Synod omit it. It is remarkable that of the holy days introduced by Prague Archbishops after 1350 (the Holy Lance and Nails, Our Lady of the Snows, the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, Translation of Relics, St. Victorinus, the Octave of St. Katherine, St. Castulus, St. Mary of Egypt, St. Brigid of Sweden, St. John Chrysostom, St. Hilary, St. Basel, St. Apollonia, St. Sigismund, and Sts. Cyril and Methodius²⁵) none were retained in the official Roman Catholic list at the start of the seventeenth century. Now it is necessary to compare the above findings with the data in the Czech graduals.

4. Comparison of the Sanctoralis in Graduals

At the start of this research it was hoped that the comparison of sanctoralis in all the graduals would provide information on which saint was commemorated in the liturgy, or how the cult changed in the course of the sixteenth century. Unfortunately, the assumptions proved to be vain for the following reasons:

- The manuscripts of one choir have different sanctoralis, or the saints mentioned in the *kancionals* may be different from those in the graduals. For instance, the *Český kancionál* Hr10 lists in the rubrics Sts. Matthew, Martin, Giles, and Gall, none of whom are mentioned in the *Český graduál* Hr13+14 of the same Church of the Holy Spirit in Hradec Králové.²⁶
- *Rakovnický graduál* lacks the feast of St. Matthias, but the tenor polyphonic book of *Rakovnický kancionál* includes a chant for the feast day of St. Matthias (f. 12r-13v). Thus, it can be concluded that different sources from the same choir might have lacked homogeneity, as far as the sanctoral was concerned.

25 and 26, definitely belonged to the feast days of obligation as codas to Christmas Day. The omission of St. Stephen, St. John the Evangelist, and the Holy Infants might have sought to protect the theological and liturgical exceptionality of the Lord's feast.

²⁵ See Polc, "Kapitoly z církevního života," 32–34.

²⁶ In the graduals of East-Bohemian provenance, Matthew appears only in the *Graduál z Žiželic* and in *Výroční písně*; neither Galus nor Giles appear in any of the graduals of Hradec Králové.

- The presence of commons (*commune*) or “*quasicommune*”²⁷ weakens the possibility of determining exactly which saint was commemorated liturgically. Common chants (*commune*) signal that even a saint who was not named in the gradual, could be celebrated by means of common chants. As an example, *Českoskalický graduál* does not mention explicitly the feast day of any apostle, yet it contains *commune apostolorum* that could be used for any of them. The use of commons for the celebration of an apostle’s feast is attested, for instance, by the *Malostranský gradual* on f. 163r where at St. Matthias a rubric notes “just as in the case of the apostles”; similarly the *Graduál z Kostelce nad Orlicí* refers to the common of the apostles for Sts. James, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Andrew.
- The index in *Husitský gradual* on ff. 351r-354r confirms that some propers were used for more than one feast day even if they are not explicitly mentioned in the rubrics. Several feast days (Annunciation, Visitation of the Virgin Mary, St. Thomas) are noted only in the index with reference to chants of other feast days notated in the gradual.
- Finally, the same is illustrated in the case of the *Pravidlo* (agenda)²⁸ and *Písně* (Graduál)²⁹ of Tobiáš Závorka Lipenský in which, for instance, the feast days of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, St. Margaret, Invention and Exaltation of the Holy Cross, Sts. Luke, Simon and Jude, and Katherine are not in the *Písně*, but are cited in the index of the *Pravidlo*.³⁰

All these particularities and variations indicate that liturgical celebrations may have included many more feast days than those which can be found

²⁷ By *quasicommune* I refer to cases when the proper for a certain saint is at the same time designated as a *commune*, for instance, when the *officium* for St. Mary Magdalene serves as the common for female saints (see, for instance, *Graduál z Litomyšle*, f. 252v, where a rubric is attached to the proper for Mary Magdalene: “For Sts. Anne, Martha; Virgins Katherine and Dorothy; and virgins in general.”) It is quite common that a gradual which contains a *proper* for *Mary Magdalene* as also usable for other virgins, in addition contains *commune virginum* in the relevant section. Thus it is an interesting phenomenon that Czech graduals can contain a sort of double *commune*: one as a section in the conclusion of the sanctoral and another – a *quasicommune* – among the *propria*. Perhaps, this duplication is a vestige of the origins of the Czech gradual, when originally the chants of *propria* were selected and over time the other elements of a gradual were added, including *commune*. Another variant of the development of *quasicommune* is offered, for instance, by the *Tištínský kancionál*, which contains one single universal officium for the Virgin Mary with the rubric *O všech slavnostech P. Marie* (For all feasts of Virgin Mary), yet the introit verses for each individual feast differ.

²⁸ Tobiáš Závorka Lipenský, *Pravidlo služebností církevních* [The Rule of Ecclesiastical Services] (Velké Náměstí, 1607).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, *Písně chval Božských* [Songs of Divine Praises] (Prague, 1602); *Knihopis*, Nr. 17175 and 17176.

³⁰ There is also an opposite instance, in which St. Anne is listed in the *Písně*, but not in the *Pravidlo*. On the other hand, Sts. Adalbert, Vitus, Procopius, Martha, Ludmila, and Ursula are neither in the *Písně*, nor in the *Pravidlo*; it seems that Závorka did not consider their feasts relevant.

notated or at least rubricated in the graduals. Herewith we can arrive at another partial conclusion: graduals at this time cannot be considered as *calendaria* that covered every individual saint and the pertinent rubricated chants, as was the case in earlier Latin graduals and missals. The absence of a saint from the sanctoral, therefore, does not prove that the given saint was not liturgically commemorated in the locality where the gradual was used. On the contrary, it is evident that the graduals simply assumed a familiarity with the calendar and liturgical customs, and that certain chants could be utilised for purposes not explicitly mentioned.

