
The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: a textual study

David R. Holeton
(Prague)

Introduction

Controversy characterized the Bohemian eucharistic movement throughout its history. From the early attacks on Jan Milíč and his eschatologically charged frequent communion movement (which culminated in the dissolution of his “Jerusalem” community shortly after his death) until long after the defeat of the Bohemian Estates at Bílá Hora when the last Counter-Reformation tracts were written against the Utraquist eucharistic practices of the lay chalice and the communion of infants, there was rarely a moment when controversy did not figure large around both the theology and ceremonial of the eucharist. The restoration of frequent communion created a crisis in the theological language that could be used of the eucharist and lead to accusations of Wyclifite remnantism.¹ The restoration of communion *sub utraque* was condemned at Constance and, of course, never ceased to distinguish Bohemia’s place in the western church until after the suppression of the practice during the years following Bílá Hora. The communion of the very young was never without its Romanist and, later, Protestant opponents. In its earliest period, Utraquism suffered reproach from the Tábórites for

1) Because the Bohemian eucharistic movement was the first of many similar mediæval movements to be successful in its goal of restoring the practice of frequent communion, it was also the first to face the problems engendered by the paradox of the increasingly restrictive spectrum of “orthodox” sacramental language which evolved during the course of the middle ages. While the communion of the faithful remained primarily ocular rather than gustatory, there was no need to use the biblical or patristic language of “meal” or of its constitutive elements of bread and wine. Once, however, the laity again began to receive communion frequently, this language again became current – particularly with the renewed understanding of the eucharist as eschatological banquet. Such a development of eucharistic language, however, was fraught with theological dangers particularly in the face of the reaction against Wyclif’s remnantism when such language became highly suspect theologically. See David R. Holeton, “The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement in European Perspective”, in *BRRP*, 1 (1996) 23ff. and “Liturgická a svátostná teologie mistra Jana Husa”, *Theologická revue* 1, (1996) 9–10. Stanislav Sousedik does not take account of this paradox in his article “Huss et la doctrine eucharistique ‘rémanentiste’” *Divinitas* 21,3 (1977) 382ff. which is the most recent attempt to convict Hus of remnantism.

refusing to abandon the traditional rites and ceremonies of the mass;² later, similar reproach was made by the nascent Jednota Bratrská.³ From Romanists, Utraquism was subject to recrimination for having done the very opposite and, allegedly, having abandoned the traditional rites and ceremonies or, worse still, for having introduced liturgical novelties.⁴

It is this early period of controversy that is best known to students of the Bohemian Reformation. In part, this is due to the public acrimony which characterized the debates but also because the “symbols of dispute” (frequent communion, the lay chalice, vesture, ceremonial etc.) which were the focus of controversy are powerful symbols in themselves. As such, they were highly visible and easily accessible even to those with little theological interest. They were capable of eliciting powerful visceral reactions at the time and can do so to this very day. This familiarity with the early period of liturgical controversy within Utraquism stands in marked contrast with a general ignorance of Utraquism’s later liturgical practices. These have often been treated rather dismissively by historians – sometimes through ignorance of the actual practices themselves but more frequently, perhaps, because later Utraquism did not accede to the liturgical practices of the sixteenth century Reformation and, to the undiscerning eye, appeared to cling too closely to the practices of mediæval catholicism.

Ironically, later Utraquism passed neither the “protestant” liturgical standards of the sixteenth century Reformers nor the “catholic” standards of the Counter-Reformers. Over the past centuries, and even to our own day, the progeny of the Counter-Reformers too often work from the *a priori* assumption that Utraquism and, consequently, its liturgical practice was

2) These reproaches, which figure throughout the contacts between Prague and Tábor, are well contextualized by Howard Kaminsky *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967) cc. VII, VIII and IX. The most developed articulation of the Táborite position extant is to be found in the 1431 University debate between Mikuláš of Pelhřimov and Jan Rokycana. See Amedeo Molnár and Romolo Cegna edd. *Confessio Taboritarum* (Rome, 1983) 88–100; 298–318. According to Vavřinec of Brězová, (*Historia Hussitica* 398, 400, 403ff.) Táborite attitudes to the traditional rites and ceremonies manifested itself in acts of vandalism (destroying liturgical vessels, vestments and books) and sacrilege (trammelling into the ground hosts consecrated by the Roman rite).

3) See David R. Holeton, “Church or Sect?: The Jednota Bratrská and the Growth of Dissent from Mainline Utraquism”, *CV* 38, 1 (1996) 17ff.

4) Among the earliest of such lists is a “catalogue of errors” compiled by the Canons of Olomouc in 1416 although the “errors” listed here are primarily those of sectarian radicals and not those of mainline Utraquists. *AÖG* 82 (1895) 386–391. In the Spring of 1418 Martin V along with the Council of Constance wrote to Wenceslaus IV outlining conditions to be fulfilled if the Bohemian Church were to be fully reconciled with Rome. (*FRA* VI 240–242) These demands included not only the suppression of communion *sub utraque* but also the demand that “the rites and ceremonies of the Christian [i.e. Roman] religion be observed and that those who do not be punished”. *Ibid.* 242 n.22.

inherently heretical.⁵ Similarly, the children of the Second Reformation (of the sixteenth century) despair because the Utraquism did not adumbrate with sufficient clarity their own reformation nor did it adopt the theological positions or the liturgical reforms of the other reformed churches once they had become known.⁶ “Neo-utraquism”, a nineteenth century neologism, became an epithet for a church reviled by some as only “half-reformed” and dismissed by others as suffering the lingering malaise of a catholic church infected by a not-quite-terminal dose of German Lutheranism. This evaluation of Utraquist liturgical practices has generally been achieved, however, without a close examination of the actual liturgical texts themselves. Needless to say, this has not served the study of later Utraquism well. It is to that question that we must now turn.

Among liturgists of our own day, Prosper of Aquitaine’s dictum “lexem credendi lex statuat supplicandi – let the law of prayer establish the law of belief”⁷ has come to serve as an important lens through which we can come to a better understanding of the actual belief and practice of a particular church at a particular time. It is my intention to use Prosper’s dictum as the lens through which we will examine the eucharistic belief and practice of later Utraquism.

I have chosen three Utraquist texts from which I hope we might gain some insight. Two are liturgical texts. The first is the *Misál Kutné Hory* copied by Jan of Humpolec in 1486.⁸ The second is the so-called *Votářní knihy*

5) As far as authors on liturgical and sacramental issues go, Jan Sedlák was the most assiduous in his attempts to convict Hus of remanentism “Učil Hus remanenci?” *Studie a texty k náboženským dějinám českým* [St.t.] 1,4 (1914) 450–481 and “Ještě jednou, učil Hus remanenci?” *St.t.* 2,2 (1915) 165–178. Stanislav Sousedík, “Huss et la doctrine eucharistique ‘rémanentiste’” (see n.1 *supra*) is the most recent to follow in this school. Dom Paul De Vooght has given us a careful outline of the progression of those attacks. “L’Eucharistie” in *L’Hérésie de Jean Huss* [Bibliothèque de la revue d’histoire ecclésiastique 35 bis] (Louvain, 1975) II,779ff. Having reviewed the literature, I cannot but concur with De Vooght that Hus never asserted remanentism and that his doctrine of the eucharist was faithful to catholic teaching. A final evaluation of this question will be possible only in the context of a thorough examination of the crisis in eucharistic language precipitated by the restoration of the frequent reception of communion by the laity. Cf. n.1 *supra*.

6) This attitude pervades Rudolf Říčan’s attitude towards the Utraquists in his *The History of the Unity of Brethren* trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem PA and Winston-Salem NC, 1992). It also lies behind František Šmahel’s reference to “la naissance d’une Eglise vraiment réformée des Frères tchèques” in his summary of the accomplishments of the Bohemian reformation. *La révolution hussite, une anomalie historique* (Paris, 1985) 123. In conversation, Amedeo Molnár would also express some incomprehension at the inability of the Utraquists to rid themselves of their attachment to mediæval catholicism and become a truly reformed church.

7) *Contra Collatoterm* 12 (PL 51,245).

8) MS Kutná Hora Okresní Archiv 10.

Adama Thaborského transcribed by Václav Čáslavský of Písek in 1588.⁹ The third text is a *Declaratio super canone missæ*¹⁰ whose only manuscript witness dates from perhaps the second half of the fifteenth century. From the first two texts we are able to trace without difficulty the liturgical evolution that had taken place in main-line Utraquist practice in the space of just over a century.¹¹ The *Declaratio* will give us an understanding of how the eucharistic liturgy was being interpreted within Utraquist circles in the second half of the fifteenth century.

In the light of the cavalier manner in which later Utraquism is often called Neo-utraquism (with its Lutheran insinuations) the 1588 Misál is particularly important. Since it was transcribed over sixty years after Luther sketched out his design for future liturgical reform in his *Formula Missæ* (FM), if Lutheran liturgical ideas are to be found in Utraquist texts, they certainly ought to have made their appearance by the time this text was transcribed particularly since Lutheran influence had reached its zenith in Bohemia by this time.¹² At the same time, since the text postdates the *editio typica* of the Missal of Pius V by almost twenty years, it could easily reflect the influence of the post-Tridentine reform of the Roman liturgical books should there have been any intention of making Utraquist texts conform to the Roman *editio typica*.¹³

While the *Declaratio* is not a liturgical book *per se* it is a part of the long tradition of *expositiones missæ* from which we gain important insights into how both text and ceremony were understood at the time when the commentary itself was composed. For even should a liturgical text remain unchanged for centuries, the manner in which the same text and ceremonies are understood in one period is often radically different from that of another.

In looking at the evolution of Utraquist belief and practice,¹⁴ I have used a number of non-Utraquist liturgical texts for comparison. The first is the

9) MS Prague KNM III F 17.

10) MS. Prague Kapitulni Archiv O VII ff.64–69^b. The edited text and commentary will appear as “Insights into Utraquist Eucharistic Thought: A Fifteenth Century *Expositio missæ*”, in the festschrift for Pavel Spunar.

11) These will be presented in a synoptic edition along with other Utraquist eucharistic texts in a collection currently in preparation.

12) See Zdeněk David, “The Plebeianization of Utraquism: The Controversy over the Bohemian Confession of 1575”, *infra*.

