

---

**“All Manner of Wonder Under the Sun”:  
A Curious Development in the Evolution of Utraquist  
Eucharistic Liturgy**

---

**David R. Holeton**

*(Prague)*

In the course of the acrimonious paedobaptist debate that raged in England during the mid-seventeenth, one proponent of “believers baptism” noted that in Bohemia Utraquists followed the theological consequences of infant baptism and also gave communion to all baptized infants. To this, his paedobaptist opponent wryly observed that “all manner of wonder under the sun can be found in Bohemia.” Happily, such heretofore untold wonders continue to appear. This article gives an account of one such untold wonder in the course of the development of Utraquist worship.

### **Eucharist at the Heart of Worship**

At the heart of the various acts of Christian worship lies the eucharist (throughout the mediæval west known as the mass) at which, in the context of a meal (or its vestiges), Christians give thanks (*eucharistia*) for the mighty acts of God in creation and redemption remembering particularly the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Today, there is consensus among scholars that the origins of this service lie in a variety of sources: the regular table fellowship of Jesus with his friends and followers, the various resurrection meals reported in the gospels as well as in the different accounts of what Jesus is said to have done and said at the Last Supper found in the synoptic gospels and St. Paul. By the second century, the proportions of the meal aspect of the eucharist had been greatly reduced from those of a “proper” meal involving a variety of foods to a more representational one consisting only of bread and wine – for it was these foods from the Last Supper of which the New Testament authors make most import.

At the heart of the eucharist lies the eucharistic prayer: the central act of praise and thanksgiving in which the community (through the one presiding) gives thanks for God’s acts of creation and God’s saving acts throughout history culminating in the birth, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In time (and in some places not for a number of centuries), the words concerning the bread and cup attributed to Jesus at the Last Supper (“Take, eat, this is my body .... drink ... this is my blood....”), often called the *verba*, were included as an interpretive hermeneutic for those who had no actual memory of the meals with Jesus either during his ministry or in the resurrection experiences. Over time, and for a wide variety of reasons<sup>1</sup>, the eucharistic prayer became less and less a public

---

<sup>1</sup>) These included the emergence of vernacular languages in the Latin world but the maintenance of Latin alone as the liturgical language of the western church (or, alternatively, the introduction of

proclamation of the mighty acts of God and increasingly a prayer recited *sotto voce* by the priest in which the *verba* came to be seen as instrumental in effecting the presence of Christ in the elements of bread and wine.

### The Eucharist in Late Mediæval Bohemia

Mid- fourteenth century Bohemia witnessed the beginnings of what is one of the most fascinating and, perhaps, least studied eucharistic movements of the late middle ages and early renaissance.<sup>2</sup> Over a period of just under a century, the movement evolved from its original concern for the restoration of frequent (at least weekly, best daily) communion to the restoration of the lay chalice and the communion of all the baptised. Parallel to these initiatives in the renewal of a what was believed to be a patristic pattern of sacramental practice, was a growing movement to vernacularize the liturgy and, in time, to reform its shape. It is in this process of reforming the shape of the Utraquist eucharistic rites that we find a remarkable example of a development of eucharistic practice that appears to be unique in liturgical history which stands as a fascinating testimony to Anton Baumstark's "Law of Organic Development" at work.<sup>3</sup>

Much of the life of Utraquism was characterised by its faithfulness to the western mediæval liturgical tradition. This was, by and large, a part of Utraquism's general sense of ecclesial continuity in which fidelity to the inherited rites – both in form and ceremony – played an important symbolic rôle. Some of the most acrimonious debates in the early fifteenth century were over liturgical and ceremonial matters. While there was a period in which the more radical ideas of Tábor<sup>4</sup> were tolerated as a part of the political compromise needed to save the nation from the crusades, the defeat of the Táborite and Orphan troops at the Battle of Lipany in 1434 also witnessed the suppression of their liturgical innovations within Utraquism.<sup>5</sup> The period between the defeat of the forces of Tábor and the defeat of the Bohemian Estates at the White Mountain (Bílá Hora) in 1620 witnessed a slow and, generally, unprogrammed liturgical evolution, unlike any reformation

---

Latin by missionaries to peoples of other language groups), the increasing social distance between the clergy and the laity, an exaggerated sense of awe at the mystery of the event at which the priest had the power through virtue of ordination "to call God down onto the altar", as some of the more notable.