In what follows, an attempt is made to interpret the data in the appended table. It is incontestable that in most cases there is an agreement *in genere* (in the sum): holy days of obligation are represented strongly in the graduals (for instance, the Nativity of John the Baptist, Sts. Petr and Paul,³¹ St. Lawrence, the Assumption); lesser feasts (like Sts. Galus and Lucy) are represented more rarely or not at all. The cases of uncertainty were reflected also in the vacillation in registering a feast day among holy days of obligation. This is evident in graduals: for instance, the Invention of the Holy Cross is recorded in roughly one half of the graduals. The same is the case with other vacillating *officia*: Sts. Procopius,³² Margaret, Ludmila, Nicholas, but not St. Adalbert, who is represented less often than might have been expected.

There is a clear correlation between the contents of the official documents and that of the graduals. It is, however, of interest to follow where the contents of the graduals do not coincide with the list of the feast days, and

³¹ The *officium* is missing in the *Rakovnický graduál*. This was obviously caused by the project remaining unfinished. There is a strange gap between the Invention of the Holy Cross and the Sending of the Apostles – especially the absence of the feast days of the Nativity of John the Baptist, and of Sts. Peter and Paul is surprising. The preceding holy days are included within the framework of the temporal of the Easter section (as was customary). The sanctoral begins with the Sending of the Apostles. Perhaps, a part of the folia of the sanctoral is missing up to (and including) the feast day of Hus? However, even further on, the sanctoral is oddly unfinished – after the Assumption, there follow only St. Wenceslaus (kyrie) and Michaelmas (kyrie), although no folia are missing (the holy days are contiguous on the same folio). Likewise, All Saints and a number of other important holy days are missing, and they are not even subsumed in the *commune sanctorum*. Perhaps, there was not enough time or money to finish the work. There is no reason to assume that the customers, the burghers of Rakovník, would have had an ideological reason to avoid commemorating certain saints.

³² Why is the *officium* of St. Procopius missing in the *Lounský graduál*, in the *Rybářovský graduál* and elsewhere? It was torn out by censors together with the neighbouring *officium* of Jan Hus. Táborský's first extant Czech Gradual (*Starší litoměřický*) does not contain offices for either St. Procopius or St. Sigismund. Here the cause was not destruction by a censor, but an early date. *Starší litoměřický graduál* belongs – from the viewpoint of the repertoire – partially to the earlier epoch together with *Třebeňický* and *Poděbradský graduály*, as well as the three earliest sixteenth-century Czech graduals (*Husitský, Graduál uchovávaný v muzeu v Sedlčanech*, and *Krolmusův kancionál*): none of these have as yet included a *proprium* for St. Procopius. Jan Táborský only later created a Czech *alleluia* for St. Procopius

attempt to explain the discrepancy. We shall again use the differentiation *per defectum* when the feast day is represented in the graduals less frequently than might be expected with respect to its rank, and *per excessum*, when the feast day is included in the graduals more frequently than its low rank would suggest.

Per defectum:

St. Matthias is a holy day of obligation, but often it is not included in the graduals. Perhaps, it remains hidden within the common of the apostles. The Annunciation to the Virgin Mary usually is not notated in the graduals; instead in most cases it is simply hidden as an Advent office. This is shown by the rubric in the *Solnický graduále* (f. 268v): *Na den vtělení Pána Krista Rosu dajte*.³³ Similar rubrics can be found elsewhere.

St. Adalbert is in graduals overlaid by St. George (same day, same *officium*). We can speak of a gradual assertion vis-à-vis George – the earliest sixteenth-century Graduals do not mention St. Adalbert, but later manuscripts list him explicitly next to George. [In Czech missals they are often listed on consecutive days. *Ed.*]

Sts. Philip and James are subsumed under the common of apostles.

St. Vitus is included in approximately one half of the graduals. He may be subsumed under the common of martyrs, since he lacks proper chants even where he is explicitly mentioned – he is covered simply by the general chants for martyrs.³⁴

St. Margaret appears substantially less frequently than does St. Mary Magdalene, although she also used to be a holy day of obligation.

St. James celebrated using the common of apostles (*commune apostolorum*)

St. Matthew celebrated using the common of apostles or evangelists

Sts. Simon and Jude celebrated using the common of apostles

St. Thomas celebrated using the common of apostles. He is, for instance,

and also an introit for St. Sigismund, which are then regularly found in the manuscripts of the second half of the sixteenth century. Moreover, even afterwards these chants of Jan Táborský are missing in the manuscripts of the region of Hradec Králové. For a closer look at the division of extant graduals into groups, based on the repertoire redactions, see *Graduale Bohemorum, Proprium sanctorum*, ed. Jiří Žůrek (Prague, 2011) especially 20–25.

³³ The occasional Christological relabeling of Marian holy days is also noteworthy. See, for instance, *Výroční písně*, MS Prague KNM, I.D.4, f. 73v: “Oficium na den Zvěstování Panně Marii, jinak den pamatný Početí Pana Gezu Krista.[Office for the Annunciation, otherwise a Commemoraton of the Conception of the Lord Jesus]” Certain theological shifts are also evident in renaming of the Assumption alternately as the feast day of the Burial, or the Dormition, of Virgin Mary.

[A number of examples of these theological shifts are noted in David R. Holeton, “The Saints and their place in the liturgy” in: *Lex orandi – lex credendi: the evolution of Utraquist theology*,” in: *Angelus pacis. Sborník prací k počtě Noemi Rejchrtové*, Pavel B. Kůrka, Jaroslav Pánek and Miroslav Polívka (eds.) (Prague, 2008) 259–265. *Ed.*]

³⁴ See *Graduale Bohemorum*, 31.

mentioned with reference to the chants for apostles in the index of *Husitský gradual* (f. 353r).