13) While it is clear from its colophon (see n.45 *infra*) that this is not the original witness to this text, it is not unreasonable to presume that the text could have been emended to conform to current liturgical opinion (either in a Lutheran or Tridentine direction) would be normal in the evolution of liturgical texts.

14) I began my study on the premise that there would be an evolution of some sort. This is based on my observations of various Latin *graduale* and *antiphonale* where various liturgical texts have been “corrected” or “purified” in the light of later theologies that postdate the transcription of the original text. Examples of this type of emendation can be found in my “The Evolution of Utraquist Liturgy”, 66 n.76.

printed *Missale Pragense*¹⁵ from which we are able to see the extent of whatever divergences there were in liturgical use between the approved Prague Use of the Roman rite and any Utraquist variants thereof.¹⁶ Other texts include the diocesan missals containing the local uses of the Roman rite in the dioceses surrounding the diocese of Prague.¹⁷ In these we will find sources for some of the texts introduced into the Missal of Adam Táborský. I have also used the *Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae Catholicae et Orthodoxae Conformis* of John III of Sweden because of its unusual and unique character among Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century.¹⁸ Finally, the Missal of Pius

15) Of the many editions of the Prague Missal towards the end of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the Nürnberg edition of 1503 is one of the few that contains the complete eucharistic rite rather than the *Canon missæ* alone. I have used the copy in the National Library (Prague, NK 46 A 88) in this study. In comparing these texts, it is important to bear in mind that there was some variance between texts even within a single diocese, until standardization was made possible with the appearance of the printing press.

16) There are sufficient copies of the printed missal which were clearly used by Utraquists that one begins with the premise that whatever variants there may be, they were not seen as being unacceptable by Utraquists. There is, for example, a Prague missal printed in Leipzig in 1531 to which is appended a manuscript supplement containing Czech versions of the proper for the *temporale* and *sanctorale* (MS Prague, Strahov DR V 12b). In a text that is undoubtedly Utraquist, the only emendations made to the printed text concern the celebration of the feast of St. Jan Hus.

17) The Diocese of Prague was surrounded by the dioceses of (clock-wise): Meissen, Breslau, Olomouc, Salzburg, Passau, Regensburg, and Bamberg. Each of these dioceses had their own diocesan use which varied to some degree from that of the Roman rite in both its pre- and post-Tridentine recension.

18) This liturgy, commonly known as the “Red Book” is the one remarkable exception to much of what will be said about sixteenth century Lutheran liturgical texts. The rite is an anomaly in the Lutheran liturgical tradition. Created by the king himself in 1576 (and abolished by the Synod of Uppsala in 1593 a year after the king’s death), it is a fascinating attempt to create a eucharistic rite (both in Latin and Swedish) closely following much of the shape of the mediæval Roman rite – but clearly marked by a broad Lutheran theological framework. While the preparatory rites and vesting prayers are preserved as well as the communion and post-communion devotions, these have been generally “Lutheranized”. The former often draw on the mediæval Swedish diocesan Uses (Uppsala, Strågnäs, Skara, and Vallentuna) while the latter draw on a variety of sources including mediæval uses and Olaus Petri’s *Svenska Mässa* of 1541. See Helge Nyman, “Die Liturgie König Johans III. 1576”, in Irmgard Pahl ed. *Coena Domini* (Fribourg, 1983) I,109–10, 122–142 for a brief introduction and German translation of the Canon; Frank Senn, “Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae: An Attempt at Eucharistic Restoration During the Swedish Reformation”, *SL* 14 (1980/81) 20–36 for an overview as well as the exhaustive study by Sigtrygg Serenius, *Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae Catholicae et Orthodoxae Conformis: En Liturgihistorisk Undersökning med Särskild Hänsyn till Struktur och Förlagor* [Acta Academiae Aboensis, ser. A, Humaniora 33,1] (Åbo, 1966).

Of the non-Utraquist texts, this is the only one whose availability in Bohemia is uncertain. I have been unable to locate a copy of the Red Book in any library in the Czech Republic. Whether there were examples which were destroyed during the many Jesuit book burnings is mere speculation. The parallels between the two rites are fascinating. Cf. David R. Holeyton, “The Late Sixteenth Century Latin Liturgies of Lutheran Sweden and Utraquist Bohemia: A Study in Comparative Liturgy”, forthcoming.

V is the reference from which we will see whatever post-Tridentine influences there were on Utraquist use.¹⁹

The non-liturgical non-Utraquist texts used in this study are Luther's *Formula Missæ*²⁰ of 1523 and selected examples drawn from the large corpus of contemporary Roman Catholic commentaries on the mass. The former will allow us to see the extent to which later Utraquism reflected the ideas of the German reformer. The latter will allow us to see the similarities and divergences between contemporary Roman Catholic and Utraquist interpretation of a common liturgical text.

Utraquist Use in the Late Fifteenth Century

When the eucharistic rite in Jan of Humpolec's Missal of Kutná Hora (1486) is compared with the printed *Missale Pragense*, the variants found are minor and certainly do not constitute what could be called a significant diversion from the Prague Use of the Roman rite – particularly given the variations found between other contemporary manuscript missals of the Prague Use and between the various printed editions of the *Missale Pragense* itself.²¹ Humpolec's transcription of the rite remains faithful to the witness he is copying even to the inclusion of the prayers for the pope²² the absence of which, by that time, would not have been surprising.²³ In the final decades of

19) Anthony Ward and Cuthbert Johnson edd., *Missale Romanum anno 1570 promulgatum: reimpressio introductione aucta, curantibus Anthony Ward sm et Cuthbert Johnson osb* [Instrumenta Liturgica Quarriensia: Supplementa 4] (Rome, 1996).

20) While reference will also be made to Luther's *Von ordenung gottis diensts ynn der gemeyne* (Ord.) (1523) and *Deutsche Messe und ordnung Gottis diensts* (DM) (1526) it is his *Formula missæ et communis pro ecclesia Wittembergensis* (FM) (1523) that represents Luther's most careful and reflected work on reforming the eucharistic liturgy. All citations of these texts are from *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar, 1883ff.) (hereafter = Weimar).

21) While it was the printing press that brought a standardization to diocesan missals, manuscript witnesses to these uses reveal an essential unity within particular dioceses whose uses are often quite distinct from that of their neighbours. As will be seen, both the Bamberg and Freising Missals have uses that are found nowhere else in Central Europe.

22) The sentence in the *Te igitur* "Una cum famulo tuo papa nostro N. et antistite nostro N. et rege nostro N. et omnibus orthodoxis atque catolice et apostolice fidei cultoribus." [f.136] has, at once, an ironic ring to it given the actual ecclesiastical situation in 1486 and yet says a great deal about how those who were to use this missal understood (proleptically?) their relationship to the whole church catholic.

23) The Humpolec transcription could even be called a conservative transcription of the Prague use. When compared to the printed missal of 1479 (Prague, Strahov DM III 23), the Humpolec transcription contains a number of prayers that are not contained in the printed missal which, presumably, represents what was intended to be the contemporary usage of the Prague use. This, in itself, is an important indicator of the conservatism of Utraquist liturgical use.

the fifteenth century, as far as the texts of the eucharistic rite itself are concerned, Utraquist liturgical use can be said to have been in essential conformity with that of Roman Catholics in the Diocese of Prague.²⁴

When we look at the *Declaratio*, however, there are important differences in how this common text was being interpreted. These range from some fundamental assumptions about the character of the liturgical celebration itself to questions of ecclesiology and matters of liturgical spirituality. The *Declaratio*, unlike the general tradition of *expositiones missæ* and commentaries, assumes a somewhat simpler celebration of the eucharist as far as both ceremonial and the liturgical ministers are concerned. The only liturgical minister described is the presiding priest. No mention is made of bishop, deacon, or subdeacon (nor any of the minor orders) so that there is no allegorical interpretation of their vesture nor any reference to the significance of their liturgical activities as was common in contemporary Roman Catholic commentaries. This leads to a considerable impoverishment of this particular literary genre in which the allegorization of the liturgical ministers in terms of the worship in both temple and the heavenly Jerusalem had come to play an important rôle. It can only be presumed that this reflects a growing reality within Bohemia itself during the second half of the fifteenth century during which there was a steady decline in the number of both Utraquist and Roman clergy. As there had been no consecrated Archbishop of Prague since the death of Conrad of Vechta in 1431²⁵ the number of ordained clerics had so declined since the beginning of the Hussite Revolution²⁶ that “real” deacons would have been virtually non-existent not to mention those in minor orders.²⁷

24) The exception would be those places in which the Creed, lections and proper were used in Czech translation. These, however, do not reflect any theological divergence from the Latin texts.

25) This manuscript antedates the arrival of the Italian bishops Augustine Sancturien, Bishop of Mirandola, and Philip of Villa Nova, Titular Bishop of Sidon and Auxiliary Bishop of Modena, who exercised their episcopal ministry in Bohemia on behalf of the Utraquists between 1482–1493 and 1504–1507 respectively.

26) See František Šmahel, suggests that the number of Utraquist clergy was decimated during the fifteenth century. “A l’aube de l’idée œcumenique: la réforme hussite entre occident et orient,” *L’Église et le peuple chrétien dans les pays de l’Europe du centre-est et du nord (XIV^e–XV^e siècles)* [Collection de l’École Française de Rome 128] (Rome, 1990) 277f.

27) With the exception of the periods when the Italian bishops were resident, Utraquist candidates for ordination were generally sent to Venice where they were ordained by “uniat” Byzantine rite bishops for whom their Utraquism was not an issue. Given the expense and difficulty of the journey these candidates would not have returned home before they had been priested which, given the custom of the day, would likely have been the same day as their deaconing or the day after at the latest. The decimation of the clergy during this period left many rural parishes without their own priest and urban parishes with but one. This would have made it generally impossible for presbyters to “play” the rôle of liturgical deacon as was the mediæval custom.