2) A general introduction to this movement can be found in my "Sacramental and Liturgical Reform in Late Mediæval Bohemia" in SL 17 (1987) 87-96 and "The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement in its European Context," BRRP 1 (1996) 23-47.

3) In his classic study *Liturgie comparée* (Chevetogne, 1940) [*Comparative Liturgy* F.L. Cross trans., (London 1958)] the philologue and liturgist Anton Baumstark (1872-1948) generated a series of "liturgical laws" which provide an important instrument for the explanation of liturgical evolution. Baumstark's "Law of Organic Development" posits that "[i]n general, because ... primitive [liturgical] elements are not immediately replaced by completely new ones, the new-comers at first take their place alongside the others. Before long they assume a more vigorous and resistant character, and when the tendency to abbreviation make itself felt it is the more primitive elements which are the first to be affected; these disappear completely or leave only a few traces." *Comparative Liturgy* 23. For liturgiologists, these "laws" remain important working tools in the explanation of new liturgical data which the sources disclose. See, for example, Robert E. Taft, "Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (d. 1948): A Reply to Recent Critics," *Worship* 73,6 (1999) 521-540.

4) Holeton, "Sacramental and Liturgical Reform...", 93-4.

5) Táborite liturgical practices surfaced later within the Jednota Bratrská [Unity of Brethren] after their schism from Utraquism in 1467.

movement of the sixteenth century.

Until the sixteenth century, all manuscript witnesses point to a continuing fidelity to mediæval liturgical use with very few innovations.<sup>6</sup> Two of note were the celebration of the feast of Saint Jan Hus on 6 July for which propers for both mass and office were ultimately provided<sup>7</sup> and an additional Alleluia and Sequence for Corpus Christi.<sup>8</sup> It is only during the sixteenth century that we have evidence for serious attempts at a more fundamental reform of the liturgical rites themselves.

Thanks to the zeal of the Counter-Reformers, we have relatively few manuscript witnesses to sixteenth century Utraquist liturgical use. Of the extant texts *graduale* and *antiphonale* are by far the most common.<sup>9</sup> These texts tended to survive the massive literary immolations either because of their artistic value or because their basic conformity to the tradition made them “re-cyclable” for the restored Roman administration where they often remained in use but with the propers for the feast of St. Jan Hus either excised or expunged.<sup>10</sup> Sixteenth century Utraquist missals or sacramentaries are much rarer.

### The “Altar Book” of Adam of Tábor

One of the texts that survived the Counter-Reformation is the so-called *Voltáňní knihy Adama Thaborského* [Altar Book of Adam of Tábor] transcribed by Václav Čáslavský of Písek in 1588.<sup>11</sup> Amongst its contents there are no fewer than three eucharistic rites: high mass in both Latin (ff. 11<sup>a</sup> - 26<sup>a</sup>) and Czech (ff. 29<sup>a</sup> - 48<sup>b</sup>) and an abbreviated sung mass “for use at an earlier hour on Sunday morning” (ff. 1<sup>b</sup>-11<sup>a</sup>). It is these three rites that are of particular interest to us in this instance for it is here that we see Baumstark’s law of organic development at work between the texts of a single liturgical book.

The Latin rite is that of the Prague use of the Roman Rite with very few

6) Even with the appearance of printed texts, Utraquists, who generally preferred to continue using manuscript texts for the liturgy, seem to have been prepared to avail themselves of the liturgical books of the Diocese of Prague adding needed manuscript supplements for their additional needs. For example Prague NK *adlig.* 42.G.28 is a printed Prague Breviary (Nürnberg, 1492) with a manuscript supplement containing prayers for the feasts of St. Jan Hus and the Transfiguration; Prague Strahov DR V 12 is a printed Prague Missal (Leipzig, 1531) with a manuscript supplement containing Czech translations of the collects and post communion prayers for throughout the liturgical year, prayers for the office during Lent and Paschaltide, and the Latin propers for a mass “in honorem penarum domini.”