It is possible to sum up by observing that, in six cases out of ten, on the feasts of apostles the use of the common may be presumed. Similarly, in the cases of Sts. Adalbert and Vitus, the use of commons for martyrs may be presumed. In the case of the Annunciation the absence is explicable by the use of the Advent repertoire. The only remaining puzzle is the low ranking of St. Margaret.

Per excessum

The Conversion of St. Paul is almost always included in the graduals. Thus, for Utraquists, it was obviously a holy day of obligation.³⁵

St. George is very popular in the graduals, although his feast was not a holy day of obligatory. Only gradually, St. Adalbert was able to assert himself next to him.³⁶

The Visitation of the Virgin Mary had an uncertain status in the Catholic milieu among the holy days of obligation. It appears always in the graduals, which indicates its unquestionable popularity.

The feast day of Jan Hus was, of course, not recognised by the sub una authorities, but its celebration was one of the most important hallmarks of Utraquism. It was almost always present in the graduals, although in many cases the relevant folia have not survived due to their later destruction by the Counter-Reformation censors.

The Sending of the Apostles is frequently included in the graduals; the feast obviously belonged among the important apostolic holy days. According to the *Agenda česká*, it was known in all of Bohemia, reflecting the high rank of this holy day.

St. Anne, although not a holy day of obligation, nevertheless appears in the graduals fairly often.³⁷

³⁵ It is missing also in *Krčínův gradual* in Sedlčany. The manuscript has a series of empty folia so that a space might have been originally left for the Conversion of St. Paul before the *officium* for Candlemas (later the space was filled otherwise). The *Krčínův gradual* in general has a very limited sanctoral, inasmuch as the work was never completed. There are many empty folia in the bound codex and possibly certain additional – originally planned – *officia* were not delivered. One may speculate that perhaps the reason for not completing the gradual had to do with religious qualms about venerating certain saints. This, however, is difficult to prove.

³⁶ More detailed research on the occurrences of the *officia* might yield interesting results. The earliest sources lack these spring holy days. The cause might be in the structural weakness of the sanctoral, because these feast days were often added to the temporal of Easter. If for some reason they were initially left out of the temporal, their subsequent recording at the beginning of the sanctoral was omitted. Another reason might have been the priority of Eastertide over the feasts of saints.

³⁷ The earliest sixteenth-century Czech graduals do not include this holy day. Likewise, it is not included in the graduals of Poděbrady, Třebenice, or Solnice. This document with which

The Transfiguration of the Lord is found in almost in every gradual as a feast that gained widespread popularity in Bohemia after its universal extension in 1457.

The Beheading of St. John the Baptist was not a holy day of obligation, but appears very frequently in the graduals, except for the East Bohemian tradition.

The Exaltation of the Holy Cross is not included in Utraquist lists among the holy days of obligation, yet even so the feast day is often notated in the graduals.

The Feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins (St. Ursula) was not a holy day of obligation, but its occasional appearance in the graduals attests to its popularity.

The cases of these holy days, kept in a certain sense *per excessum*, are a very important find, because they supplement and distinctly correct the idea of the holy days of obligation, which is derived from official documents. This is especially true in cases, when the proper appears in almost all of the graduals and we can be certain that the holy day was considered one of high rank, and hence perceived by most of the Bohemian Church as one of obligation (Conversion of St. Paul, Visitation of the Virgin Mary, Sending of the Apostles, Transfiguration of the Lord, Beheading of St. John the Baptist, and Exaltation of the Holy Cross). In a number of parishes the traditionally observed holy days of obligation also included St. George, St. Anne and, perhaps, also the Eleven Thousand Virgins.

The findings listed above, of course, are valid only on a general level. In each case it would be necessary to assess separately, why any given saint was or was not represented in any given gradual. This could be a subject for further research. Here the starting point will be the fact that the Czech gradual was not in a fixed and stable form. Instead, every author was an innovator and to a certain degree created each time a new product. There was no *editio typica*. It was not a matter mainly of copying earlier versions, as in the case of Latin graduals. On the other hand, there is a certain element of economy present in the creation of Czech graduals, as though the order for them stipulated: deliver us exactly that, and only that, which is necessary for the liturgical process, that is, *propria* for the most important holy days, while *commune*

these three graduals have something in common are the earliest redactions of Czech chant, although their origin falls into another era. East Bohemian manuscripts also lacked an interest in this holy day, except that it appears in the two-volume *Dvoudílný český graduál kostela sv. Ducha*, which, in turn, confirms that this gradual embraced both the East Bohemian and the Prague choral traditions. The holy day is included in both the first and the second redaction of Táborský's graduals, from which the holy day found its way into some of the manuscripts of Jan Kantor. It is clear then that certain holy days were disseminated in Czech graduals in only some redactions – another reason to assume that the resulting form of the gradual's content was due to the authorial input of its creator.

are enough for the rest of the feast days. Do not prescribe too many rubrics in full detail, instead let every user of the gradual be governed by general or local custom.³⁸ Thus the contents of Czech graduals appear to be modest as far as the sanctoral is concerned when compared with the earlier Latin ones.

5. Notes on the Sanctoral in Some Specific Sources

As an excursus, I will now present minor notes on the peculiarities of the sanctoral in selected Czech graduals.

Editor's note: Titles of graduals have been left in Czech. Most are in the adjectival form of the town in which the codex was written and/or is presently held. Locating the text will be easier using this title than with an English translation.

Husitský graduál

A gradual of the Library of the National Museum, sign. V B 5 belongs among the earliest extant graduals from the sixteenth century.³⁹ The venture shows certain signs of imperfect coordination. The entire spring sanctoral is missing except for the feast days which were still part of the post-Christmas cycle (the Conversion of St. Paul and Candlemas). The section *de sanctis* does not then begin until the Nativity of John the Baptist [24 June]. Several of the missing feast days are subsumed under *commune* (John the Baptist, Sts. Peter and Paul, Michaelmas). The second principal scribe added a *registrum* (index), which also covers feast days but which lack rubrics of their own in the gradual; the spring feast days, however, are again passed over in silence. A remarkable aspect of the manuscript is that it is the only Czech gradual to include the proper of a mass for the vigil of the Assumption.