The Humpolec missal assumes the presence of a deacon as at the blessing before the reading of the Gospel reads “Dominus sit in corda tuo et labiis tuis” whereas in the

Ceremonial practice, as described in the *Declaratio*, is also somewhat reduced from that which usually appears in other mediæval commentaries on the mass. No mention is made of incense, for example, something which usually gave the author much space for both historical and allegorical interpretation.²⁸

Not surprisingly, neither pope nor bishop is mentioned in the author's commentary on the *Te igitur*. This, of course, could be merely reflect the contemporary ecclesiastical reality with which Utraquism was living (particularly given the extensive interpretation the author gives to other words in the *Te igitur* such as *ecclesia*, *katholica*, and *et omnibus orthodoxis*), but a deeper anti-papalism might be discerned, particularly when we look at the historical explanations our author gives for various liturgical ceremonies.²⁹ Unlike William Durandus³⁰ who attributes many liturgical ceremonies to the innovations of different popes, our author (who himself draws heavily on Durandus as a principal source) never attributes any rite or ceremony to papal initiative. On the other hand, rather than seeing this as anti-papalism, it could be argued that it was, in fact, a defence against the radicals on the peripheries of Utraquism who, since at least the days of Tábor, had attacked various rites and ceremonies *because* they were said to be of papal origin and, therefore, *not* the use of the purer "primitive" church.³¹

contemporary missal (MS Prague KNM XV A 5) the priest prays for himself i.e. "Dominus sit in corda *meo* et labiis *meis*" which also appears in the Táborský Missal.

28) It should be noted, however, that Humpolec' missal assumes both the presence of a deacon as a liturgical minister and the copious use of incense. One might presume that the former reflects the conservatism of liturgical texts and the latter actual liturgical use.

29) It is important to note, however, that in a Missal copied for use at the cathedral during the late fifteenth century (when it was in Utraquist hands and Augustine Sancturien, Bishop of Mirandola near Modena had come to act for the Utraquists [1484–1493]) the text of the *Te igitur* reads: "una cum famulo tuo papa nostro N. et antistite nostro Augustino et rege nostro Wladislao et omnibus orthodoxis atque katholice et apostolice fides cultoribus." (MS Prague, Strahov DG III 20 f. 5^{a2}.)

30) *Guillelmi Duranti rationale divinatorum officiorum I–IV* edd. Anselm Davril and Timothy M. Thibodeau [Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 140] (Turnholt, 1995).

31) In his 1431 debate with Jan Rokycana who represented the University Masters, the Táborite Bishop Mikuláš of Pelřimov had used the fourteenth century Franciscan *Flores temporum* [MS Prague NK IV H 18] (which attributed various rites and ceremonies to particular popes) against the masters on the very grounds that the customs were papal innovations and, therefore, did not reflect the use of the primitive church. See "De sacramento manus impositionis in fide scripture habente fundamentum" in Amedeo Molnár and Romolo Cegna, *Confessio Taboritarum* [Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 105] (Rome, 1983) 74–75.

There are a number of interesting ecclesiological differences that mark the *Declaratio* as quite distinct from its Roman Catholic contemporaries. The tripartite fraction of the priest's host, for example, once the focus of a famous debate between Florus of Lyons and Amalar of Metz, is given an interesting shift in meaning when the three parts of the host are given ecclesiological, rather than christological, interpretations. The three particles of the host which had been interpreted by Amalar (and thereafter for the general tradition) to represent respectively: Christ risen, ascended and glorified (the particle dropped in the chalice at the commixture); Christ walking amongst the faithful (the particle given in communion); and Christ in the tomb (the particle reserved in the tabernacle)³² But by our author they are instead allegorized as representing the church triumphant, the church militant and the church expectant respectively.³³ While the shift may seem insignificant, I would suggest that it is of considerable importance because it represents a much greater association between the eucharistic elements and the faithful than was common for the time. Here, our author has a much better grasp on the inseparability of the three meanings of *corpus mysticum* (the body of Christ risen, ascended and glorified; the eucharistic body of Christ; and the ecclesial body of Christ, the baptised) than did the late mediæval tradition as represented by his Roman Catholic contemporaries who had come to distinguish between the *corpus mysticum* (the church) and the *corpus verum* (the eucharistic body).³⁴ It could be convincingly argued that such a shift is both a natural and logical consequence of the frequent communion movement which was central to Utraquism. When frequent (weekly) communion characterizes the religious practice of the faithful (as it did within Utraquism but not within Roman Catholicism at the time) there is no ground on which to create the (ultimately false) distinction between the *corpus mysticum* and the *corpus verum*.

As for matters of piety, the *Declaratio* is also distinct from its Roman Catholic homologues in a variety of ways. By the late middle ages, the mass had come to be interpreted almost exclusively in terms of the passion of Christ.³⁵ In that sense, the *Declaratio* has much in common with its

32) Henri de Lubac, "Le 'Corpus triforme' d'Amalair et ses destinées", *Corpus Mysticum: L'eucharistie et l'église au moyen âge* (Paris 1944) 301ff.

33) The shift in this last image would have had visual as well as literary impact as, in the late Gothic period, it was common to have representations of Christ standing in the tomb painted on the wall over the tabernacle. In the Czech Lands such images still survive in churches in Kunitice and Myto. [I am grateful to Dr. Zuzana Vřetečková for this information.]

34) De Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum* especially 285–306.

35) See Adolf Franz, "Sie Mittelsalterlichen Meßerklärungen" in *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1902) 333 ff.

contemporaries. Drawing primarily on Durandus, the vestments of the priest, for example, are all allegorized as either the vestments worn by Christ during his passion³⁶ or as instruments of the passion itself.³⁷ But, unlike many contemporary commentaries, the author of the *Declaratio* goes beyond the tradition and, while including the traditional allegories of the priest's vesture during the act of vesting, declares that the actual significance of the vesture was moral and not passional.³⁸ While the shift again may seem a matter of little import, I would suggest that it makes an important theological point. In *vesting*, the priest is reminded of the mystery of the passion into which he is about to enter but in *celebrating* he no longer appears to the faithful primarily as the *alter Christus* who offers the sacrifice of Calvary anew; instead, he is the person who is clothed in moral virtues which are, in turn, held before the congregation for its contemplation during the mass.³⁹

This, however, is not a prolepsis of the second reformation refutation of the sacrifice of the mass for that theme is central to the *Declaratio's* interpretation of the Canon itself. For example, the writer explains the fact that in many missals there is an illumination of the crucifixion at the beginning of the *Te igitur* and that the priest is required by rubric to kiss it at the beginning of the Canon is rememorative of the fact that the priest must enter into the mystery of the passion reverently and with devotion.⁴⁰ Again, the priest's ritual bow at the beginning of the *Te igitur* represents Christ's humility in the passion and, accordingly, the priest must enter the mystery of the altar

36) The amice as the veil that hid Christ's face during the scourging, the alb as the garment in which Christ was clothed when presented to Herod, and the chasuble as Christ's purple robe. *Declaratio* ff.64^{a1+2}.

37) The cincture as the whip with which Christ was flagellated, the maniple as the pillar to which he was bound by the Jews, and the stole as the cords which bound him to the column where he was whipped. *Declaratio* 64^{a2}.

38) Hence, the alb signifies (*in sacerdote vero significat*) pure conversation, the cincture interior and exterior continence, the maniple the need to turn from perversity and wicked (sinister) deeds etc. *Declaratio*, f.64^{a1+2}.

39) It is important to note here that there remains within Utraquism the same liturgical crisis that characterised the life of the mediæval church as a whole. Allegory becomes the primary medium through which rite and ceremony are interpreted when texts and actions cease to exegete themselves. The liturgical explanations given in the *Declaratio* would indicate that there was no concern within Utraquism that the "plain meaning" of the liturgy be accessible to the clergy, let alone the faithful. That concern was left to the likes of the Taborites and the Jednota who saw that the "plain meaning" of the rites was accessible only through a process of drastic simplification.

40) *Declaratio*, f.66^{b2}. See Pierre-Marie Gy, "La Passion du Christ dans la piété et la théologie aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles", *Le Mal et le diable: leurs figures à la fin du moyen âge* [Cultures et Christianisme 4] (Paris,1995) 177ff.

reverently.⁴¹ Similarly, the *Declaratio* follows the mediæval tradition in which the many signs of the cross made over the oblations during that Canon are interpreted allegorically as rememorative of various aspects of the passion.⁴²

While there are many more examples that could be drawn from the *Declaratio*, I think these should suffice to illustrate the point that while, in the second half of the fifteenth century, Roman Catholics and Utraquists were still using the same liturgical texts, the interpretation of those texts had already begun to diverge on questions of some theological import. This divergence was not, however, in a direction that anticipated the continental reforms of the sixteenth century but was of a much more conservative, catholic nature. If we need to find sixteenth century homologues, they would be John III's *Liturgia Svecanae* and Cranmer's *Order for Communion* of 1547 but the Utraquist text is, in fact, much closer to catholic liturgical theology of our own day.

Sixteenth Century Developments

The century that passed between the times when Jan of Humpolec copied the missal for Kutná Hora and Václav Čáslavský copied the agenda for Adam Táborský had seen monumental changes within the western church. The reformations of Luther, Calvin and Zwingli brought tremendous pressures on Utraquism. When compared to the radical liturgical changes that had taken place in much of Europe since the advent of Luther, the earlier "abuses and deviations" which had elicited Roman Catholic complaints about Utraquist liturgical practice⁴³ appear relatively minor. However, the pressure on Utraquism, both internal and external, to conform more closely to those changes was often tremendous.⁴⁴ The momentum of continental reform would have been a force difficult to resist by the relatively small and increasingly marginalized Bohemian church. How Utraquism actually reacted to this pressure will now become the focus of this study.

41) In an interesting witness to the mediæval identification of the mass with the passion the author of the *Declaratio* (f.66^{b2}) reads Durandus as saying "ad misterium *altaris* accedit" rather than the original "ad misterium *crucis* accedit".

42) For example, the three signs of the cross made by the priest during the *Te igitur* are said to represent the three-fold crucifixion. The two signs of the cross at the *benedixit* in the *verba* signify that Christ was crucified as both God and man. At the *Per ipsum* the three signs of the cross are said to signify that it was at the third hour that the Jews cried out "crucify him" thrice. *Declaratio* ff.67^{a1}, 68^{a1}, 68^{b2}. Beginning in the eleventh century, mass commentaries began giving various allegorical meanings to the signs of the cross during the Canon not all of which were related to the passion. Berthold of Regensburg, for example, wrote that the whole of salvation history can be learned from the crosses in the Canon. Adolf Franz, *Die Messe ...* 733.

