
Quandries in Dating Utraquist Mass Books of the Period 1470-1537

Barry F. H. Graham

(Toronto)

The assignment of a date to a manuscript is an integral part of its codicological description. It becomes essential if one is interested in identifying trends in the contents of a collection of volumes such as these mass books. The plan of this paper is to start by defining the books included in this corpus and to continue by discussing various methods used in their dating, including a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the methods. The last task will be to examine two books where the different dating methods produce inconsistent results and to suggest how these disparities should be resolved.

Extant Jagiellonian Mass Books

What is believed to be a complete, or almost complete, list of Utraquist graduals from this period is set out in the appendix. There are twenty-four volumes listed. Most of these are written entirely in Latin. In five of the books (documents 1, 4, 6, 11 and 20), a small minority of the hymns and motets are in Czech. Two books (4 and 5) have a long Czech tract in each of the two offices for the dead. All of the books containing Czech are probably or certainly from the sixteenth century. In addition to these books, two Utraquist missals made by the scribe Jan of Humpolec survive. One was made in 1486, perhaps for the Church of St. Václav in Pněvice¹, and the other in 1493 for the Church of SS. Peter and Paul in Ledec².

Dating by Colophon

This is one of the two methods that can establish the precise year and sometimes even the day of the book's completion. If the date is included in an inscription written by the scribe in the script of the book, it can be relied upon with confidence. For example, according to the colophon on f. 427v of Louny I G 8a (doc. 10), the artisan Paul of Mělník completed the work on 2 June, 1530.

Anno nativitatis christi M^oCCCCC^oXXX^o. Ad laudem et gloriam Sanctissime et individue Trinitatis, Marie virginis, et tocius curie celestis. Feria v ante Penthecostem die Marcelli pape. Consumatum est Graduale duarum parcium propriis sumptibus discreti viri domini Andree Lunensis Civitas Civis pro memoria habenda sempiterna, ut a christi fidelibus tale beneficium non detur oblivioni temporibus futuris, Sed deus omnipotens et largissimus premio sempiterno in beatitudine illum remuneret. Necnon et Paulum Melnicensem operis huius artificem premio non privet.

1) MS Kutná Hora, Okresní archiv, č. 10

2) MS Ledec, Děkanství, ZP 826/1

In some books, we see only dates written in one or more places within the manuscripts and/or an inscription concerning date in other than the main script. Sometimes, these may be as reliable as a full colophon such as Paul of Mělník's which was quoted above. In other cases, they may be questioned or recognized as unreliable. The dating of the Smíškovský gradual (document 22) should be straightforward. The year 1490 is written, apparently by the initial artist, in an illuminated G on f. 316r. A colophon in small script at the bottom of f. 492v reads, "finis feria vi post Iacobi [29 July] anno Domini 149.1. The different dates assigned to this book come about because some commentators have, not without some justification, read the last digit in the year as "5". Some who have fallen into this trap include Mazal and Unterkircher (in 1963) in the catalogue of the Austrian National Library³ and Krása⁴ who give the date of 1490 - 1495. The dating 1490 - 1491 is accepted by Chytil (by implication)⁵ and by Unterkircher (in 1974)⁶. One would have thought that a period as long as 1490-1495 would not have been suggested because other graduals of the time seem to have taken at most two years to complete and because Matthew, the illuminator of the book, had moved to Prague in 1494.⁷

In two other books, dates added in other than the main hand have been judged by some scholars to have been added later. One of these, the New York gradual (document 21) will be discussed below. In the second (document 4), the name of the famous scribe Jan Táborský and the date 1530 are written at the bottom of the last column of the register of the book's contents.⁸ An early commentator on the book accepted this date without questioning it.⁹ Karel Chytil, writing later, observed that the register was believed to have been written after the book itself which, for artistic and stylistic reasons, should be placed in the first or second decade of the sixteenth century.¹⁰ This seems unlikely for reasons of content. Both document 4 and document 5, the latter undoubtedly by Táborský¹¹, are the only documents which contain a tract in Czech in each of the offices of the dead. The texts are identical.

3) Otto Mazal and Franz Unterkircher, *Katalog der abendländischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, "Series Nova", Part 2/1, (Vienna, 1963) 331.

4) Josef Krása, "Knižní Malba" [Book Painting] *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění* [A History of Czech Fine Arts] (Prague, 1984) 1/ 2:608.

5) Karel Chytil, *Vývoj miniaturního malířství českého za doby králů rodu jagellonského* [Progress of Czech Miniaturist Painting in the Jagiellonian Era] (Prague, 1896) 12.

6) Franz Unterkircher, "Die datierten Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek von 1451 bis 1500", *Katalog der datierten Handschriften in lateinischer Schrift in Österreich* (Vienna, 1974) 3/1:190.