Manuscripts of Jan Táborský of Klokotská Hora

The manuscripts of the famous workshop of Jan Táborský are largely consistent for a given redaction.⁴⁰ His products show certain common features

³⁸ Utraquist authorities sometimes disapproved of this aspect of a certain arbitrariness in the use of songs at mass, see, for instance, the complaint: "... bloudí, když zpívání obecné církve od starodávna zachovávaná proměňují a opouštějí, a jiná od osob ledasjakých skládaná v kostelích zpívají ... [they wander around when they alter and foresake the singing from ancient times preserved by the universal church, and sing in the church other songs composed by all sorts of people...]", viz *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících a jiné listiny téže strany se týkající z let 1562–1570* [Protocols and Letters of the Utraquist Consistory], ed. Julius Pažout (Prague, 1906) 437.

³⁹ See Jiří Žůrek, "The Analogies between the Chants of the Jistebnický Kancionál and the Repertory of the Oldest Czech Graduals in the 16th Century," in *Hudební věda* 48 (2011) 41–78.

⁴⁰ For the distinction of redactions see, for instance, Jiří Žůrek, "Proměny českého chorálu v 16. století, Pokus o klasifikaci redakcí českého chorálu 16. století na příkladu aleluja ke

according to their date of origin, regardless of by whom they were ordered. From this it follows that Táborský had a lion's share in the substance of what was recorded.⁴¹ Incidentally, this is attested by the famous dispute between him and the mining officials (*šepmistři*) of Kutná Hora, who were reluctant to accept an already finished work because of the small size of the musical notes. Táborský retorted that the officials of Kutná Hora's heterodox reservations toward the veneration of saints were the real reason for their rejection of certain chants in the sanctoral.⁴² Táborský has clearly helped to develop the sanctoral cycle of the Czech gradual by complementing it with new proper chants (St. Anne, St. Procopius, the Eleven Thousand Virgins, St. Sigismund). This sprang from his creativity as an author, something which has not yet been sufficiently explored – both the now outdated study of D. Orel⁴³ and the more recent efforts of B. Graham⁴⁴ entirely ignore Táborský's contribution to Czech choral music for their interest lay (with the exception of a single sequence) only in the song compositions of this truly Renaissance man. Táborský was, in fact, a prolific author also in the area of Czech choral music, as attested by the acronym INT in the margins of folia in a number of chants in his graduals.⁴⁵

Solnický gradual

Manuscript of the Library of the National Museum, sign. 1 A 17, is noteworthy among Czech graduals due to its extensive sanctoral. A number of lesser feasts not mentioned in any other Czech Gradual: Blasius, Scholastica, Translation of the Relics of St. Wenceslaus, Gregory, Lucy; and others occur only once in other Czech graduals: Valentine, Gall, and Barbara. These saints, however, lack proper chants of their own; their *officia* merely contain rubrical references. The table, especially shows a contiguous series of winter feast days

svátku Nanebevzetí Panny Marie [Changes of Czech Chant in the Sixteenth Century: An Attempt at the Classification of the Sixteenth-Century Czech Chant on the Basis of the Alleluia for the Feast of the Assumption], in *Hudební věda* 47 (2010) 333–350. For a list of Táborský Graduals see, for instance, Graham 87–88.

⁴¹ This is reconfirmed by the earlier observation that sanctorals from various sources existed in a single choir loft may have been heterogeneous, especially if they had been written by different authors.

⁴² See Josef Šimek, "Zpráva o Kaňkovském graduale [Report about the Kaňkovský gradual]," in *PA* 15 (1891) 461–464.

⁴³ Dobroslav Orel, "Jana Táborského proza o mistru Janovi z Husince [Jan Táborský's Prose about Master Jan of Husinec]," *Bratislava* 6 (1932) 196–237.

⁴⁴ Barry F.H. Graham, "Jan Táborský and the Vodňany kancionál," *StR* 34 (2001) 220–229.

⁴⁵ Of course, Jaromír Linda errs when he ascribes to Táborský the authorship of the melodies of some chants in the *Žlutický graduál*, see Jaromír Linda, "Jasnost slunečná všhecko ovětluje? [The Light of Sun Illuminates All?]," in *Žlutický kancionál 1558–2008*, ed. Petr Brodský (Žlutice 2008) 44–50, here 48. It is obvious that the melodies are adopted from traditional Latin chants. Jan Táborský's authorship thus can refer only to the creation (or at least an editorial adjustment) of Czech texts and to adjustments to the adopted choral melody of this Czech text.

between Candlemas and the Annunciation which are usually missing in other graduals. Considering that this period usually coincided with Pre-Lent and Lent, this phenomenon tends to confirm the impression that the majority of Utraquist parishes liturgically gave preference to the temporal.

Českoskalický graduál

It is evident that the East Bohemian version of Czech choral music, as a general rule, includes fewer saints' days. The one exception is the two-volume *Dvoudílný český graduál kostela sv. Ducha*, which shows signs of influence by the Prague tradition. Of course, an exceptional place in the limitation of the sanctoral belongs to the gradual from *Česká Skalice*, in which only three holy days are found: the Purification of the Virgin Mary, Jan Hus, and the Assumption. Noteworthy is that there are no missing folia between Hus and the Assumption. This deepens the mystery behind the cause and the purpose of this truncated sanctoral. In addition the given church did not limit its veneration of saints to the three included by name; this is shown by the presence of *commune apostolorum*. Perhaps, the ultimate answer may be that this gradual is merely a fragment of the originally intended project.