43) See, for example, the seventy articles of Václav of Krumlov and Prokop of Plzeň of 1455 in Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Dějiny křesťanství v Československu* (Prague 1948) III, 114–116.

44) See David, "The Plebeianization of Utraquism", *infra*.

Before we engage this question, a little must first be said about Adam Táborský's book which, as far as I know, is the unique remaining manuscript witness to this stage of Utraquist liturgical development.⁴⁵ Like a number of other Utraquist texts from the sixteenth century this book draws together liturgical material that would not have appeared within a single liturgical text a century earlier. While entitled "voltární knihy" by its copyist, the book is technically neither missal nor sacramentary. For unlike a sacramentary it does not contain the variable prayers for the eucharist and, unlike a missal, it contains eight readings (all noted gospels) rather than all the readings needed for the liturgical year. As a liturgical book it could have been used for the eucharistic liturgy only in conjunction with other liturgical texts (at the least a collectar,⁴⁶ a lectionary and a graduale). As such, the "voltární knihy" would have proven inadequate for a "low mass" with priest and server alone (for which the normal book during the period was the missal⁴⁷) as well as for a more "solemn" celebration in which there were a variety of liturgical ministers each with their own proper liturgical book – sacramentary, epistolary, evangelary, gradual etc.⁴⁸ While the text is incomplete in itself as a resource for the eucharistic liturgy, it does include material that would not have been expected in a book compiled for eucharistic use at this late date but, instead, in an antiphonary, a processional, or an hymnary.

One of the extraordinary features of the book is that it contains no fewer than three eucharistic rites each quite different from the other. The first is an abbreviated rite in Czech (ff.1^b–11^a) which was intended for use early on Sunday morning and at which the hosts for the communion of the faithful at a later celebration were to be consecrated and at which the priest himself does

45) The text has a colophon [f.1^a] which reads: "This is the altar book with Canon and Prefaces and with the Venite of the reverend priest Adam Vodice Taborský, transcribed for each/every priest for godly use by me Vaclav Caslavsky, citizen of the city of Písek, in the presbytery of the village of Bubovice *and at this time priest in the city of Breznice* in the year of our Lord 1588." [*_* = marginal emendation.]

From this it would appear that the scribe Václav Čáslavský had made a number of copies of this book before he made this copy for Adam Táborský. At present, it is not possible to date the original text from which Čáslavský made his copies. It would appear either that Čáslavský's latinity was questionable (there are many mistakes the Latin text) or else he was an inattentive copyist working from a defective original.

46) The manuscript supplement to the printed Prague Missal (MS Prague Strahov DR V 12b) containing Czech translations of the variable prayers for the *temporale* and the *sanctorale* is one witness to this genre of liturgical book in Utraquist use.

47) MS Prague KNM IV B 6, while presently missing the ordinary of the mass, is a missal written for Utraquist low mass containing, as it did, the variable prayers for the *temporale* and *sanctorale* in Latin and the lections in Czech.

48) While the Utraquist missal prepared for use at the cathedral (see n.29 *supra*) could be used by a single priest at "low mass", its rubrics expect such elaborate ceremonial as well as processions to neighbouring churches that its use would only have made sense in conjunction with these other liturgical texts.

not appear to communicate!⁴⁹ The second is a Latin sung mass (ff. 11^a–27^a) and the third is a Czech sung mass (ff.29^a–48^b). The Latin language rite will be the primary focus of this study.⁵⁰

The differences between the Latin rite in the Táborský book and that in the Humpolec missal are significant. The 1486 text is unquestionably the Prague Use of the Roman rite which is definitely not the case with the 1588 text. What we find in the Táborský text is a liturgy that has been the subject of a major liturgical reform. The principal characteristics of this reform are a radical simplification of some parts the rite and important changes made in some liturgical texts. Behind both there appears to lie the intention of making an important. theological shift.

Among the changes of the first category are a radical simplification of what liturgists have come to refer to as the “soft points” in the liturgy.⁵¹ In the preparatory rites before the actual liturgical celebration began, the long series of psalms said by the priest before the actual vesting for the liturgy in the Prague Use were suppressed and the long vesting prayers themselves were reduced to short ejaculations to be said while the priest put on each of the liturgical vestments. The devotions said by the priest (and server) after the dismissal were also simplified radically.⁵² While this would have reduced the time taken by the priest in preparing for the celebration and in finishing afterwards by a good half hour, it would have made no difference to the

49) According to the rubrics (f.1^a) the celebration was to take place at a side altar. The actual consecration of the eucharistic elements takes place between the epistle and the gospel (ff.6^b–8^b). After the sermon, the priest, accompanied by acolytes and a server ringing the sanctus bell, carries the sacrament to the high altar. During this, all the church bells are rung and the hymn “O most glorious body of God” is sung (f.10^{a&b}). The priest then communicates *sub utraque* any communicants who might present themselves (f.11^a). It would appear that the community was expected to communicate at the later mass and not at this abbreviated liturgy.

50) The Czech texts will be the subject of a study to be published in BRRP 3.

51) The term itself may first have been coined by Robert Taft, S. J. “The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology”, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (Washington, 1984) 160f. and refers to those parts of the liturgy whose growth and development have long been acknowledged by liturgiologists as being more subject to uncontrolled growth than have the central portions of the liturgical action. The three public “soft points” of the service are (1) before the readings, (2) between the word service and the eucharistic prayer, and (3) at the communion and the dismissal that follow this prayer. In the primitive liturgy these were points of action without words: (1) the entrance into the church; (2) the kiss of peace and transfer of gifts; (3) the fraction, communion, and dismissal rites (*ibid.* 161). The “private soft points” are the devotional prayers of the celebrant (and server) before and after the liturgy proper which, in time, came to assume a public and official character.

52) These prayers in the Prague use are typical of what had become ubiquitous in the various diocesan missals of the late middle ages. By this time the mass had become overshadowed by lengthy prayers and devotions which were recited by the celebrant (and server) in the sacristy before the celebration began and after it had ended.

length of the public celebration itself or how mass was “seen” by the faithful. The theological significance of these changes, however, far outweighs their lack of visual impact.

Based on an understanding of the mass as a *bonus opus* performed by the priest on behalf of the faithful, these clerical devotions before and after the public rite made the eucharistic celebration but one part of a much larger clerical devotional act. As it was this very clericalised understanding of the eucharistic celebration that was used by Matěj of Janov’s opponents as a principal argument against his efforts to restore frequent communion,⁵³ it should not be surprising to see these portions of the rite subjected to radical pruning in the Táborský text. Even though these reforms would not have been visible to the whole assembly, the radical suppression of most of the private clerical devotions with the resulting focus on the public dimension of the eucharistic rite would make an important statement to the clergy about the Utraquist mass having ceased to be a *bonus opus* performed by the priest on behalf of the people and become, once again, the *sacrificium laudis*, a corporate act of all the baptized.

As far as public “soft points” are concerned, the entrance rite was simplified both by a reduction in the number of prayers said⁵⁴ and the omission of any provision for the blessing of incense and the censuring of the evangelary, host, chalice, and altar which were a part of the entrance rite in the Prague Use. The effect of these changes would have been similar to those described above but, if anything, more dramatic. For while the earlier rites were said in private, the abbreviation of the heavily clericalized entrance rite would have made a clear statement to the laity about the restored balance of ministry within the eucharistic celebration.⁵⁵

Other changes to the entrance rite included the omission of any provision for the usual mediæval tropes of the *Gloria in excelsis* although, from the *graduale* which date from this period, we know that tropes continued to be sung in both Latin and Czech versions of the Utraquist rite long after

53) The practice of representative communion, in which the priest was said to communicate on behalf of the faithful, was one of the greatest obstacles to the restoration of frequent communion. See David R. Holeton “The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement”, *BRRP* 1 (1996) 30f. Matěj wrote extensively against this practice in his *Regulae Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. *Ibid.* 31 n.41.

54) This “soft spot”, like the preparation rites before the liturgy, had attained such a complexity that the basic purpose of the rite had become obscured. Their visual effect was to reinforce the popular understanding of the mass as a clerical act performed in the presence of the laity.

55) It would be anachronistic to look for the variety of ministries that we find in either the patristic period or the churches influenced by the liturgical movement of recent years. When examined in its own contemporary context, however, the Táborský text is remarkable – particularly when compared to other rites which emerged at this time (those of Luther, Cranmer, Bucer, Zwingli) which were far more clericalized than the mediæval rites they replaced.

they had been suppressed in the post-Tridentine Roman rite.⁵⁶ This is also true of the many *prosæ* used by Utraquists years after the Missal of Pius V had reduced the number allowed to the traditional Roman six.⁵⁷

From a modern liturgical point of view, the relatively radical reform of these liturgical “soft points” in no way affected the fundamental core of the eucharistic rite itself. Each of the parts affected by these reforms was a late accretion to the liturgy whose character was primarily devotional, affecting the priest (and his server) alone. Because it is not possible to date the original witness to the Táborský text, it is impossible to say whether these reforms are proleptic of, responsive to, or independent from the work of the Protestant and Roman liturgical reformers who in the sixteenth century also took radical shears to these same accretions.⁵⁸

From a clerical point of view, however, the effect of these reforms in the Táborský text would have appeared much more radical in their original context for they constitute a complete *volte face* from the clericalised piety of the mass cultivated by the late mediæval liturgical text. While these particular reforms may seem cosmetic and with little effect on the whole liturgical assembly, the fundamental issue at stake was the very nature of the eucharistic celebration itself. The clear message transmitted by them was that the mass had ceased to be a *bonus opus* of the priest and had once again become the work of the whole People of God within which each of the faithful had his/her own particular ministry – a much more biblical and patristic understanding of the eucharist.

The anti-clericalist battles fought by Matěj of Janov and his contemporaries in their efforts to restore the frequent communion of the laity had faced an almost insurmountable liturgical obstacle: the mass of his time had effectively become the preserve of the clergy. It was encased within extended clerical devotions both before and after the “public” rite. The rite itself had undergone the interpolation of lengthy clerical devotions at the time of the preparation of the gifts and before and after the moment of the priest’s communion. This clericalization of the liturgy flew in the face of Matěj’s arguments against the general belief of the time that the priest both offered the eucharist and communicated on behalf of the faithful. The suppression of these clerical devotions in the Táborský text and the clericalised theological

56) It was not uncommon in printed missals from the end of the fifteenth century on to print only one *Gloria in excelsis* and, if a troped *Gloria* appeared it was restricted to the *Gloria de beata virgine*. Thus, no theological change can be imputed to this omission from the Táborský text.