7) J. V. Šimák, "Zprávy o malířích a iluminátorech pražských doby jagellonské 1471 - 1526" [Information Concerning the Painters and Illuminators of Prague in the Jagiellonian Period 1471 - 1526] *Památky archaeologické a místopisné* (hereinafter *Památky*) 18 (1898-9), col. 472 and Chytil, *Vývoj* 12.

8) MS Chrudim. Okresní muzeum, inv. č. 12580, f. 2r.

9) J. E. Wocel, "Miniatury české XVI. století", *Památky* 3 (1859) 247.

10) Karel Chytil, *Vývoj* 29.

11) The rubric colophon on the last page (f. 545v) is in the same script as the rest of the book and reads, "Hoc Opus perfecit Joannes Taborinus Prage, Anno christi M D xxxvii.

There is one instance of a date which was undoubtedly inserted later. In the Mladá Boleslav Gradual (document 12), we are faced with the activities of Josef Kohauth, a local antiquary (sometimes described as a busybody) in the first decade of the nineteenth century. The last name, Kohauth, is found at the base of the altar in the miniature inside the letter S on f. 214v. The angel at the lower outside corner of f. 23v carries a ribbon which reads "1809" on his right hand and "1509" on his left. The band carried by the angel in the middle of the lower margin proclaims the name "Joseph". It seems clear by Kohauth's self-advertisement that he was not trying to counterfeit the date 1509. Indeed, he may have had access to some records which have not been preserved that led him to the correct date of the book. Chytil observed that some contemporary motifs found in Schedel's chronicle¹² find an echo in motifs in this gradual. The chronicle was among the most widespread books of the time and found its way to Bohemia through an outlet of its publisher in Prague. However, there is no record of its arrival there before 1509.¹³

The conclusion of these remarks about colophons is that they are almost always reliable and that one therefore has to have unambiguous evidence that they are false before rejecting them.

Dating using Collateral Historical Information

This method, like the previous one, can give reliable dates. However, the usual information that it renders is in the nature of an accurate upper and/or lower limit of the range of years in which the book was made.

For example, the later Sobotka gradual (document 23) is shown in the appendix as having the rather wide range of possible dates of 1509-1537. The beginning of this range is a judgement based on contents. The *terminus ad quem* of 1537, on the other hand, is quite firm and is based on solid internal evidence. We know that the sponsor was Jindřich z Valdštejna whose name¹⁴ and coat of arms¹⁵ appear on the frontispiece on f. 1v. He died in 1537.¹⁶

A second example of firm dating from collateral historical information is that of the magnificent Litoměřice gradual (document 8). The book had two sponsors, and town and other records contain information about them. The first, Jakub Ronovský of Welgnau, is the subject of a poem on f. 1v entitled "Epigramma in huius operis Emptorem". Below it lies a coat of arms, presumably of Ronovský. The second is Václav of Řepnice. A picture of him kneeling is found on f. 245v. His coat of arms hangs on the limb of a tree over his head. We know that he was until 1511 a resident of Lovosice, six km downstream of Litoměřice on the Elbe. In 1511, he

12) The *Liber chronicarum* of Hartmann Schedel (1440-1514) contains illustrations by Michael Wolgemut and Wilhelm Pleydenwurf. It was published in Nuremberg by Anton Koberger on 12 July, 1493.

13) Karel Chytil, *Vývoj* 26.

14) On f. 1v, we read: "Ke czti a k chwale panu bohu - urozny pan pan Gindrich z walsstayna a na Rychnibce".

15) See Milan Mysliveček, *Erbovník*, (Heraldry), (Prague, 1993) 69f. and illustration on 59. The shield has rampant lions, gold on blue and blue on gold in four quarterings. A crown sits atop a rightward facing helm. The crest is a gold and a blue wing, which on f. 1v, each have a rampant lion.

16) Anna Livorová, "Sobotecký graduál", *Sobotka 1498 - 1948. Jubilejní sborník ke 450. výročí povýšení na město* [Jubilee Collection for the 450th Anniversary of the Town's Charter] (Sobotka, 1948) 71.

moved to Litoměřice where he played a prominent role in the struggle against the efforts of the first estate (the upper nobility) to whittle away the power of the towns. He served as lord mayor of Litoměřice from 1515 to 1517, after which no further mention of him appears in the town records.¹⁷ The name Kubík Ronovský appears in the town's tax registers in the years 1505, 1508 and 1510. In 1512, he had died and his property was occupied by someone else. Chytil therefore concluded that the book was begun under Ronovský's patronage in 1510 and was concluded under Řepnice's in 1514.¹⁸ This theory has a certain amount to be said for it, apart from the notion that the book's completion required the implausibly long period of four to five years.