Třebeňský graduál

This Gradual has a rather elaborate *commune*. Moreover, the particular groups of saints are divided according to their numbers – one type of *officium* is designed for a group of confessors, another type for a single confessor. At the same time, the rubrics of the *proprium de sanctis* mention virtually no case for which the given *commune* would be applicable. This clearly confirms the assumption that also the lesser saints – in no way visible in the gradual – could and were celebrated by the chants of the *commune*. Otherwise the presence of such a *commune* in the gradual would be inexplicable.

Sedlčanský graduál Krčínův

There is as yet no definite answer to the question of why in the *Sedlčanský graduál Krčínův* some important *officia* are lacking (for instance, the Conversion of St. Paul). It is, however, not probable that the parishioners of Sedlčany did not wish to commemorate particular saints for reasons of ecclesiastical politics, or of theological conviction. It seems more plausible that the Gradual was not entirely completed, as blank pages – or pages filled with irrelevancies – indicate.

Rakovnický graduál

Aside from missing folia, it is also notable that this gradual remained unfinished, inasmuch as it ends in August. Up to that point, it contains reference to all the traditional holy days, including the lesser ones. After the Assumption, however, it does not continue, except for several chants for St. Wenceslaus

and the Holy Angels. It does not even contain All Saints, one of the greatest holy days in the year. Apparently, a lack of financial means prevented completion of the liturgical book.

Liturgické knihy Tobiáš Závorky

The author allegedly represented a Lutheran orientation towards Utraquism. Actually his *Pravidlo služebností církevních* and his *Písně chval Božských* do not help to clarify what it meant to be a Lutheran in the theological and liturgical sense. With respect to the mass and to the liturgical calendar he remains an orthodox Utraquist, in his version there was very little Lutheran influence, instead it was rather the traditional Utraquist Eucharistic liturgy, including, for instance, the canon of the mass,⁴⁶ which was the litmus test of the orthodoxy of a Utraquist priest.⁴⁷

6. Conclusion

The hitherto discussed observations and comparisons unambiguously indicate that the representation of a given saint in sixteenth-century Czech graduals depended on the rank of the given feast day. Thus the most represented feast days belonged those that were traditionally obligatory: the Epiphany, the Purification of the Virgin Mary (Candlemas), the Nativity of John the Baptist, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. Mary Magdalene, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, Michaelmas, and All Saints.

Some of the holy days of obligation are represented less frequently than one might have expected and, in those cases, it is necessary to seek an explanation. The issue concerns the feast days of the apostles, the Annunciation, St. Margaret, St. Nicholas, and certain holy days of Czech saints and patrons. The disparity between the high rank of these holy days and their relatively infrequent occurrence in the graduals can be explained in most cases by the use of chants from the commons or songs from another hymnal. This was true of the holy days of certain Bohemian patrons (Sts. Adalbert, Vitus, Sigismund, and Ludmila), for whom the common chants for martyrs, or for holy women, could be utilised. In addition, it is necessary to take into account that the ranking of these feasts vacillated. The absence of propers for the feast of the Annunciation could easily be explained by the use of the *Rorate* office during Advent on this occasion.

⁴⁶ See: Tobiáš Závorka Lipenský, *Pravidlo služebností církevních* [The Rules of Ecclesiastical Services], f. CXLII and preceded by a very traditional *canon missæ* on the verso side of f. CXXI. For a more detailed analysis of the structure and sources of the eucharistic prayer in *Pravidlo služebností* see Pavel Kolář, "Canon missæ in the Rule of Ecclesiastical Services of Tobiáš Závorka Lipenský, and Its Source" in this volume.

⁴⁷ See also *Jednání a dopisy konistoře pod obojí*, ed. Julius Pažout, 256, 292 or 316.

In this connection it is necessary to mention a “defect” in Czech gradu-als, many of which do not contain propers for the celebration of the patron saint (*patrocinium*) of the local church. It is, however, unimaginable, that the patronal feast of the local church would not be celebrated liturgically. Nevertheless, the *Českobrodský graduál* lacks an *officium* for St. Gothard; the *Svatovalentinský graduál* lacks an *officium* for St. Valentine, and so forth. Just exceptionally, we are in luck when, for instance, *Svatohavelský graduál* (f. 320r-v) has rubrics for St. Gall, but only in sequences, not in the sanctoral. Other instances occur when the *patrocinium* of a church coincides with one of the major holy days. However, in such cases the *officium* is not usually distinctly marked or provided with relevant chants; even the rubric of the type *O svatém Kříži, dědici tohoto Božího domu* in the *Rybářovský graduál* (f. K8) is entirely exceptional. An explanation of this anomaly has not yet been found.

A kind of domestic tradition (local liturgical *proprium*) is manifest in that – besides holy days of the highest ranking – Czech gradu-als also frequently tend to include holy days of a lower rank (non-obligatory) or such, for which the degree of *feriation* had vacillated. Thus, it appears that these holy days were also traditionally celebrated – throughout the land in the words of the *Agenda česká* – as holy days of obligation, without the author-ization of the existing ecclesiastical order. These were: the Conversion of St. Paul,⁴⁸ the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, M. Jan Hus, the Sending the Apostles, the Transfiguration of the Lord, and the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. Also the Beheading of John the Baptist and St. Anne appear relative-ly frequently in the gradu-als, despite the lack of an official obligatory status. The sanctorals of Czech gradu-als complement and make more precise the information about the rank of holy days, which can be obtained through research in official documents. It is, however, necessary to add a note of caution: our analysis enabled us to look at only one type of liturgical source, namely, the Czech-language gradu-als. A complex view of the sixteenth-century Utraquist calendar would require further study of antiphonaries, kancionáls, calendars, missals, Latin gradu-als, lectionaries – indeed, also sermon collections.