57) The rich collection of *prosæ* disappeared from use north of the Alps only gradually as dioceses slowly abandoned their own diocesan uses in favour of the Missal of Pius V.

58) It is an important reflection on the difficulty with which the growth of these “soft points” can be controlled to remember that the entrance and dismissal rites also demanded radical reform again during the liturgical reforms of the last quarter of our own century which took place in many of the western churches.

culture which they nurtured is a logical consequence of the Bohemian eucharistic movement that first promoted frequent communion and, later, the lay chalice and the communion of all the baptised. In short, the *lex orandi* had come to reflect the new *lex credendi*.

This restoration of a more patristic understanding of the liturgy by reducing the sacerdotal character of the rite (through the reduction of its clericalist tone and private devotional character) must be seen as a genuine step in the renewal of the liturgy. Here, the reforms found in the Táborský text transcend any concern that could be labelled either as uniquely Roman Catholic or Protestant and must, instead, be reckoned as being well within the broad lines of the liturgical reforms that were to characterize a common strand in the life of the churches over a number of centuries.

Other reforms in the Táborský text are of a quite different character. These affect the position of the preparation of the gifts and the excision of several prayers within the Canon or eucharistic prayer itself. It is difficult to discern a clear and convincing rationale (either liturgical or theological) for either of these reforms.

In all three eucharistic rites in the Táborský text there is a shift in the place at which the chalice (Latin rite) or both paten and chalice (Czech rites) were prepared. In the traditional Prague use of the Roman rite this took place after the prayers of the faithful⁵⁹ or, more commonly, after the creed. In the Táborský text this preparation has been moved earlier in the rite to after the singing of the prose and before the reading of the gospel. This change appears to be an importation of a liturgical practice which was common in the rites of some religious orders and many diocesan uses of the time including dioceses geographically contiguous to Prague,⁶⁰ and for which

59) These had become, at best, vestigial in most place by the middle ages but was replaced in many parts of Europe north of the Alps by the prone which followed the sermon at high mass on Sundays and included, among other things, a series of biddings. I have yet to find evidence that this continued to play a liturgical rôle in Bohemia during the Utraquist period. See J. B. Molin, "L'*oratio communis fidelium* au moyen âge en Occident du X^e au XV^e siècle", in *Miscellanea liturgica ... Cardinale Lecaro* (Rome, 1967) II, 313–468.

60) These would include the Dioceses of Regensburg and Bamberg. See "Ordo misse secundum morem Ecclesie Ratisponensis" in Anton Beck, *Kirchlichen Studien und Quellen*, (Amberg, 1903) 265 and *Liber missalis secundem ordinem ecclesie Bambergensi* (Bamberg, 1490) n.p. The classic study of the question is that of J. Wickham Legg "A Comparative Study of the Time in the Christian Liturgy at Which the Elements Are Prepared and Set on the Table", in *Ecclesiological Essays* Vernon Staley ed. [The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers 7] (London, 1905) 91–178. See also Pierre Salmon "Les prières et les rites de l'offertoire de la messe dans la liturgie romaine au XIII^e et au XVI^e siècles", EL 43 (1929) 508–19 and P. Tirot "Histoire des Prières d'Offertoire dans la liturgie romaine du VIII^e au XVI^e siècle", EL 98 (1984) 148–97, 323–91.

there is at least one witness in a Prague missal transcribed long before the Táborský text.⁶¹

Other than as a matter of liturgical fashion, there does not seem to be any clear rationale for the introduction of this custom into the Utraquist rite. In the Latin rite in the Táborský text, it is only the chalice that is prepared before the reading of the Gospel. For this there is considerable precedent in other diocesan uses.⁶² The custom of preparing both chalice and paten (i.e. all the oblations) between the lections, which is prescribed in the two Czech rites, is a much less common practice but is found in the rites of some religious orders which, given the strong antipathy Utraquism had to the religious orders, seems like an unlikely source for the Táborský practice. As there is no commentary explaining the rite, the rationale for this innovation is left to speculation. It may simply reflect a natural instinct to prepare both the species at the same time coupled with a lack of historical knowledge about (or disregard for) when the preparation of the oblations had traditionally taken place.⁶³ The motive behind the shift cannot have been an intentional “protestantizing” of the rite in that the language remained traditional and associated the action with the passion.⁶⁴ The spreading of the corporal was accompanied by a recitation of Ps.21:19–20, associating the action with the division of Christ’s garments among the soldiers, while the image of blood and water issuing from Christ’s side was used no fewer than three times during the preparation of the chalice.⁶⁵

The rationale for the excisions from the eucharistic prayer is even less clear than the change in the preparation of the gifts. While to most sixteenth

61) While I have seen no evidence of this practice in any printed Prague Missal, a fifteenth century Prague missal anticipates the preparation of the chalice before the reading of the gospel (MS Prague KNM XV A 5 f.153^{b2}–154^{a1}).

62) See Legg 169–173.

63) The preparation of the chalice at this point in other diocesan uses could have served as an “historical” precedent; the Utraquist emphasis on the “equality” of both eucharistic species as an incentive to move the preparation of the paten alongside that of the cup. From a practical point of view, the quantity of music sung between the two lections (gradual, sequence/prose or tract) certainly provided enough “cover music” for these preparations and their accompanying prayers.

64) Martin Luther, for example, condemns the *offertorium* “of which everything sounds and reeks of oblation” and orders the preparation of the gifts to take place after the Creed or Sermon (FM, Weimar 12,211). Of the various offertory rites found in late mediæval sources few, if any, could be said to be more clearly rites of oblation than the Táborský Latin rite or more mechanistic than the Czech ones.

65) Luther was uncertain whether or not he would allow the mixed chalice; if the practice were to continue, however, he made it quite clear that it was in no sense to be used as an allegory of the mystery of our union with Christ (FM, Weimar 12,211–12). This allegory not only remained central in the Utraquist rite but took on a greater prominence in it than in any other contemporary rite or use.

century protestants the Roman Canon was the *odium tremendum liturgicum* and, therefore, was either completely suppressed or radically rewritten by the protestant liturgical reformers of the sixteenth century, it remained virtually intact within Utraquism.⁶⁶ New prefaces continued to be written for it⁶⁷ and it remained the very centre of the Utraquist eucharistic celebration. In this context, it is somewhat curious that the *Communicantes*, the *Memento* of the departed and the *Nobis quoque* should all be excised from the prayer⁶⁸. While the former and the latter involve the commemoration and invocation of the saints, it is unlikely that this was the rationale for their exclusion, as this question had been settled for Utraquism in the early fifteenth century as had the legitimacy of prayer for the departed which was the substance of the *memento*.⁶⁹ While these questions had again become issues at the time of the schism of the Jednota Bratrská, Utraquism remained unyielding on the matter. The presence of other liturgical texts in Táborský's agenda in which the saints are prayed to⁷⁰ and the departed prayed for⁷¹ certainly cannot lead us to conclude that the grounds for these excisions are some later change of theological heart. An hypothesis I would suggest is that the changes reflect the Utraquist concern to focus the eucharist on the sanctification of the gathered assembly and away from the intercession of the saints and prayer for the departed which had been so central to eucharistic culture in the high middle ages. Excising the *Communicantes*, the *Memento* of the departed, and the *Nobis quoque* would shift the weight of the eucharistic prayer to the church militant and away from the church triumphant and the church expectant.

We are helped only a little by the *Declaratio* on this matter for, unlike most contemporary Roman Catholic commentaries on the Canon, it does not comment on each prayer within the Canon itself. Thus, it remains silent on the *Memento* of the departed but much, however, is made of the significance of the particular saints named in both the *Communicantes* and the *Nobis*

66) The only exception was the John III's *Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae*. This liturgy, however, follows the order prescribed by Luther: Salutation/*Sursum corda*, Preface, *Verba*, and *Sanctus* which were then followed by "Lutheranized" versions of the *Unde et memores*, *Supplices te rogamus*, *Nobis quoque* and *Per quem haec omnia*. While this may have "felt" like the Latin mass for the nostalgic, unlike the Utraquist revision of the Canon, it was very far from the Roman Canon theologically.

67) E.g. the Preface for the feast of Hus in the Táborský text ff.74^b–76^b.

68) In an age when there was little sense of the integrity of the eucharistic prayer as a cohesive entity, the Roman Canon is particularly susceptible to this type of piecemeal revision as in its literary form it appears as a series of independent prayers all of which were not necessary to "consecrate" the eucharistic species.

69) Both principles were affirmed by a meeting of University masters on 25 January 1417 (F. M. Bartoš, *Do čtyř pražských artykulů* (Prague, 1940) 66 n.45. and in the Twenty-three Articles of the St. Wenceslas' Day Synod of 1418 in Documenta 678 no. 4, 679 no. 6.

70) E.g. the *Regina coeli* ff.209^b–211^b.

71) E.g. the Preface *Pro defunctis* ff.102^a–103^a.

quoque. Here, we are faced with a mystery that is much more impenetrable than the change in the position of the preparation of the gifts for there are no precedents for a partial revision of the Roman Canon nor, with the exception of John III's *Liturgia Svecanae*,⁷² are there any witnesses to it in the reformation of the sixteenth century. One thing that can be certain, however, is that these excisions are not an attempt to refute the sacrificial nature of the eucharist for that language abounds in the parts of the Canon that were left untouched.

In order to make a more comprehensive assessment of the nature of these liturgical reforms as well as an evaluation of their theological import, the Latin eucharistic rite contained in the Táborský text must be compared with both the schema for eucharistic revision proposed by Martin Luther in his *Formula Missæ* and the reformed Missal of Pius V. In so doing, we will see emerge a liturgical text with its own rationale and theological integrity.