Information about the activities of the town's *literati* for whose use the gradual was made is found in the town clerk's record of a celebration held on 15 February 1517. Its participants included four priests from other parts of the country, including the archdeacon from Kutná Hora, the local rector and a number of leading citizens from Litoměřice, of whom the first two listed are Václav of Řepnice and a Pan Hron. The gathering was large enough that no one house could accommodate it, and so there were five tables in the home of Jan Výcena and a further three at the home of Martin Nosidlo. Each of the participants gave three groše towards the cost of the food, and some of the elder citizens provided the drink. After dinner, the participants crossed the square with the church bell ringing and singing the Te Deum.¹⁹ Donek tells us that the mayor of the town for the period 1517 - 1523 was none other than Jakub Ronovský z Velchova, whom he connects with Pan Hron.²⁰ Smetana observes that, while it is not possible to equate Hron with Jakub Ronovský, the two names are related. Therefore, we can conclude that the volume was certainly finished during Řepnice's period of residence in Litoměřice and, because of the historical information we have, all commentators on the book agree that it was made at some time during the period 1510-1517. It would further appear that the banquet of *literati* in early 1517 was held to celebrate the completion of the gradual and that thus it is probable that the making of the book occurred in the year or two before 15 February 1517.

Collateral historical data will be used below to date the Kuttenberg Kancional. In general, the method gives results which are reliable but usually does not identify one day or year, but rather a range of years.

17) Chytil, *Vývoj* 51.

18) Chytil, *Vývoj* 51-52.

19) Chytil, *Vývoj* 51. Also Jan Smetana in private correspondence in which he quotes from his paper, "Nejstarší kronikářské záznamy litoměřických radních písařů" [The Oldest Chronicle Entries of the Litoměřice Town Clerks] *Litoměřicko* 14 (1978) 128.

20) J. Smetana, in "Heraldické památky na litoměřické erbovní měšťany" [Heraldic Records about the Arms of the Burghers of Litoměřice] *Litoměřicko* 17-20 (1981 - 1984) 80 cites E. Donek, "Království rychtáři a primatorové litoměřičtí ve století XVI. až XVIII." [Reeves and Lords Mayor of the Realm of Litoměřice in the 16th through 18th Centuries] *Časopis musejního spolku v Litoměřicích* [Journal of the Litoměřice Museum Association] 2 (1930) 13.

Dating by Contents

Contents can be used as a negative criterion in establishing a *terminus a quo*. To use a contrived example, suppose a mass book, said to be from the early twelfth century, contains an office of Corpus Christi. An informed scholar would have to reject this dating, since Corpus Christi was not known in the church before the thirteenth century.

Turning to our own corpus, look at the books in the appendix whose dates are in bold and add to them documents 4 and 8 which, in the light of the comments above, can be considered to have been reliably dated. None of the securely-dated books which were made before 1500 have unnoted troped Kyries. There also seems to be a tendency for later books to have more tropes than earlier ones. The last reliably-dated book, which is from 1537 (document 5), has seventeen. The two books from the first decade of the century (documents 1 and 2) each have only eight.

Let us go through a similar process with respect to the presence of prose and eucharistic propers for the feast of Hus. We are told that he was first commemorated as a martyr on 6 July 1416²¹. The delegation from the council of Basel to the meeting of the Prague diet in the early summer of 1433 witnessed the celebration of the feast of Hus in a mass sung in Latin by a traditional choir of *literati*.²² Despite the fact that we know that the feast of Hus was celebrated in the early fifteenth century, it is true that there is no sign of eucharistic propers among our documents for the feast before the second decade of the sixteenth century, although sequences for Hus began appearing in 1491 (document 22). Probably the feast was celebrated in the fifteenth century using antiphons taken from the common of martyrs.

Contents then can be used to separate the earlier from the later books of the period. Books with troped Kyries are sixteenth century. Books with sequences for Hus are later than 1490 and those with proper antiphons for Hus are later than the first decade of the sixteenth century. While this method produces reliable results, it is of itself only able to place books within a time-frame of several decades.

Dating Assisted by Palaeography

While palaeography may be useful in dating at other times and in other places, in the Bohemian Utraquist mass books of this period it is a tool with a rather blunt edge. Of the twenty-four books in the appendix, the script in eighteen is textualis formata. We shall return to them below. Four (documents 6, 15, 19 and 20) are written in cursiva formata which shows no noticeable differences among the four books. Since the dates of none of these books are certain anyway, there is effectively no palaeographical evidence which can be used in their dating. Document 11 is in what one would think of as a typical hybrid book script. It is like

21) František Bartoš, "M. Jan Hus v bohoslužbě a úctě církve podobojí a v podání prvního století po své smrti" [Master Jan Hus in the Divine Service and Esteem of the Utraquist Church and Tradition of the First Century after his Death] *Národopisný věstník československý*, 17 (1924) 20.