Among Czech saints and patrons, the leading place – besides Master Jan Hus – is undoubtedly occupied by St. Wenceslaus, whose feast occurs in

⁴⁸ Concerning the celebration of the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, I once tried to demon-strate that the high degree of “feriation” had the devious motivation of serving as a coun-terweight to the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, or the Chair of St. Peter, which tend to glorify the Roman papacy. Certain anti-Roman allusions can be detected in the texts for the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul. See Jiří Žůrek, “Officium sv. Pavla na víru obrácení [Officium for the Conversion of St. Paul],” in *Pulchritudo et Sapientia*, ed. Zuzana Silagiová, Hana Šedinová and Petr Kitzler (Prague 2008) 288–305, esp. 295–296. [Ed. Czech gradu-als fre-quently interpolate anti-Roman polemic into their translations of Latin texts. See: “Liturgy as polemic: an evolving ecclesiology,” in Holeton, “*Lex orandi – lex credendi...*”, 265–269]

almost all the extant sources. The texts of recorded prayers, however, indicate that Jan Hus had actually taken over the role of the principal patron of the Bohemian lands.⁴⁹ One half of the graduals also contains Ludmila, St. Procopius (in many places torn out together with the *officium* of the Bohemian Martyrs), and St. Vitus. The feast day of St. Sigismund, on the contrary, entirely disappeared; it was included only by Jan Táborský in the graduals of the first edition; it can also be found in *Litomyšlský graduál*, which has much in common with Táborský's edition. Finally, the feast day of St. Adalbert was just gradually gaining ground next to the feast of St. George, with which the date had occurred.⁵⁰ The graduals do not support the idea that during the sixteenth century "properly speaking only the feast of St. Wenceslaus was kept," because a considerable portion of Czech graduals include the feast days of all the other Czech saints.⁵¹ Rather, it is more plausible to agree with the conclusion of Halama's article in which he sums up his research findings as follows:

The sources of Utraquist provenance document that the veneration of Czech saints among the adherents of the Church sub utraque in our lands did not differ much from the veneration which these saints enjoyed within the framework of the Roman Church. The Utraquist Church and the Church sub una celebrated liturgically the feast days of all the Czech saints, even though the Utraquist added and, indeed, gave higher rank to the feast of Hus.⁵²

This conclusion is fully confirmed by our research into Czech sixteenth-century graduals and an examination of documents of both ecclesiastical authorities. It is clearly evident that the selection of the holy days of obligation in the sixteenth century basically coincided in the sanctoral of the Utraquists and the sub una. This contrasts in particular with the drastically reduced sanctoral of the *Agenda česká* of 1581, which took for its model German Lutheran agenda, in which the principal of *Sola Scriptura* unambiguously prevailed in the question of celebrating holy days – the compilers of the *Agenda* included exclusively the commemoration of persons or events

⁴⁹ See, for instance, the antiphon *Křista, krále mučedlnikův* [Christ the King of the martyrs] (*Graduale Bohemorum*, 138–139), introit *Radujme se všickni* [Let Us All Rejoice], (*ibid.*, 141), alleluia *Chvála čest* [Praise, Honour] (*ibid.*, 144) and others.

⁵⁰ Ota Halama in a discussion at the symposium of the BRRP on 20 June 2012 confirmed that also homilies in the last third of the sixteenth century tended to promote St. Adalbert along side St. George. This elevation might have been related to the re-occupation of the Prague archiepiscopal chair in 1561, when reality confronted the Utraquists' yearning for a good Czech bishop, for whom St. Adalbert would serve as a good model. [Because of the occurrence with St. Adalbert on 23 April, St. George was often celebrated in Bohemia on the 24th rather than on his traditional Western date of the 23rd. Ed.]

⁵¹ Halama, *Utravistická úcta*, 194.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 196–197.

found in Scripture. It is, of course, questionable where, if at all, this *Agenda česká* was in practical use, and whether it had any legitimising authority behind it. As shown by the graduals, the preponderant majority of localities where they were used, attest to the traditional Utraquist practice. Not even the *Graduál českoskalický* with its extremely abbreviated sanctoral does not attest to an influence of the theological currents which had finally led to the formulation of the *Agenda česká*. In distinction from the *Agenda*, the *Graduál* includes as one of the three holy days the Assumption, but it has neither the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, nor the Sending of the Apostles, nor the Transfiguration of the Lord. Thus, we do not find a single gradual which was composed on the basis of the requirements of the *Agenda česká*. Instead, it rather appears that the project of the *Agenda česká* was a rather limited undertaking in both space and time.

Differences in the ranking of feasts between the sub una and the Utraquists are noticeable only in several cases: the Conversion of St. Paul – *per excessum*, St. Vitus – *per defectum*, M. Jan Hus – *per excessum*, the Sending of the Apostles – *per excessum*, and the Transfiguration of the Lord – *per excessum*; we also notice several cases of vacillation: St. Adalbert, the Invention of the Holy Cross, St. Procopius, St. Margaret, St. Ludmila, and St. Nicholas.

Differences in rank, however, exist also among individual official documents of the party sub una. Thus we can say with the words of the late Cardinal Josef Beran that: “in practice a certain confusion prevailed in Bohemia in the practice of celebrating feast days,”⁵³ or one may speak of a certain arbitrariness or freedom. Even this, of course, operated within the framework of a local, and sometimes also a wider tradition. Such an approach is ultimately documented by the Consistory’s recommendation to the town of Kadaň: “You are obliged to celebrate the holy days, which are customary in your town.”⁵⁴ Thus, Utraquism appears again as an orientation, which is firmly rooted in its tradition (namely, the tradition of the Western Latin Church), while at the same time it does not abandon a certain feature of individual or collective freedom for particular exceptions, within the framework of the broad limits laid down by this tradition.

7. Key to the Table of Feast Days

Columns 1–7 on the left side of the table record the sanctoral of selected Roman and non-Roman documents, which are important for understanding the situation of celebrating holy days in the sixteenth century. The degree of obligation of a feast day is noted by the following signs:

⁵³ Beran, *Mešní liturgie*, 66.