7) See D.R. HOLETON “‘*O felix Bohemia – O felix Constancia*’: the Liturgical Commemoration of Saint Jan Hus,” in F. Seibt ed., *Jan Hus Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen* (Munich 1997) 385-403 and *idem*. “The Office of Jan Hus: An Unrecorded Antiphonary in the Metropolitan Library of Estergom,” in J. Neil Alexander ed., *Time and Community* (Washington, 1990) 137-152.

8) These are original Czech compositions for which the only witness is the so-called Jistebnice Kancionál from the second decade of the 15th c. See H. Vlhová “The Jistebnice Kancionál – Its Contents and Liturgy,” in J. Kolár, H. Vlhová et al. *Jistebnický Kancionál: Kritická edice I* (Prague – in press). What remains unknown is the extent to which the vernacular was actually used in the liturgy before the fifteenth century.

9) See Barry F. H. Graham, *The Litoměřice Gradual of 1517* [Monumenta Liturgica Bohemica I] (Prague, 1999) xv-xxxii for a description of a number of these graduals.

10) “Catholic books in the Bohemian tradition can only be distinguished based on contents from Utraquist ones by the presence or absence of mass propers or sequences for Hus....” Graham, *Litoměřice Gradual* lxxvii.

11) MS Prague KNM III F 17.

changes.<sup>12</sup> The deviation from that use which is of particular interest in this study is in the treatment of the preparation of the gifts – the elements of bread and wine (often referred to by their receptacles the paten and chalice) for use at the eucharist. In all three eucharistic rites in the Táborský text there was a shift in the place at which the oblations were prepared. In traditional Prague use, this normally took place after the creed. In the Táborský text part or all of this preparation has been moved earlier in the rite to after the singing of the prose and before the reading of the gospel. This practice, which was followed in the rites of some religious orders and in many late mediæval diocesan uses (including dioceses geographically contiguous to Prague<sup>13</sup>), was not the use of the Diocese of Prague although it was not entirely unknown in Bohemia in the two preceding centuries.<sup>14</sup>

Other than as a matter of liturgical fashion, there does not seem to be any clear theological 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 was considerable precedent in other diocesan uses.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> However, given the strong antipathy Utraquism had to the religious orders, this seems to be an unlikely source of inspiration for the Táborský practice. As there is no extant *expositio* or commentary explaining this or any other Utraquist rite dating from the sixteenth century, the rationale for this innovation is left to speculation.<sup>17</sup> It may simply reflect a natural instinct to prepare both the species at the same time

---

12) I describe the Latin Utraquist use in “The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: a textual study,” BRRP 2 (1998) 97-126.

13) These would include the Dioceses of Regensburg and Bamberg. See “Ordo misse secundum morem Ecclesie Ratisponensis” in A. Beck, *Kirchlichen Studien und Quellen*, (Amberg 1903) 265 and *Liber missalis secundum 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 V*. 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 XIIIe et au XVIe siècles,” EL 43 (1929) 508-19; Paul Tirot “Histoire des prières d'offertoire dans la liturgie romaine du VIIIe au XVIe siècle,” EL 98 (1984) 148-97, 323-91 also published under the same title in the series Bibliotheca «Ephemerides Liturgicae» Collectio «Subsidia» 34 (Rome, 1985) and Michael G. Witczak, “St Gall Mass Orders (I): Ms. Sangallensis 338. Searching for the Origins of the ‘Rhenish Mass Order’,” *Ecclesia Orans* 16,3 (1999) 393-410.

14) While I have seen no evidence of this practice in any of the editions of the Prague Missal printed of the late 15th and early 16th cc., my examination of a large number of late mediæval Bohemian manuscript missals in Prague libraries has produced three in which the preparation of the chalice took place before the reading of the gospel: MSS Prague National Library [NK] XIV B 17 f.4a (14th c); NK XIV B 9 f.128b (14th - 15th c) and KNM XV A 5 f.153b2-154a1 (1485). Josef Beran, *Mešní liturgie secundum rubricam ecclesiae Pragensis ve st. XV a XVI* (Prague, 1931) 15-16 makes no mention of any Prague use other than after the Creed.