22) "Když aspoň 1433 husitský mluvčí na bazilejském koncile, Martin Lupáč, vykládal otcům o mohutné síle národní úcty k M. Janovi, mohl se dovolati svědectví koncilních legátů, kteří za nedávného pobytu v Praze viděli, jak byl svátek 6. července v hlavním městě slaven, a rozuměli patrně mezinárodní [latinské] řeči oficia, zpívaného patrně již tehdy literátskými sbory, vzešlými právě z těchto kruhů husitských." (František Bartoš, "M. Jan Hus," 21.)

textualis formata but with single-compartment a's, s's and f's which break the line and ascenders without loops. Document 5 has the hybrid book script which appears in the deluxe Czech-language mass books after 1540. It is characterized by single-compartment a's, looped ascenders and s's and f's which break the line.

The textualis formata script in the deluxe books, with the two minor exceptions noted below, shows very little evolution in its form over the seventy years. The script in some books is neater and in others less so, but this has to do with the care and expertise of the scribe, rather than with the age of the document. The a's found in document 14 have a single compartment a, not of the kind found in early textualis scripts when the upper compartment is not entirely closed, but rather in the manner of hybrid or cursive script of the time and of what became the predominant book script after 1540.

Biting connections are a feature of later textualis script. The first rule of biting states that, if two adjacent letters have bows facing one another (for example *be*, *oc*, *do*, *po*), then they are set so close that the bows partially overlap. Whenever the bows of the textualis are changed into straight strokes, the letters share the vertical parts of the transformed bows.²³ The scribe Jan Mikuš of Hradec Králové was responsible for documents 3 and 16. The second of these has a colophon giving its date as 1470. The first was probably completed within a year or two of the second. In both books, the normal biting rule is usually not followed, which is consistent with their being the earliest in our corpus.²⁴ The script in document 24 has consistent biting which, however, does not fully follow the biting rule. For example the pairs *de* and *do* usually follow the biting rule but *be* and *pe* do not. This perhaps supports the date suggested for the book of the last half of the fifteenth century.

Perhaps one is unreasonable to hope that palaeography can provide much detailed help in ordering the relative dates of manuscripts produced within as short a period as seventy years. Paul of Mělník was an illuminator and scribe who lived in various different houses in Prague for most of the years between 1492 and his death in 1433, that is forty-one years of our total period of sixty-seven years. He seems to have been a prominent member of the artists' guild for the last quarter century of his life, since he was called on to mediate financial disputes among other members of the guild.²⁵ So we can ask ourselves whether we think Paul's book script changed consistently with contemporary trends during his career as a scribe. The perhaps unsurprising answer is that there is no perceptible difference between the script in his earliest surviving manuscript (document 2 - 1506) and his latest one (document 10 - 1530).

Dating Assisted by Art Historical Considerations

It is apparent that the illuminators of these books often relied on models, sometimes by way of an actual book lying before them, sometimes by a picture they had seen and, at other times, through the recollection of a master they worked for. This does not mean that they usually produced a slavish copy of another picture.

23) Bernhard Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography*, trans. Dáibhí Ó. Cróinín and David Ganz (Cambridge, 1990) 130.

24) This may, however, be an idiosyncrasy of Mikuš since the Kutná Hora antiphonary completed in 1471 by the scribe Valentin Noh (MS Prague NK XXIII A 2) does follow the usual biting rule.

25) J. V. Šimák, "Zprávy o malířích a iluminátorech pražských", col. 475.

Rather, the work that an artist produced was also influenced by his inventiveness, technical ability and by contemporary taste (as reflected, for example in dress, bodily posture and the grooming of hair and beard). They drew on a wide variety of sources over a considerable time span from the Germanic and French lands and from the Low Countries. Masters whose work provided models for Bohemian artists of this era included Berthold Furtmeyer, the master E. S., Martin Schöngauer, Václav of Olomouc, Israel van Menkenen, Michael Wolgemut and Albrecht Dürer.²⁶ An example of an artist modifying an old model by using new ideas can be found in the Man of Sorrows used in the miniature for the *Kyrie* of document 8.²⁷ The traditional elements and posture of the Man of Sorrows²⁸ are all present. The powerful musculature, though, represents Renaissance ideas and would not have appeared at the beginning of our period.

Art historical considerations are helpful, it seems to me, in establishing a *terminus a quo* for a painting. It would not be reasonable to assign a painting a date of 1470 if the model on which it was unambiguously based was not created until 1517. However, it is possible for a picture made in 1517 to be based on a model from 1470 and to reflect clothing and hair styles from the earlier time. The use of a primitive style of painting may not necessarily imply an early date. It may be a reflection of the artist's poor technical ability, a desire to archaize or perhaps a dwelling distant from Prague which isolated the illuminator from contemporary trends. In other words, art historical observations, like liturgical contents and palaeography, are most useful when establishing a *terminus a quo*. Oftentimes they cannot be reliably used to identify the *terminus ad quem*. Dating using art historical means must incorporate intelligence and common sense.