⁵⁴ *Jednání a dopisy*, ed. Klement Borový, 230.

X: the feast day belonged among the non-obligatory or lesser holy days.

Z: the holy day was obligatory.

(Z): the holy day was obligatory, but is not listed in the source under its own name, only under a collective name.

Column 8 shows the names of the holy days found in sixteenth-century Czech graduals.

BMV: *Beata Maria virgo* and designates feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Column 9 shows the date on which the holy day is celebrated.

Column 10 shows the total number of times that the holy day appears in the graduals.

In the case of the holy days of M. Jan Hus and St. Procopius, in which we find a large number of folia torn out by the censors, the figure represents a sum of the extant records of the holy day plus the number of the records, which are presumed to have been destroyed by the censor.

Column 11 and the rest indicate the concrete form of the sanctoral in each of the explored graduals.

An occurrence of the holy day is noted in the following manner (see Appendix):

Figure 1 in a shaded box: the holy day is recorded in the gradual.

Letter A in a shaded box: the holy day was torn out of the gradual, but its original presence in the Gradual can be assumed as probable

Letter M in a dark shaded box: an empty space is in the gradual in the place of the holy day.

Letter V in a dark shaded box: torn out pages in the gradual, and their original content is uncertain.

It remains to note that the graduals are arranged in the table according to particular redactions (versions) of the Czech choral music. To a certain degree this corresponds to a chronological order; hence the earliest graduals are on the left, the most recent ones on the right. The division of the groups is as follows:

I, the earliest Czech sixteenth-century Graduals.

II. 1. Táborský's redaction.

III. East Bohemian redaction.

IV. 2, Táborský's redaction and the redaction of Jan Kantor.

V. Later manuscripts of individual creativity.

For a more exact identification of the individual graduals with redactions of the Bohemian choral music see *Graduale bohemorum*, 18–25. The known, or at least the approximate, date of each source is given in the following list.

8. List of Graduals Noted in the Article and the Table

- MS Brno, Moravský zemský archiv, Fond G 11, FM 631, *Tištínský kancionál*, po r. 1600 (BrMZA_Tiš).
- MS Česká Skalice, Muzeum Boženy Němcové, O 13291, *Českoskalický graduál*, 1567 (ČeSkal_G).
- MS Dačice, Městské muzeum a galerie, R 23, *Dačický graduál*, 1586–1587 (Dač_G).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 8, *Český graduál literátského bratrstva při kostele sv. Ducha*, 1564 (Hr8).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 10, *Český kancionál*, 2. pol. 16. stol (Hr10).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 13 a HR 14, *Dvoudílný český graduál kostela sv. Ducha*, 1584–1604 (Hr13+14).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 16, *Graduál kostela sv. Anny v Kuklenách*, kolem 1580 (Hr16).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 42, *Graduál lochenických literátů*, 1586–1597 (Hr42).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 43, *Graduál kostela v Nedělišti*, kolem 1600 (Hr43).
- MS Hradec Králové, Muzeum východních Čech, HR 57, *Graduál z Žiželic*, 1550–1553 (Hr57).
- MS Hradec Králové, Státní okresní archiv, a 1–20, *Graduál z Nového Bydžova*, asi 1583 (Nbydž_G).
- MS Chrudim, Regionální muzeum, inv. č. 12579, *Chrudimský český graduál*, 1570 a později.
- MS Chrudim, Regionální muzeum, inv. č. 27409, *Graduál kůru sv. Jiljí*, posl. třetina 16. stol.
- MS Jílové, Regionální muzeum, inv. č. 1000, č. 27, *Jílovský graduál*, asi 1580–1590 (Jil_G).
- MS Klatovy, Vlastivědné muzeum Dr. Hostaše, MS. 1, *Klatovský český graduál*, 1560 (Kt_Ms1).
- MS Kolín, Regionální muzeum, př. č. 80/88, *Kolínský kancionál*, asi 1512–1517.
- MS Kroměříž, Arcibiskupský zámek, knihovna, M I-1, *Svatohaštalský graduál*, asi 1580.
- MS Litoměřice, Oblastní muzeum, inv. č. 12952, *Mladší litoměřický graduál*, 1578.
- MS Litomyšl, Regionální muzeum, př. č. 104/70, *Litomyšlský graduál*, 1561–1563 (Limyšl_G).
- MS Louny, Státní okresní archiv, I G 9, *Lounský graduál*, 1561–1563 (Lou_IG9).
- MS Mladá Boleslav, Muzeum mladoboleslavska, II A 2, *Mladoboleslavský český graduál*, 1571–1572 (MlaBol_IIA2).

- MS Nový Jičín, Státní okresní archiv, inv. č. 188, *Přiborský kancionál*, 2. pol. 16. stol. a později.
- MS Poděbrady, Polabské muzeum, C-5, *Poděbradský graduál*, 1559 (Poděb_G).
- MS Prague, Knihovna Národního muzea, I.A.17, *Solnický graduál*, před 1558 (PrM_IA17).
- MS Prague, Knihovna Národního muzea, I.D.4, *Výroční písně*, po 1600 (PrM_ID4).
- MS Prague, Knihovna Národního muzea, II.B.4, *Písně svaté*, kolem 1600 (PrM_IIB4).
- MS Prague, Knihovna Národního muzea, IV.B.9, *Krolmusův kancionál*, kolem 1530 (PrM_IVB9).
- MS Prague, Knihovna Národního muzea, V.B.5, *Husitský graduál*, kolem 1530 (PrM_VB5).
- MS Prague, Muzeum hlavního města Prahy, D 1270, *Graduál záduší sv. Vavřince*, 1581–1582.
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.3, *Malostranský graduál*, 1569–1572 (PrN_XVIIA3).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.31 a XVII.A.32 a XVII.A.39, *Graduály novoměstských řezníků*, 1567–1574 (PrN_XVIIA31+32+39).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.40, *Staroměstský graduál*, 1561 a později (PrN_XVIIA40).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.41 a XVII.B.19, *Dvoudílný svatohavelský graduál*, 1576 (PrN_svHavla).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.42, *Graduál z Nového města nad Metují*, 1604 (PrN_XVIIA42).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.53a a XVII.A.53b, *Dvoudílný graduál z Lomnice nad Popelkou*, 1578 a později (PrN_XVIIA53a+b).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.A.54, *Graduál kostela sv. Vojtěcha většního*, konec 16. stol. (PrN_XVIIA54).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.B.20, *Českobrodský graduál*, 1557 a později (PrN_XVIIIB20).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.B.8, *Konvolut zlomků graduálů*, 16. stol. (PrN_XVIIIB8).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.B.21, *Graduál psaný od Jakuba Sklenáře*, 1574 a později (PrN_XVIIIB21).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XVII.E.97, *Kancionál užívaný v kostele v Kuněticích*, kolem 1600.
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, fond Křižovnická knihovna, XVIII.A.6 a XVIII.A.7, *Dvoudílný graduál od sv. Valentina*, 1559 a později (PrN_XVIIIA6+7).
- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, XXIII.B.2, *Svatoštěpánský graduál*, 1573 a později.