Late Utraquist Liturgy and its Contemporary Homologues

a) Lutheran

In this context it is important that the Táborský text (in conjunction with the other liturgical texts referred to earlier as necessary: collectar, lectionary, gradual etc.) be compared with Luther's *Formula Missæ* to see if it is, in fact, a Lutheranized text. Even at a cursory glance it would be extremely difficult to make the case that the Utraquist eucharist represented here is the product of Lutheran influences. While Luther's reforms retained the basic *shape* of the eucharistic liturgy of the Latin (more accurately, Roman) west and, consequently, a parallelism exists between the shape outlined in his *Formula missæ* and that of this Utraquist rite, that parallelism exists also with the Roman rite. However, there are two major *lacunæ* in Luther's rite that do not exist in the Utraquist rite: the offertory and the Canon. Both of these were specifically abrogated by Luther as they were seen by him as the principal instruments through which a theology of eucharistic sacrifice was perpetuated. As we have seen, this was not an issue in Utraquism and, therefore, was not reflected in the liturgical texts.

Looking at these late Utraquist eucharistic texts more closely, there is a long series of features that would have made the rite theologically abhorrent to a contemporary Lutheran.⁷³ We could begin with the fact that Latin was the

72) See Serenius, *Liturgia Svecanae*, 221ff.

73) For the sake of ecumenical honesty, it must be stated clearly that many of the issues that were subject to Lutheran criticism in the sixteenth century are no longer issues in contemporary Lutheranism. For example, the eucharistic prayer which was so problematic for Luther has found its way back into most contemporary Lutheran rites, the first modern restoration of such a prayer being in the *Agenda für die Lutherische-Evangelische Kirche in Russischen Reich* (St. Petersburg, 1897). See the forthcoming study on this little known rite by Eero Sepponen.

language of the rite for all but the lections and sermon. While the *Formula Missæ* anticipated the continued use of Latin for the eucharistic rite, this was superseded in spirit by the *Deudsche Messe und Ordnung Gottis Diensts* of 1526.⁷⁴ While it is true that Latin long remained a liturgical language in parts of the Lutheran world,⁷⁵ nowhere was it as preponderant as it is in this Utraquist rite.⁷⁶ And, while the other two Czech rites contained in the book provide a balance in the liturgical language, this very balance is unique to the liturgical life of Utraquism at this stage in the history of the church.⁷⁷

In looking at the course of the liturgical celebration itself, there is a series of rites and ceremonies that would have been very difficult to reconcile with any intentional “Lutheranization” of the liturgy. Looking through the rite sequentially, at least the following would have been irreconcilable with sixteenth century Lutheranism:

- **vestments:** while Luther did not object to the continued used of the traditional vestments, he did object to their being blessed and asked that

74) Luther suggests that his German Mass “should be introduced for the sake of the simple layman” (DM Weimar 19,74) and, while allowing for the continued use of Latin, suggests that “it is best to plan the services in the interest of the young and of such other simple-minded as may happen to come” (DM, Weimar 19,112) which would certainly favour vernacular over Latin liturgies.

75) In DM, Luther himself declares that he did not wish to abrogate or change the use of Latin in FM and was to remain “for use where and when it pleases us or when occasion calls for it”. His apology for the continued use of Latin is pædagogical – so that youth may learn the language for communication when abroad “in order to avoid the experience of the Waldensians in Bohemia who confined their faith to one language so completely, that they cannot speak correctly and intelligently with anyone, unless he first learn their language”. (DM, Weimar 19,74.)

76) The *Liturgia Svecanae* of John III was the exception as it also enjoined the use of Latin for the lections. (Serenius, *Liturgia Svecanae* 175–177.) It was John III’s intention that his Latin rite be used in the towns and the parallel Swedish version in the countryside although this latter principle seems to have been applied somewhat loosely. For example, Ericus Erci Sorolainen, was nominated Bishop of Åbo (Finland) by John III in 1583. At a part of the oaths at his episcopal consecration he promised to introduce the John’s liturgy in his diocese – which he did with remarkable success and without dividing the diocese as was the case in the dioceses of Sweden itself. When, after the Synod of Uppsala (of which he was a member) inhibited the use of the Red Book, Ericus Erci found himself faced with the task of eliminating the use of the *Liturgia Svecanae* in his diocese, he had considerably more difficulty inhibiting its use than he had in introducing it. (I am grateful to Fr. Eero Sepponen of Åbo for this information.)

77) This balance, unique among liturgies that were to emerge during this century, is an important feature of the non-programmatic character of the liturgical reforms of Utraquism. See David R. Holeton, “The Evolution of Utraquist Liturgy: A Precursor of Western Liturgical Reform”, *SL* 25,1 (1995) 51f.

“pomp and the excess of splendour be absent”.⁷⁸ From the illuminations we have depicting the Utraquist liturgy⁷⁹ it would, on the whole, be difficult to suggest that they were devoid of “pomp and excess of splendour”. It is also difficult to believe that Luther would have been comfortable with the vesting prayers – even in their radically abbreviated form.⁸⁰

– **lectionary**: Luther was very unhappy with the Roman lectionary, particularly the distribution of the epistles⁸¹ whose originator he said “seems to have been a singularly unlearned and superstitious friend of works”.⁸² While Luther never acted on this unhappiness and did not produce a new lectionary,⁸³ his complaints about the epistles went unheard in Bohemia. Czech lectionaries, of which there are many postdating Luther’s FM,⁸⁴ continued to follow the traditional Prague Use of the mediæval cursus without any emendation.

– **graduals**: while Luther would allow the use of “two-verse graduals”, those which were longer were “to be used at home” for fear of “extinguishing the spirit of the faithful with tedious things”.⁸⁵ Similarly, Luther objected to the distinction made between the music sung during Lent and the rest of the year i.e. the use of the Tract instead of the

78) FM, Weimar 12,214–15.

79) E.g. MS Prague KNM IV B 24 f.55^b; MS Chrudim Okresni Museum c. 12 579 f.181^b.

80) Here, the “*Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae*” is the exception which, perhaps, proves the rule. See Serenius, “Påklädningsbönerna”, *Liturgia Svecanae Eccleiae*, 129–139.

81) FM, Weimar 12, 209.

82) FM *loc. cit.*

83) By the time of DM Luther seems to have forgotten his dissatisfaction with the Epistle pericopes for he notes that “for the holy day or Sunday we retain the customary Epistles and Gospels ...” (Weimar 19,78) and that “The customary Epistles and Gospels of the various days of the year are retained by us because there is nothing specially censurable in the custom. This is the arrangement at Wittenberg at the present time when many are here who must learn to preach in the places where the system of Epistles and Gospels still is and may remain in vogue.” (DM Weimar 12,79.) In *Ord.* (Weimar 12,36f.) Luther suggests that the sermon be on the gospel at mass and the epistle at vespers.

84) See František Verner, *Bibliografie českých překladů celé bible i jejich částí* (Prague, 1987) 73–75. Despite the canonical requirement to read the lections in Czech, the continued production of Latin Utraquist missals until at least the end of the fifteenth century would suggest that many parishes continued to read the lections in Latin. There is no textual evidence to suggest that any of these lections were altered from those in the Roman cycle. See Canon 17 of the St. James’s Day Synod of 1434. Blanká Zilynská, *Husitské Synody v Čechách* (Prague, 1985) 117–18.

85) FM, Weimar 12,210.

Alleluia.⁸⁶ There is no trace whatsoever of this concern reflected in the many extant Latin or Czech Utraquist *graduale*.

– **sequences and prosæ:** Luther would “allow no sequences or prose” with the exception of the *Grates nunc omnes* at Christmas and the *Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia* and the *Veni Sancti Spiritus*.⁸⁷ The Táborský text enjoins the use of the traditional sequences. After the Pian Missal had reduced the number of sequences to the Italian five, the large and living tradition of *prosæ* in Utraquism (both in Latin and Czech) represented the most extensive secular use of this liturgical genre anywhere in Europe.⁸⁸

– **creed:** the rubrical permission for the priest to recite both the *Pater noster* and *Ave Maria* while the creed was being sung⁸⁹ could not but have been offensive to Lutherans given the importance Luther attributed to the corporate nature of the singing of the creed.

– **offertory:** I have already mentioned this feature of Utraquist liturgy and will return to it again. We need to remind ourselves, however, that Luther refers to the offertory as “that complete abomination”.⁹⁰ In his observations on the preparation of the eucharistic elements, Luther was ambivalent about allowing the mixed chalice (adding some water to the wine) and objected on theological grounds to the traditional allegories associated with this action. Our texts maintain the mixed cup, and the allegorical interpretation of the action to which Luther objected constitutes a central theme in the prayers of preparation themselves.

– **dialogue and preface:** By Luther’s time there was little sense of the eucharistic prayer as an integral whole beginning with the dialogue (*Sursum corda*) and culminating with the *Per ipsum* and great *Amen*. As such, the preface and the dialogue that preceded it was seen as a separate prayer. Luther allowed the preface to remain even though he would not tolerate the use of the Canon i.e. the *post sanctus* from the *Te igitur* to the *Per ipsum*. Thus a variety of prefaces would not be incompatible with Lutheran use. What, however, would be intolerable to Luther would have been the use of proper prefaces for the feasts of Saints

86) FM *loc. cit.*

87) FM *loc. cit.*

88) The liturgical books of both religious orders and diocesan uses more than two hundred years old were unaffected by this reform. Only in Utraquism, however, were new texts of this liturgical genre being written.

89) The rubric instructs the priest to intone the Creed, to recite the Pater Noster and Ave Maria and then to read the remainder of the Creed from the missal. f.19^b.

90) FM, Weimar 12,211.

Peter and Paul, Jan Hus, Mary Magdalene, James the Great and Lawrence which are found in the Táborský text.⁹¹

– **Canon:** this, to Luther, the greatest of abominations, was reduced by him to the recitation of the *verba* alone.⁹² The retention of the Roman Canon in the Táborský text, even with the excision of the three prayers discussed earlier in this paper, would have been an intolerable burden for a Lutheran to bear. What would have made this doubly offensive would have been the retention of the many signs of the cross during the prayer as well as the rubrical injunction for the use of the sacring bell at the *verba*. The retention of the manual acts and the sacring bell would have been a clear message to the faithful that what was essentially “the mass” remained unchanged.⁹³

– **Ite missa est:** Luther asked that this be replaced by the *Benedicamus Domino*.⁹⁴ Our texts have retained the traditional dismissal which would fly in the face of what had otherwise become an ubiquitous Lutheran practice.