Let us consider an example where a larger portion of common sense would have been helpful. The gradual of Havlíčkův Brod (document 2) concludes with the colophon, "Anno salutis mdvi manu Pauli Mielnicensis". The figure of Christ on the first page of the *Kyriale* is seated. His right elbow is on his right thigh and his head rests on his right hand. There are a remarkable number of points of similarity to *Der Schmerzensmann*,²⁹ the woodcut on the title page of Dürer's *Little Passion*, produced in the years 1509 and 1510, but not published until 1511. Chytil asks how a Czech illuminator could arrive at a picture which Dürer published several years later and wonders whether there was some earlier artist who influenced both.³⁰ This line of reasoning was taken one step further by an author of this century. Josef Krása observed that, while the *graduale* is dated 1506, its decoration must have taken several years longer since it is dependent on Dürer's engraving which only appeared in 1511.³¹ First, he seems to forget that Paul was certainly the illuminator and probably also the scribe of the book. Since Paul says it was completed in 1506, we are entitled to assume that it really was. Chytil's thought that there may have

26) Chytil, *Vývoj*, 4, 8, 12, 25.

27) f. 3r.

28) Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art* trans. Janet Seligman (Greenwich, Conn., 1972) 2:199-224.

29) See plate 727 in Schiller, *Iconography*.

30) Karel Chytil, *Vývoj* 34.

31) Josef Krása, "Knižní malířství" [Book Painting] *Pozdně gotické umění v Čechách* [Late Gothic Art in Bohemia] (Prague, 1978) 440.

been an earlier artist on whom both Paul and Dürer relied is a possible explanation. Another one is that Paul himself was the originator of the seated Man of Sorrows.

We shall now proceed to examine the quandaries presented by two of the books in our corpus whose dating is particularly challenging.

Dating of the New York Gradual (document 21)

Pavel Brodský, a Czech expert on art history, inspected copies of the miniatures in the gradual and provided his observations, particularly about the question of dating. His initial comments³² referred to the extraordinary replacement of Jesus for the angel in what he identified as the miniature for the feast of the Annunciation³³ and to the possibility that the church for which the book was made was dedicated to St. Andrew, since Andrew appeared at the beginning of the sanctorale before St. Peter³⁴. As to the art itself, he believed that the twenty-eight miniatures were executed by probably four artists or groups of artists, the first of which had moderate ability and the remaining three of whom had little talent.³⁵ Brodský noted that he had no explanation for the pedestrian quality of the miniatures. He is sure though that they were not painted in the sixteenth century and that therefore the date 1532 which appears on f. 25v is not original.

Six factors lead him to the conclusion that the manuscript is fifteenth century.

1. The draping of the clothing on ff. 37v and 87v
2. The shape of the soldier's shield on f. 87v
3. The helmet of the soldier behind the tomb on f. 106r
4. The long hair of the man on f. 133r
5. The presence of four men having beards with two points
6. The shape of the acanthus leaves in the margins.

It is perhaps fair to note this author's observation that most of the male figures in the illuminations have short, not long, hair and that only four men out of perhaps two score have double-pointed beards. For the six reasons noted above, Brodský dates the manuscript in the period 1440-1470. He is able to be more precise and to state that the book was made in the 1450s because the figure on f. 133r with the long blond hair resembles the manner in which King Ladislav the Posthumous was depicted. Ladislav died in 1457. Consistent with his conclusion on dating, he asserts that the figure of the scribe at the bottom of f. 25v who is writing "1532" on a scroll of paper is a later addition to the manuscript.

Brodský did not mention the extensive use of cartoons (which are crude, consistently with the rest of the artistic contents) to decorate smaller initials which do not have miniatures. Looking at the other books in the appendix, with the exception of the Smíškovský gradual (document 22), no book made before 1500

32) Private letter from Pavel Brodský to David HOLETON of 13 December 1995.

33) In fact, it was the feast of the Assumption.

34) *sic*

35) The classification of the miniatures on the various pages of the four groups follows. Group 1: 26r, 106r, 125r and perhaps 129v; Group 2: 87v, 122v, 126r, 155r, 155v, 168v and 217v; Group 3: 10v, 131r, 133r, 153v, 206r, 209v and 225v; Group 4: 25v, 34r, 37v, 45r, 170r, 200v, 213r and 235r.

has cartoons. The same can be said for the Kutná Hora antiphony made by Valentin Noh in 1471.³⁶ Books made after 1500 usually have cartoons used in this way.