- MS Prague, Národní knihovna, 54.B.38, Tobiáš Závorka Lipenský, *Písně chval Božských*, 1602 (Záv_1606).
- MS Prague, Památník národního písemnictví, Tr I 27, *Žlutický graduál*, 1558–1559 (Žlu_G).
- MS Prague, Strahovská knihovna, DA I 6, *Starší litoměřický graduál*, 1542–1544 (PrS_DAI6).
- MS Příbram, Hornické muzeum, L 264 a L 265, *Dvoudílný příbramský graduál*, 1579 a později (Příbram_G).
- MS Rakovník, Muzeum TGM, B 98 a B 99, *Dvoudílný rakovnický graduál*, 1594–1596 (Rak_G).
- MS Rakovník, Muzeum TGM, inv. č. 95/2002, *Rakovnický kancionál* (part tenoru), 1583–1598.
- MS Rychnov nad Kněžnou, Muzeum a galerie Orlických hor, př. č. 829/87 (pův. 562/74), *Graduál z Kostelce nad Orlicí*, 1589 (Rych_G).
- MS Sedlčany, Městské muzeum, M-1, *Krčínův graduál*, 1582–1596 (Sedl_M1).
- MS Sedlčany, Městské muzeum, M-4, *Graduál uchovávaný v muzeu v Sedlčanech*, asi 1530–1550 (Sedl_M4).
- MS Teplice, Regionální muzeum, Ms. 1, *Teplický graduál*, 1560 (Tep_G).
- MS Třebechovice pod Orebem, Třebechovické muzeum betlémů, př. č. 126/81 (pův. 519/53), *Třebechovický graduál*, 1559 (Třebech_G).
- MS Třebenice, Městský úřad, (dnes uložen v Oblastním archivu v Litoměřicích), bez sign., *Třebenický graduál*, 1574–1575 (Třebce_G).
- MS Ústí nad Orlicí, Děkanský farní úřad, bez signatury, *Graduál z Ústí nad Orlicí*, 1588 a později (ÚO_G).
- MS Vídeň, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Mus.Hs.15503, *Graduál z Čáslavi*, 1557 (W_15503).
- MS Vídeň, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Mus.Hs.15509, *Rybářovský graduál*, 1568 (W_15509)

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David
with the assistance of Brian Pollock

							I.		II.											
1350 Armošt	1559 Constitutiones	1605 Synod. Berka	1524 Hromm. art.	1548 Instr. Kadaň	1549 Dopis Ferd.	1581 Agenda čes.	svátek	datum	výskyt celkem	PrM_VB5	PrM_IVB9	Sedl_M4	PrS_DAI6	PrN_XVIB20	W_15503	Zlu_G	PrM_JAI7	PrN_XVIII6+7	Poděb_G	Třebce_G
Z	Z		(Z)				Ludmila	16. 9.	24	1			1	1	1	1		1		
Z	Z	Z	(Z)	(Z)	(Z)	X	Matheus	21. 9.	23	1						1	1	1	1	
Z	Z	Z	(Z)		Z		Wenceslaus	28. 9.	37	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Angeli	29. 9.	40	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
							Gallus	16. 10.	3	1							1			
X	X		(Z)	(Z)	(Z)		Lucas	18. 10.	2											
							Ursula	21. 10.	13	1				1	1	1		1		
Z	Z	Z	(Z)	(Z)	(Z)	X	Simon & Iuda	28. 10.	17	1				1	1	1		1	1	
Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z		Omnes sancti	1. 11.	40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	Z	Z		Z	Z		Martinus	11. 11.	30	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	Z	Z			Z		Katharina	25. 11.	28	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	Z	Z	(Z)	(Z)	(Z)	X	Andreas	30. 11.	30	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1
							Barbara	4. 12.	3								1			
Z	Z			Z	Z		Nicolaus	6. 12.	19	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1
		X					BMV conceptio	8. 12.	2											
							Lucia	13. 12.	1								1			
							Sapientia Dei	17. 12.	2											
Z	Z	Z	(Z)	(Z)	(Z)	X	Thoma	21. 12.	7	1							1			
Z	Z	Z		Z			Stephanus	26. 12.	32	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	Z	Z	(Z)	(Z)	(Z)		Iohannes evangelista	27. 12.	32	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
							Innocentes	28. 12.	14	1	1								1	

							COMMUNE														
							Maria		25		1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1
			Z		Z		apostoli		38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1
							evangelistae		13	1											1
							martires		40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
							confessores		39	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
							patroni		16				1	1	1	1	1				1
							virgines		37	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1
Z	Z	Z					dedicatio	(1. 10.)	40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1