15) See Legg 169-173.

16) For example at solemn mass in the Dominican and Carmelite uses. Legg 145-146.

17) The only extant Utraquist commentaries on the mass known to me date from the previous century. See D.R. Holeton, “Insights into Utraquist Eucharistic Thought: A Fifteenth Century Mass Commentary,” in *Pavlovi Spunarovi k jeho sedmdesátinám* [Festschrift for Pavel Spunar on his Seventieth Birthday] (Prague, forthcoming) and “Allegory and Eucharistic Understanding,” in the, as yet, untitled festschrift for Noemi Rejchertová (Prague, forthcoming)..

coupled with a lack of accurate historical knowledge about when the preparation of the oblations had traditionally taken place.<sup>18</sup> The motive behind the shift cannot have been an intentional “protestantizing” of the rite<sup>19</sup> in that the language remained traditional and identified the action with the passion.<sup>20</sup> The spreading of the corporal was accompanied by a recitation of Ps.21(22):19-20 (They divide my garments among them, they cast lots over my clothing), 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 – an allegory that was totally unacceptable to Luther and the other protestant reformers known at that time in Bohemia.<sup>21</sup>

What is of particular interest is the way in which this practice evolves within the three rites in the Taborský text. The Latin rite is the most conservative adhering, on the whole, most closely to the Prague use of the Roman rite.<sup>22</sup> Here, the preparation of the gifts took place in two stages. During the first stage, after the reading of the epistle and while the gradual and prose are sung:

- i) the corporal was spread while the priest recited the verse “Diviserunt sibi vestimenta...”
- ii) then followed the prayer “Deus qui nobis sub sacramento...”
- iii) the server presented wine and asked the priest to bless it “Iube domine...”
- iv) the priest blessed the wine “In nomine Domini benedicitur ...”
- v) the priest then blessed water with a similar formula
- vi) and prayed “Fiat haec commixtio...” as he pours it into the chalice
- vii) the preparation of the chalice ended with the prayer “Deus qui humanae

---

18) The preparation of the chalice at this point in a few Bohemian manuscript missals (see n.10) as well as in the uses of contiguous dioceses may have been taken as an “historical” precedent; the Utraquist emphasis on the “equality” of both eucharistic species could also have served as an incentive to move the preparation of the paten alongside that of the cup. Given the importance to Utraquism of arguments from “tradition” for the restored lay chalice and infant communion, it is most unlikely that Utraquists would have ignored the tradition on a matter like the basic shape of the eucharist. 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.

19) Later Utraquism has often been accused of being Lutheran in theology and practice. The recent work of Zdeněk V. David has clearly demonstrated that neither is the case. See his, “The Plebeianization of Utraquism: The Controversy over the Bohemian Confession of 1575,” BRRP 2 (1998) 127-158 and “A Cohabitation of Convenience: The Utraquists and the Lutherans under the Letter of Majesty, 1609 - 1620,” BRRP 3 (1999).

20) 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 (“Formula Missae” [FM] *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* [Weimar 1883ff.] 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 Taborský Latin rite or more mechanistic than the Czech ones.

21) 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.

22) Where there are additions to the text, these appear to be drawn from the Bamberg use which had variants found nowhere else in Central Europe.

substantiae dignitatem ...”

viii) after which the priest prepared to read the gospel.

During the second stage, after the creed, the priest:

- i) greeted the people “Dominus vobiscum”
- ii) said the bidding “Orate fratres et sorores....”
- iii) and then prayed the Minor Canon (*menší kanon*) which involved:
  - a) taking the paten with his host and those of the communicants and praying: “Sanctifica quesumus ... hunc panem...”
  - b) placing it on the corporal saying “In pace factus est locus...”
  - c) and, finally, placing the chalice on the corporal saying: “Sanctifica quesumus ... hunc calicem...”
- iv) he may have then said the Orate fratres (presuming it has not already been said?) “or any other suitable prayer.”