The chief question about Brodský's reasoning which occurs to someone who is not an art historian is whether the art might not look early because of the primitive ability of the artist rather than because the art itself was truly early. The application of normal analytical principles to the work of an inept provincial artist is perhaps a task best not begun. A second question is how did a group of four indifferent artists in the 1550s pioneer a use of cartoons which was not seen again for forty years?

Thomas Talley also assigns the book to the period 1450-1460. Talley confirms this conjecture with a palaeographical opinion which he was given by John Plummer, Curator of Medieval Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library.³⁷ Since Talley did not cite the reasons for Plummer's opinion, it is impossible to comment on them. A slight palaeographical anomaly of the book is that only on f. 25v, some of the minims end on the line in straight lines rather than in lozenges. The significance of this phenomenon, if any, is not apparent. One can only repeat the observation noted earlier that, apart from the manuscripts of Jan Mikuš, which were made about 1470, the script in our body of books shows no perceptible signs of evolution. This book is entirely similar to the others.

Most of the books listed in the appendix are massive, weighing as much as 50 kg. In order to avoid damage to the leather covers during handling, most of the books were provided with cast brass corner pieces and central bosses. As it happens, the corner pieces and central bosses on the New York Gradual are almost indistinguishable from those on volume 1 of the Šternberk gradual³⁸, a book prepared in 1499 for the Franciscan convent in Bechyně, about 120 km south of Prague. The danger of paying undue heed to this information is made clear by the fact that the brass fittings on volume 2 of Šternberk³⁹ (completed in 1500) are nearly identical with those on the back covers of the two-volume Louny gradual (document 10) which was certainly completed in 1530. It seems that the designs for metal book fittings were remarkably persistent and therefore that their use in dating is not much greater than that of art history or of palaeography.

Let us turn to contents and first consider the question of troped Kyries. Looking only at those books in the appendix whose dating is sure, we find no books with troped Kyries older than 1505. The first book in which the number reached as high as fourteen was made in 1512. Our book has sixteen, a figure attained among the books dated with certainty only by the Klatovy gradual (document 5) of 1537.

A similar conclusion can be reached from the presence in the book of eucharistic proper antiphons. Minor textual variances notwithstanding, the text of the alleluia verse in the New York Gradual is the same as those found in documents 8,

36) MS Prague NK XXIII A 2

37) Thomas J. Talley, "A Hussite Latin Gradual of the XV Century", *Bulletin of the General Theological Seminary* 48 (1962) 6.

38) MS Vienna ÖNB Mus. Hs. 15493.

39) MS ÖNB Mus. Hs. 15494.

10, 11⁴⁰ and 23. New York also contains the prose *Rex regum*, the longer sequence used on the feast of Hus. The earliest sure date among these five documents is 1512.

To recapitulate our data for the *terminus a quo* for the book, art history gives dates of the 1450s (or 1490), palaeography gives the 1450s (or 1490) and liturgical contents give a date of 1512. The *terminus ad quem* is 1540 since there are no Utraquist books written only in Latin which are known to have been produced after that date. It would be rash indeed in these circumstances to do other than accept that the colophon of 1532 on f. 25v accurately reflects the date when the book was completed.

Dating of the Kuttenberg Kancional (document 7)

The decoration of this book is remarkably similar to the Smíškovský Gradual (document 22). The standard of artistry of both is first rate. Each has 23-24 miniatures in initials executed in opaque paint and gold leaf at the start of the set of proper antiphons. Illuminations and/or extensive decoration usually appear in the margins of these pages. The agreement of the art of the two volumes is particularly impressive in that it relates not only to major details, but also to minor ones which no one would be tempted to copy. Frimmel points to the remarkable similarity of the cartoon of a young man hammering on an anvil on f. 10r of ÖNB 15492 to the figure on f. 50v of this book. The medallions illustrating Moses and the burning bush (f. 62v of 15501, f. 64v of 15492) are identical except for the landscape background. The miniatures and the marginal decorations for the feast of the Epiphany (f. 73r in both books) are the same apart from differences in the colouring. Frimmel notes a number of other instances of the striking similarity of the art in the two volumes.⁴¹ Additionally and unusually, there are wash illustrations of the particular saint's day at the beginning of most sequences. It is hard to describe the liveliness, joyfulness and humour of the figures of Turks, soldiers, damsels, monkeys etc. which lean against the initials or peep out from within them. Both have drolleries in the margins which are irreverent, funny and sometimes risqué. We know that the name of the illuminator of Smíškovský was Matthew⁴² and that it was made in the years 1490-1⁴³.

It is said that there was a new mining code promulgated in 1486 and revised in 1494. Chytil, relying on the mining practices recorded on the frontispiece which he says complied with the earlier, but not the later code, states that the book must have been prepared between these two years⁴⁴. The principal art critics who have commented on this book agree that Matthew or the school of Matthew was responsible for this book.⁴⁵ Chytil and Krása both believe this to be the earlier of the

40) While the outer l of f. 302 of document 11 has been torn away, the material on the stub which is left is sufficient to identify the alleluia verse as the same one found in the other four books.