– **the abbreviated mass:** The provision for an early celebration of the eucharist at which the hosts for the communion of the faithful attending the later sung celebration were consecrated⁹⁵ would have run into heavy water with Luther on several points: certainly with his emphasis on the importance of the communion of the faithful at every celebration of the eucharist⁹⁶ and, most likely, with his understanding of eucharistic presence outside the celebration of the eucharist itself.

91) Luther provided only for an abbreviated form of the Common Preface. (FM, Weimar 12,212.) In Wittenberg Luther observed only the Lord’s Day and Feasts of the Lord, abrogating completely the festivals of all the saints although he allowed the introits for feasts of the Apostles and the Blessed Virgin if they were drawn from the Psalms or Scriptures. (FM, Weimar 12,209.)

92) There is extensive literature on this matter; see the recent bibliography in Yngvill Martola, *Verba Testamenti i nordisk luthersk liturgitradition*, (Åbo, 1989) 333–349.

93) In the eyes of the faithful, it was often ceremony more than text that conveyed the sense that the mass remained the mass. In England, for example, there are numerous examples of laity who treated the newly imposed Book of Common Prayer as if it were an English version of the Roman Missal and assured that the traditional liturgical objects remained in place. Clergy, too, often continued to impose the traditional liturgical gestures on the new text. While this “counterfeiting the mass” was intolerable to the leaders of the reform, it was not easily extirpated. See Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (New Haven and London, 1992) 470f.

94) FM, Weimar 12,213.

95) MS Prague KNM III f 17 ff.1^b–11^a.

96) FM, Weimar 12,215.

In the light of all these textual divergencies from Luther's ideas about eucharistic reform, it is very difficult to conclude that the eucharistic practices of later Utraquism as represented by these liturgical texts themselves, are the product of Lutheran influence. While a few of the practices might have been accommodated by Luther's willingness to allow local custom to determine the direction liturgical reform would take,⁹⁷ there are a sufficient number of practices which in and of themselves would have been impossible for a sixteenth century Lutheran to countenance and, when taken cumulatively, would have been an unbearable burden.⁹⁸

On the other hand, in looking at the ways in which late Utraquist liturgy was *similar* to Lutheran use, two conclusions may be drawn. Where there is a communality of use, it is either because both uses follow that of their common progenitor (the Roman rite) or else it is in ways that can be argued to be of Utraquist, rather than Lutheran, origin. After all, vernacular liturgy, a great corpus of popular hymnody and communion *sub utraque* were all Bohemian phenomena a century before Luther wrote his *Formula missæ*. In that sense, it would be as appropriate to speak of the Bohemianization of Lutheran worship as it is to speak of the Lutherization of Utraquist worship! For whatever late Utraquist liturgical use may have been, it was not Lutheran. As such, the epithet Neo-Utraquist (with its Lutheran insinuation) is quite inappropriate as a label for Utraquist liturgical texts of the later period. If there is one phenomenon that possibly can be attributed to the influence of Lutheranism on Utraquist worship, I would suggest that it may be the rapid vernacularization of the liturgy beginning in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. While Latin continued to remain a liturgical language to the very last days of Utraquism, it lost its liturgical hegemony when, around the time of the advent of Luther, there was a rapid transition from Latin to Czech as the primary liturgical language.⁹⁹ More will be said about that below. However we must now turn to a comparison of the Utraquist liturgical texts with their Roman Catholic counterparts in order to see what justification there may be for the other allegation brought against later Utraquism.

97) FM *passim*, particularly Weimar 12,218; DM, Weimar 19,72.

98) The abolition of John III's *Liturgia Svecanae* by the Synod of Uppsala, a year after the king's death, would seem to reënforce this point. This would suggest the importance of a study of "the monarch as liturgist" and the fate of liturgies created and imposed by monarchs and not ecclesiastics.

99) In the Utraquist liturgical texts extant the transition from Latin to Czech as the primary liturgical language begins in the third decade of the sixteenth century. Czech had probably attained linguistic hegemony by the middle of the century. There were, however, parishes where the musical tradition of the *litterati* was well entrenched and where Latin remained at least the primary *sung* language. There is a five part *graduale*, for example, copied in 1578 for the parish of St. Michael's in the Old Town (MSS Prague NK XI B 1a-1d, Strahov DA III 3).

b) Roman Catholic

If late Utraquist liturgical use is to be legitimately subject to the criticism of being “too Roman Catholic” then (one would assume that) it would need to reflect in some way the liturgical texts which appeared after the Council of Trent. If Utraquism had simply maintained the traditional diocesan Uses of Prague or Olomouc, it could hardly be accused of anything worse than liturgical conservatism or, perhaps, reaction. For, surely, it would be anachronistic to suggest that Utraquism set out to establish itself to be anything other than one part of the church catholic renewed according to the “Law of God” as found in the Four Articles of Prague¹⁰⁰ whose liturgical practices were also reformed (where needed) according to that Law.¹⁰¹ As a church whose self understanding was catholic, the maintenance of the traditional liturgical rites and ceremonies was an important sign of Utraquism’s intention to remain visibly a part of the church catholic.¹⁰² In that sense, all rites and ceremonies that were not clearly antithetical to the Law of God could (and did) remain untouched. It is this acceptance of the inherited liturgical tradition that first infuriated the Tábórites and, decades later, the Jednota Bratrská¹⁰³ both of which groups’ demands for a much more radical liturgical reform were firmly resisted by the heart of Utraquism.

When the Táborský text is compared to the Missal of Pius V, a number of common features are clearly evident. First, while both texts show a marked tendency towards a simplification of the rite, the Táborský text is often much more radical in its reforms.¹⁰⁴ The vesting and preparatory prayers, the entrance and dismissal rites and the priest’s devotions at the time of communion are all cases in point. In the Táborský text, the vesting and preparatory prayers have been abbreviated considerably more drastically than their counterparts in the Pian Missal and the extended thanksgiving said

100) Thomas Fudge, “The ‘Law of God’: Reform and Religious Practice in Late Medieval Bohemia”, BRRP 1 (1996) 67f.

101) Two of the four Articles (communion *sub utraque* and the free preaching of the word) were specifically liturgical in their implications.

102) The post-biblical development of the liturgy was freely acknowledged and, except where it contravened scripture (e.g. the withdrawal of the chalice from the laity), was regarded as healthy and good. This position was articulated early by Jakoubek of Stříbro in his *Epistola pro communione infirmorum* (1415) and he *De ceremoniis* (1417) and remained an operating principle throughout Utraquist history. See “Les rites”, in Paul De Vooght, *Jacobellus de Stříbro (†1429) premier théologien du hussitisme* (Louvain, 1972) 150ff.

103) The extent to which the early Jednota simplified the liturgy can be seen from the controversies over the liturgical “restoration” under Brater Lukáš at the beginning of the sixteenth century. See Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren*, 104f.

104) It is important to remember that the eucharistic text found in the Pian Missal is the product of a radical liturgical reform although some might find this difficult to credit when compared to the reforms in the *Missal of Paul VI*. The “soft points”, of which we have written above, were subject to particular attention and radical pruning.

by the priest after mass has been abolished altogether in the Táborský text while it remained, albeit, in an abbreviated form in the Pian Missal. This is very much in keeping with the tendency noted above in which the priest's devotional elements were excised so that the corporate nature of the eucharist might be more evident.

But here, as well as elsewhere in the Táborský text, the sources for the reformed texts, while diverse, do not include the Missal of Pius V or any of the other post-Tridentine Roman books.¹⁰⁵ Among the new texts contained in the Táborský book, there are some which are quite clearly derived from texts of long-standing in the liturgical tradition included within the Prague Use but which were not included in the printed editions of the *Missale Pragense*. Other texts are derived from sources which lie outside Bohemia, one of which is the Bamberg Use from which there have been a number of direct borrowings e.g. the prayers *Domine Jesu Christe* and *Corpus tuum domine Jesu Christe* immediately before the priest's communion.¹⁰⁶ On other occasions, these extra-Bohemian diocesan uses have served as sources for the language of particular prayers (e.g. the ejaculations during vesting) from which the composers of the Utraquist rite have crafted their own liturgical texts. Still other texts are apparently entirely new creations.

In reforming their liturgy, the drafters of the Utraquist rite quite clearly availed themselves of a variety of sources which they used judiciously. In studying the texts, all the criteria employed by the Utraquist reformers in compiling their rite are not always entirely clear.¹⁰⁷ What is clear, however, is that the criteria used do not include "pro-Lutheranism" or "anti-Romanism" as principles of selection. That the liturgical reformers have not drawn on specifically Roman sources or uses but, instead, on other mediæval uses may have been an intentional effort to establish a Bohemian use that was more clearly distinct from the Roman rite than was the traditional Prague Use. If this was their intention, they were also being careful to draw on sources whose catholicity and authority were beyond reproach and whose legitimacy and orthodoxy could easily be defended in the face of any Roman criticism

105) This may simply weigh in favour of the argument that the Latin rite in the Táborský text antedates the reform of the Roman liturgical books after the Council of Trent.

106) Both these prayers have glosses in the Taborský text which, of all the diocesan uses in Central Europe, exist only in the Bamberg use. It is inconceivable that Bamberg borrowed these glosses from the Utraquists (ff.24^b-25^a).

107) Why, for example, they chose to adopt texts that existed only in the Bamberg Missal, is not immediately obvious. If one were to speculate, however, it is probably because these glosses were most in keeping with the penitential piety that was so predominant at the time.

that they might draw. It is also possible that, in turning to other sources, they believed that they had access to a more ancient use.¹⁰⁸

The same might be said of the rapid transition to the vernacular. There had been experiments with Czech in the liturgy since at least the end of the fourteenth century¹⁰⁹ and Jan Čapek's translation of the liturgy into Czech circulated within some circles in the early days of Utraquism.¹¹⁰ From the time the practice was first introduced in Bohemia, one rationale offered for the use of the vernacular in the liturgy was the antiquity of the practice.¹¹¹

Pressure to vernacularize the liturgy seems to have been a constant factor from some quarters within Utraquism. Why Czech took a century and a quarter to achieve liturgical hegemony in Utraquist liturgy is not entirely clear.¹¹² Latin certainly had the cachet of being the language of the western church but, even in Bohemia, it was not the only language of the catholic church – the Slavonic language monastery of Na Slovanech in the New Town of Prague was living witness to that reality as was the historic monastery of

108) This would be analogous to Cranmer's use of the Mozarabic *Missale Mixtum* among his sources for the *Book of Common Prayer* or John III's use of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in his *Liturgia Svecanae*.