The rubric then directed the priest to take off his chasuble, kneel down, pray and then mount the pulpit and preach. After the sermon, the liturgy continued immediately with the Salutation, Sursum Corda followed by a variable Preface, the Sanctus/Benedictus and the Roman Canon.<sup>23</sup>

The Czech high mass takes this evolving shape even further. The entire action of the preparation of the gifts is moved to the time of the lections. The spreading of the corporal (with its remembrance of the division of Christ’s garments) takes place before the reading of the epistle. Then, during the singing of the Alleluia and the prose, the priest prepares the chalice in the same manner as in the Latin high mass but using Czech translations of the prayers.

After the prayer “Deus qui humanae substantiae dignitatem ...” (which, in this instance, the priest is instructed to recite kneeling) the minor canon is recited. While, Czech translations of all the prayers from the minor canon in the Latin text are present, there are many extensive interpolations. The first of these is devotional: the priest prays that he might worthily consecrate the sacrament.

After this follows a series of somewhat prolix prayers for the consecration of each of the species as well as for the fruits of communion. Following the example of the earlier Latin prayers, these texts anticipate the consecration of the eucharistic elements – a theology that is visually reinforced by the multiple signs of the cross which accompany the prayers.

Several examples drawn from these new texts should suffice to give a sense of their general tenor. After placing the chalice on the altar, the priest is instructed to turn his heart sincerely towards God, make the sign of the cross and to pray:

+ Come, Almighty Sanctifier, eternal Lord God + and our Lord Jesus Christ + and also you O Holy Spirit, dear Master of souls +, and sanctify

---

23) At this stage in Utraquism the Roman Canon had undergone several changes but basically remained intact with the exception of the commemoration of the pope, bishop and king in the *Te igitur*, the Communicantes, the Memento of the departed and the *Nobis quoque* all of which are omitted.

these holy gifts that this bread might be + the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ and that this wine might also be + the Blood of the dear Lord Jesus Christ and grant that we might receive them unto the eternal salvation of our dear souls in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.<sup>24</sup>

This prayer then follows immediately:

O holy, holy, holy God one in three persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit; from eternity our everlasting and indivisible God. I pray you with your holy, catholic church that you would grant us all to sup at the table of the Lord and that worthily so that it may neither be unto judgement nor unto death nor [may it bring us] to hell nor to eternal condemnation but rather that you might grant what we ask worthily, seriously, respectfully, humbly and with an intimate and heart-felt desire that we might receive through holy prayer and faith for [the sake of] our conversion and a holy life of penitence + the Body and the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ for the salvation of our dear souls, for eternal life, and for participation in all the merits of his holy grace, [and] that all the faithful and penitent might come to the joys of heaven and to eternal life. And we believe that this Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ whose flesh was given up to death for us and whose most precious blood was shed on the cross from his right side will wash away all our sins and cleanse our faults + and that we might receive the sacraments of the Body and Blood of the Lord in memory of his innocent suffering and death and we all believe that we will attain through the great merit of the same Lord Jesus Christ the pardon of our sins and eternal life unto the ages. Amen.<sup>25</sup>

After this extended preparation of both species, the priest read the gospel and the creed was then sung. Following this the minor canon was recited (a faithful translation of the text from the Latin rite detailed earlier) after which there was a lengthy prayer in which the priest prayed that he might preach well. The sermon finished, the liturgy continued immediately with the Salutation and Sursum Corda, followed by a variable Preface, the Sanctus/Benedictus and the Roman Canon.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, in the evolution of the liturgy from Latin into Czech the entire preparation of the gifts has been shifted and now the preparation of both chalice and paten took place between the two lections. In so doing, the late mediæval prayers surrounding the action are retained and to them are added much more extensive prayers for the consecration of the elements, for worthy communion and for the fruits of communion. The minor canon continues to be recited in its former place, but when compared to the expanded rite between the lections it now looks almost vestigial.