41) Theodor Frimmel, "Urkunden, Regesten und artistisches Quellenmaterial aus der Bibliothek der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses", *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 5 (1887) XI.

42) The illuminator is identified on f. 433v of MS ÖNB Mus. Hs. 15492.

43) MS ÖNB Mus. Hs. 15492, ff. 316r, 492v.

44) *Vývoj* 16. Chytil gives no details.

45) Ant. Rybička, "Dva staročeské kancionaly v c. k. sbírce Ambraské" [Two Old Czech Kancionals in the Imperial Ambras Collection] *Památky* 6 (1865) 284. Chytil, *Vývoj* 15. Eva Handiaková, "Život kutnohorských havířů a jeho odraz v titulím listu kancionálu Matouše iluminátora"

two books. Handiaková assigns the book to 1493-4, but she may have believed that Smíškovský was not completed until 1495. Matthew died between 17 September 1495 and 11 January 1496.⁴⁶ The library catalogue does not identify the illuminator and says only that the book is fifteenth century⁴⁷.

Let us then move on to a consideration of the book's contents. Chytil, who is usually astute, remarks that, "the book is wholly preserved and has been damaged by no one".⁴⁸ However, a careful examination of the text shows that the last few words of the communion for Procop (after f. 96), all of what seem to have been the propers for Hus and the introit and first line of the gradual for Margaret have been excised. While the position of the excision makes it probable that the missing folios related to Hus, assurance becomes doubly sure when we observe the rubric "quaere Iohannis hus" for the gradual of the feast of Ursula (f. 111v) and again "quaere hus" for the offertory of All Saints' day (f. 113r). Since there is only one lacuna in the propers, it can only relate to Hus. Later in the book we see that the last 7" lines of the prose for Procop (following f. 189) and all but the last 2" lines of *Clericalis turma*, a sequence for Hus, have been excised. An excision following f. 223 has removed the last four lines of the sequence for the common of confessors and the first four of the common of martyrs. The text of the latter is a standard one with no Hussite allusions to disquiet the censors. Most of the sequences though have marginal colour wash illustrations at their beginnings, and the one for martyrs may have portrayed Hus in a manner which someone subsequently found offensive.

Contents then reveal that the book originally contained both proper antiphons and a sequence for Hus. As noted earlier, this fact places the book no earlier than the second decade of the sixteenth century.

We are fortunate in having two pieces of collateral historical information to assist our dating. The letter W with an intertwining L and a crown on top appears as a monogram on a crest with a blue background on f. 95r and on another crest, this time with a red background, on f. 150v.⁴⁹ These two letters were used to refer to Vladislav and his son Ludvík on public buildings and other works completed during their reigns.⁵⁰ Ludvík was born in 1506, crowned King of Bohemia at St. Vitus's Cathedral during his father's lifetime in 1509 and died in 1526. The conjunction of the two initials with a crown suggest that the book was completed between 1509 and 1516, when both were King of Bohemia. Vladislav died in 1516. The argument that the L was added later would appear untenable.⁵¹

[The Life of the Miners of Kutná Hora and its Reflection in the Frontispiece of the Kancional of Matthew the Illuminator] *Český Lid* [The Czech People] 43 (1956) 196. Josef Krása, "Knižní malířství" [Book Painting] *Pozdně gotické umění v Čechách* [Late Gothic Art in Bohemia] (Prague, 1978) 417 f.

46) J. V. Šimák, "Zprávy o malířích a iluminátorech pražských", col. 472 and Chytil, *Vývoj* 12.

47) *Tabulae Codicum Manu Scriptorum praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, vv.9-10 (Graz, 1965) 1.

48) Chytil, *Vývoj* 15 f. "...jest úplně zachován a obsah jeho nebyl nikým poškozen."

49) Krása in "Knižní malířství", 419, states that this is a monogram typical of one for a burgher's family ca. 1500. His interpretation is surely incorrect.

50) Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích* (Prague, 1992) 1:189, 298.

51) Emanuel Leminger, *Umělecké řemeslo v Kutné Hoře* (Prague, 1926) 216.

The book was almost certainly made for the consistory church of St. James in Kutná Hora. The Gothic church depicted in the miniature for the Dedication Festival (f. 116v) is identical in its major architectural features with the church's present form. These include the presence of four bays in the nave, two in the choir, the roof of the choir which is lower than that of the nave and the form of the two asymmetric towers of the west end. Krása also says that the book was produced for the church of St. James but gives no reason for his opinion.⁵² There was an inventory of the contents of St. James's Church in 1516 which mentions a *new* large gradual and a second small gradual.⁵³ Assuming that our book must be the large gradual, the adjective "new", while quite apt for a book produced in the most recent seven years, would not seem to fit one produced twenty-five years earlier.