109) Jakoubek of Stříbro tells us that it was Matěj of Janov who first introduced the reading of the liturgical epistles and gospels in Czech. Jakoubek also tells us that, at the same time, an un-named priest at the parish of SS. Philip and James close to the Bethlehem Chapel sang the passion gospels in Czech, a practice for which he received an ecclesiastical summons (and presumably a reprimand). See Rudolf Holinka, "Nová betlemské postila M. Jakoubka ze Stříbra" in *Věstník české akademie věd a umění* 60,1 (1951) 26.

110) In 1416 Jakoubek encouraged his disciple Jan Čapek to translate the whole Roman liturgy into Czech. See "Kněz Jan Čapek", in Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Dějiny husitského zpěvu* 4 (Prague 1955²) 226–48. An early witness to this Czech liturgy is the *directorium chori* commonly known as the Jistebnický Kancionál [MS Prague KNM II C 7 (c. 1420)]. See Jaroslav Kolár, Hanna Vlhová et al. *Jistebnický Kancionál I* (Prague, 1998).

111) Prokop of Plzeň argued for the use of Czech in the liturgy at the Council of Basel in 1434 on the grounds that the vernacular had been the original liturgical language. "Nam in nostro linguagio slavico, jak se pravi na odůvodnění, ex indulto ecclesie olim ab antiquo in vulgari suo exercetur, eciam in regno nostro." Jaroslav Prokeš, *M. Procop z Plzně* (Prague, 1927) 96; 221 n.423. When, in 1448, Jan Rokycana returned to Prague from his exile in Hradec Kralové he upheld the use of Czech in the liturgy pointing out as precedent that the pope himself had authorized SS. Cyril and Methodius to use the Slavonic liturgy. F. M. Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce* (Prague, 1966) II,228. See also Amedeo Molnár, "Cyrilometodějský motiv v husitství", *Náboženská revue* 34 (1963) 157–163.

112) The recent codicological studies of the primarily Czech *directorium chori* known as the Jistebnický Kancionál which have confirmed its datation to the third decade of the fifteenth century raises significant questions about what was transpiring liturgically during the early decades of Utraquism. If, for example, the Jistebnický Kancionál represents a serious attempt to translate the Prague Use of the Roman Rite into Czech, why is there no trace of its general adoption for almost a century? See Jaroslav Kolár, Hana Vlhová et al. *Jistebnický Kancionál I* (Prague, 1998).

Sázava.¹¹³ It is clear that the use of Czech as the language of the liturgy was infuriating to the Roman authorities and was, perhaps, avoided by the more conservatively inclined within Utraquism as long as a lively hope for reconciliation with Rome remained.¹¹⁴ The shift to Czech as the primary liturgical language in the later half of the sixteenth century could be as much a part of the internal dynamic of Utraquism itself (in which the idea, once planted, took time to come to fruition¹¹⁵) as it was the product of pressure from the admirers of Luther. Again, it could simply be a part of the spirit of the age¹¹⁶ with the Renaissance emphasis on the importance of understanding which manifested itself not only within the churches of the sixteenth century reformation but within some quarters of the Roman church as well.

At the same time, there is a certain tendency towards modernity in the Utraquist rite. To return to the place of the preparation of the oblata, for example, the position after the epistle used exclusively in the three rites in the Táborský text was a much more “modern” use than the classical position of the Roman rite found in the *Missale Pragense*. While prayers during the preparation of the oblata are all relative novelties, those used by the Táborský text entered the tradition more recently than those in the *Missale Pragense*. We have no way of knowing, however, if the reformers were conscious of

113) Na Slovanech was founded under Charles IV as a centre of Slavonic liturgy. Sázava played an important rôle in the Czech consciousness of the nation. Contemporaries could have held these foundations as proof that catholic liturgy could be celebrated in languages other than Latin but, even then, Slavonic was not exactly the vernacular! In his *Kronyka czeska*, Bohuslav Bilejovský affirmed that the liturgy had been sung in Czech since the advent of Christianity in the Czech lands. He recounts the legend of the appearance of the ghost of St. Procopius before the German usurpers of his former monastery at Sázava. Upon failing to heed his exhortations to leave and to desist from the use of Latin, the ghostly abbot finally resorted to driving the Germans from Sázava with his abbatial staff. Zdeněk V. David, “Bohuslav Bilejovsky and the Religious Via Media: Czech Utraquism in the Sixteenth Century”, BRRP 1 (1996) 82.

114) We know that Jan Rokycana avoided the Czech liturgy while in Prague for the sake of peace with the emperor and the Council envoys and began to use it only during his exile in Hradec Kralové when, apparently, he had lost hope of a swift reconciliation with Rome. Similarly, he is said to have avoided celebrating the feast of Jan Hus until that time. Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce loc. cit.*

115) The seeds for the fifteenth century restoration of both communion *sub utraque* and communion for all the baptized had been sown in the debates over frequent communion in the fourteenth century. It is quite possible that the vernacularization of the liturgy was also an idea whose seeds were sown early but, while some of them sprouted when sown, most of which sprouted late because of political, rather than theological, considerations. Both communion *sub utraque* and the communion of all the baptised pertained to the Law of God, a claim which would have been difficult to sustain in the case of vernacular liturgy.

116) The glosses to the prayers *Domine Jesu Christe* and *Corpus tuum domine Iesu Christe*, which were taken from the Bamberg Missal certainly are “of the age” in that they are typical of the personalistic penitential piety that characterized the prayers that appeared in several western churches (both catholic and reformed) at the time.

introducing novelties into their rite or if they believed they were restoring more ancient uses. Whatever might be said about these aspects of the Utraquist liturgical texts, however, it would be anachronistic to dismiss the rite as too Roman Catholic. For as we have seen, catholic the Utraquist rite was but Roman it definitely was not.

Conclusion:

What we have come to see is the evolution of an Utraquist liturgical life that had an integrity of its own and which could neither be described as Lutheran nor as Roman Catholic. Here, as we have seen it in the Táborský text, it stood as a witness to what were to be the final years of a liturgical reform movement whose roots date to the late fourteenth century and which can only be understood in the context of the sacramental movement of Jan Milíč, Matěj of Janov and the others of their time. This movement received its permanent and distinctive character through Jakoubek of Stříbro's initiatives in the restoration of the chalice and the communion of all the baptised. But it was also a movement which continued to develop so that our text also witnesses to the tradition as it had evolved after over a century and a half of sacramental and liturgical reflection and renewal under the most adverse of conditions. As we have seen, the growth and development of the Utraquist liturgy drew upon a wide variety of sources. With an eye firmly fixed on what was thought to be the pure use of the early church, those who crafted the Utraquist liturgy were open to drawing on other liturgical rites and uses both from within Bohemia and from abroad. But, as we have also seen, none of these borrowings were simply mindless or slavish imitations of another tradition but, rather, part of a coherent effort to forge a liturgical tradition with a rationale and integrity that was uniquely its own.

A final reflection might be helpful as a means of focusing some of the issues at hand. In the last decades of liturgical reform in our own century, those opposed to the new liturgical texts often accuse them of being either too catholic, too protestant, too Anglican or too Lutheran etc. When these accusations are made, the epithet is usually chosen from a glossary calculated to elicit the most negative reaction from one's audience. This has clearly been the case in the history of Utraquism. "Lutheran" and "Roman Catholic" have been invoked as terms of opprobrium designed to elicit negative reactions in a Pavlovian fashion. When the process behind the reform of modern texts is examined more closely, however, what often proves to be the case is that liturgical scholars have not borrowed from the work of their contemporaries but, rather, have worked independently and have arrived at similar conclusions and that the primary referents were the liturgical practices of the patristic church and the pastoral needs of the local church for whom the new rites were being prepared. I would suggest that such a

process was probably operative in the sixteenth century just as it was during the liturgical reforms of our own day. If there has been a common model to which reformers shaped their texts, I would suggest that it was from the liturgical life of the ancient church (either real or imagined) to which all the liturgical reformers, be they in Bohemia, Germany or Rome, made appeal. Texts from a common “ancient” source which are shared in new liturgical creations hardly make the new text subject to accusations of being “Lutheran” or “Roman Catholic”.

When there were borrowings from other liturgical traditions, as there were then just as there are now, great care must be taken before such borrowing can be invoked to dismiss an entire rite as “Lutheran”, “Roman Catholic”, or “Utraquist”. The borrowed text must be seen and judged in the context of the entire liturgy in which it is given a place and not simply as an isolated liturgical element. For example, the use of a quite explicit epiclesis (prayer for the sending of the Holy Spirit) on the eucharistic elements found in the Czech eucharistic prayers in the Táborský text cannot be invoked as grounds on which to call the eucharistic rite “Byzantine” simply because an explicit epiclesis on the eucharistic gifts is a feature of the Byzantine, but not the Roman, tradition. In fact, we do not yet know what lay behind the incorporation of an epiclesis into the Utraquist rite; perhaps it was inspired by the study of ancient liturgical texts, perhaps by a borrowing from the Byzantine or even the Mozarabic rite. But when examining liturgical borrowings, we might be wise to abandon an automatic hermeneutic of suspicion and impute to the liturgical reformers an integrity which assumes that they were able to sift through the texts available to them in both ancient and modern sources and, from them, create a liturgical text of their own which was closer to a seamless garment with its own rationale and theological integrity than it was to an ugly patchwork of borrowed texts crudely sewn together.

This study is but an initial exploration into the evolution of Utraquist liturgy. It should also be clear that there is a vast amount of work to be done before we can even begin to say that we understand the dynamics behind its growth and development. As a tentative step towards this end, I hope that this paper has made two things clear. First, that the dismissive attitude that has been adopted towards Utraquist liturgy has been founded on cant and prejudice rather than on an examination of the liturgical texts themselves. For when the texts are examined, it quickly becomes clear that the traditional accusations cannot be substantiated. Second, when the Utraquist liturgical texts are studied, they prove to be the product of a liturgical movement with its own unique sacramental theology and liturgical principles in light of which the texts make coherent sense and, when studied carefully, become themselves a rich mine from which we can learn much about Utraquism in its final years.