The third rite in the Táborský book (the abbreviated<sup>27</sup> rite) takes the evolution

---

24) MS Prague KNM III F 17 f. 39a.

25) *Ibid.* ff. 39b-40a.

26) Here, the Canon is a faithful Czech translation of the recension used in the Latin rite.

27) "Abbreviated" is a relative term. This was not "low mass" but one in which a number of texts had been abbreviated, including, as will be seen, the canon. The rubrics make it clear that the "abbreviated" liturgy was to be sung at a side altar but with all the usual music, ceremonial and servers (*ministranti*).

one unprecedented step farther. The preparation of the gifts remains much the same as in the Czech high mass except that the devotional prayers for worthy communion and the fruits thereof are somewhat abbreviated. But to this something remarkable is added.

After an abridged form of the prayer “Come, Almighty Sanctifier, eternal Lord God ...” the following rubrics and text appear:

*Once again, take the first sacrament in hand along with the ciborium; take the oblations – that is some of the small hosts – in hand and say:*

Our Lord Jesus Christ, on the night he was betrayed took bread and when he had given + thanks, broke it and gave it to his disciples saying take and eat, this is my body which will be given for you. Whenever you eat this bread, you do it in memory of me.

*Having replaced the ciborium [on the corporal] say: We all believe together that this is + the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>28</sup>*

There follows a parallel consecration of the chalice after which the priest is instructed to kneel and to pray that he might have the strength to proclaim the gospel worthily. The gospel is then read and is followed by the Nicene Creed and the sermon. After the sermon the priest begins the hymn “*O przeslawne Tielo Bozy*” [O most glorious body of God] and the sacrament is carried in procession to the high altar accompanied by lights and the ringing of the sacring gongs and all the church bells. The sacrament is then set on the corporal which has been spread on the altar. Then all kneel in devotion and those who wish may come to receive the communion. The service then comes to an abrupt end as the priest returns to the chapel and removes his chasuble. The Roman Canon is completely omitted. The “heart of the eucharist” has disappeared.

What has happened is most remarkable: Baumstark’s “law of organic development” normally meant to explain liturgical evolution over the centuries can be seen to have worked itself out between the covers of a single book. Allow me to simply interpolate the examples into the “law” itself: *The primitive elements* (here, the preparation of the gifts and the eucharistic prayer following the liturgy of the word) *are not immediately replaced by completely new ones* (in this instance, the extended rite for the preparation of the gifts and the eventual attachment of the consecration of the elements to that part of the rite) *the new-comers at first take their place alongside the others. Before long they assume a more vigorous and resistant character, and when the tendency to abbreviation makes itself felt it is the more primitive elements* (in this instance the eucharistic prayer) *which are the first to be affected; these disappear completely or leave only a few traces.<sup>29</sup>*

While what has happened is quite astounding to those with a well-grounded sense of the shape of the eucharist, it is also completely logical. The preparation of the chalice alone between the lections may have been, in its inception, utilitarian, but preparing it alone makes little theological sense and would have made even less sense in a church for whom the equal importance of both elements for all the baptized had become fundamental. Shifting the preparation of the paten to the

---

28) MS Prague KNM III F 17 ff. 7b-8a.

29) Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy* 23.

same place as the preparation of the chalice was a logical evolution of the rite and, given the frequent communion practices of Utraquism, the music sung at this point would have given the amount of time needed to prepare the quantities of bread and wine required for all the communicants.<sup>30</sup>

The offertory prayers which had begun to proliferate during the late middle ages (with their tendency to anticipate the eucharistic prayer itself through multiple blessings of the elements both in word and action culminating in the emergence of the “minor canon”) created a theological confusion in which it became increasingly unclear at which point the elements were truly being “consecrated”. However, the elaboration of these prayers in the Czech high mass with the addition of more devotional material was certainly well within the spirit and direction this element of the liturgy was taking in its evolution in other dioceses and religious orders. By the time of the emergence of the Czech high mass, the balance between the prayers at the preparation of the gifts and the canon itself does not give very clear evidence as to where “consecration” is actually taking place. In a climate in which eucharistic consecration had become more a matter of manipulation than of prayer, the one thing that was missing at the preparation of the elements was the *verba*. By interpolating the *verba* into the preparation of the gifts, the “abbreviated rite” supplied the one remaining element that was needed to make the preparation of the elements (with its elaborate blessings) the undoubted moment of eucharistic consecration.