Collateral historical data, supported by the book's contents, leads to the conclusion that the book was produced between 1509 and 1516. While it is certainly true that there are impressive similarities in the artistic content of this book and of Smíškovský, they may have come about through borrowing of the general form and of some specific pictures. Indeed, the resemblance of the two miniatures for the Epiphany in the two books is so close to suggest that perhaps the artist of this book had Smíškovský open in front of him as he painted the two illuminations.

Dating Methods - A Conclusion

Having reviewed the principal dating methods which can be used on this body of books and looked at two specific examples, we are in a position to suggest an answer to the question of how one should resolve quandaries which occur when different methods point to different conclusions. There may also be additional considerations to ponder about a particular volume which do not apply to most of the books. It seems that the hierarchy of dating methods for this particular group of books, ordered as to their reliability, is as follows:

1. Colophons and collateral historical data,
2. Liturgical content and last,
3. Palaeography and art history.

Of course, among manuscripts in general, evidence of the first two classes is frequently absent. One must then rely tentatively on class three. The two examples show that when evidence of a higher order is available, one must be ready to discard that of a lesser order.

52) Krása, "Knižní malířství" 419.

53) František Beneš, "Archiděkanský chrám sv. Jakuba na Horách Kutných" [The Archidiaconal Church of St. James] *Památky* 6 (1865) 266.

APPENDIX
UTRAQUIST OR POSSIBLY UTRAQUIST GRADUALS, 1470-1537

	Depository (1)	Shelfmark (2)	UnKyr (3)	S/P (4)	Date (5)	Place of First Use (6)
1	Eastern Bohemia Mus (HK)	II A 6	8		1505	Ch. of the Holy Spirit, Hrad. Král.
2	Havlíčkův Brod Dist. Mus.	SK 2/1	8		1506	Ch. of the Assumption, Hav. Brod
3	Eastern Bohemia Mus (HK)	II A 2			ca. 1470	Ch. of the Holy Spirit, Hrad. Král.
4	Chrudim District Museum	č. 12580	11	SPX	1530	Ch. of the Assumption, Chrudim
5	Klatovy District Muzeum	403	16	SP	1537	unknown
6	Kutná Hora District Mus.	88/85 č. 264	14		1500-30	perhaps St. Barbara, Kutná Hora
7	Vienna, ÖNB	Mus Hs 15501	14	SPX	1509-16	Church of St. James, Kutná Hora
8	Litoměřice District Museum	IV C 1		SP	1512-7	Church of All Saints, Litoměřice
9	Prague, Národní knihovna	XXIII A 1			ca. 1500	unknown
10	Louny District Archive	I G 8a & 8b	11	SP	1530	Church of St. Nicholas, Louny
11	Prague, Národní muzeum	XIII A 2	14	SPX	1512	Church of St. Bartholomew, Kolín
12	Mladá Boleslav Dist. Mus.	II A 1		S	ca. 1509	Church of the Mother of God, MB
13	Mnichovo Hradiště Hist Mu	60-1-10			XV ⁴	unknown
14	Prague, Národní knihovna	VII A 13		S	ca. 1500	unknown, perhaps Prague
15	Prague, Národní knihovna	XII A 21			ca. 1500	unknown, perhaps Prague
16	Prague, Národní knihovna	XIV A 1			1470	Church of St. Bartholomew, Kolín
17	Prague, Národní muzeum	XII A 25			XV ⁴	perhaps Čáslav
18	Pelhřimov District Museum	7 860/R			1493	St. Mary in the Wall, Pelhřimov
19	Příbram, District Museum	L 261	?	?	XV ⁴	perhaps Ch. of St. James, Příbram
20	Prague, Národní knihovna	VI B 24	19	SPX	1510-37	Church of St. Castulus, Prague
21	NYC, Gen. Theol. Semin.	BX2043.A3H8	16	SP	1532	unknown
22	Vienna, ÖNB	Mus Hs 15492		S	1491	Holy Trinity Ch., Kutná Hora
23	Jičín Dist. Arch. at Jeřice	Sobotka 3		SP	1509-37	perhaps Ch. of Our Lady, Turnov
24	Jičín Dist. Arch. at Jeřice	Sobotka 5			XV ³⁻⁴	perhaps Ch. of Our Lady, Turnov

Notes:

- (3) Number of unnoted Kyrie tropes found in the book
- (4) The book contain or contained Sequences or Proper antiphons for the feast of Hus. X indicates that the propers and/or the sequences have been wholly or partially excised.
- (5) Dates which seem certain and have never been contested are shown in bold face.