This is admittedly an example of organic development gone wild. For the liturgiologist it is, because of its uniqueness, an interesting witness to one curious development which elucidates the consequences and dangers of a process in which eucharistic “consecration” had become more important than eucharistic “praying”.

For the student of the Bohemian Reformation, Adam of Tábor’s “Altar Book” takes on a greater significance as it gives some important insights into the liturgical/theological development of later Utraquism.

### **Adam of Tábor in the Context of the Second Reformation**

Other liturgical traditions which emerged during the Reformation of the sixteenth century unwittingly followed the natural logic of the theological developments of the middle ages which saw the *verba* alone as essential in order to effect eucharistic consecration. Accordingly, they abandoned the eucharistic prayer (notably the Roman Canon which they perceived as the most offensive perpetrator of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice) and retained the *verba*, alone.<sup>31</sup> But the

---

30) All of this is possible only in a clericalized church in which the laity no longer have anything to do with the preparation and presentation of the bread and wine to be used at the eucharist. This is a stark contrast from the earlier Christian practice where all the members of the assembly processed to the altar with gifts of bread and wine to be used at the eucharist as well as offerings in kind to be used for the charitable work of the church. See, for example *Ordo Romanis I* in Michel Andrieu, *Les ordines romani du haut moyen age* [Spicilegium Sacrum Louvaniense – Études et Documents 23] (Louvain, 1971) 2:90-91.

31) Zwingli’s *Action oder Brauch des Nachtmahl* [Action or Use of the Lord’s Supper] (1525) has a simple reading of the institution narrative under the heading “The way Christ instituted the Supper.” (Irmgard Pahl ed., *Coena Domini I: Die Abendmahliturgie der Reformationskirchen im 16./17.*

*verba* were always recited in the place where the eucharistic prayer had been. There was no question of breaking with the classical *ordo* in which the eucharistic prayer – even though by then reduced to consecration – followed the liturgy of the word. In Adam of Tábor's abbreviated Czech rite consecration was interpolated into the *middle of the liturgy of the word* falling, as it did, between the epistle and gospel. Whatever other reformers did, the classical *ordo* of table always following word was observed. In the Taborský text word and table are jumbled together.

The retention of the elaborate offertory rites and the minor canon was unthinkable for any of the reformers of the sixteenth century. Next to the Roman Canon, these were the most offensive elements of the mediæval mass and there was no question of retaining them in any of the reformed liturgies. These were among the first texts with which the reformers dispensed – even in their initial, rather conservative, revisions of the Latin rite. Thus Luther's *Formula Missae*, Zwingli's *De canone missae epicheiresis* (1523) Cranmer's first *Book of Common Prayer* (1549) or the *Liturgia Svecnae ecclesiae* (1576) of John III with its many Roman features all excised the offertory prayers and ceremonies.<sup>32</sup>

These objections over the offertory, long since current by the time Václav Čáslavský transcribed the book for Adam of Tábor were, apparently, of no interest to the Utraquism represented in the text which maintained offertory prayers in which direct allusions to eucharistic sacrifice recurred repeatedly. It is as if all the debates over eucharistic offering and sacrifice which had raged throughout Europe since the second decade of the sixteenth century had gone unheard or, perhaps, had been heard and rejected so that the texts contained in Adam of Tábor's "Altar Book" represent an ultra-catholic (almost integrist) position on the question.

Significantly, the offertory rites contained in Adam of Tábor's "Altar Book" are far more ritually elaborate than those in the *Missale Romanum* of Pius V which was promulgated in 1570 as part of the implementation of the liturgical reforms which followed upon the Council of Trent. With the publication of the new *Missale Romanum*, dioceses (including Prague) gradually ceased printing their own diocesan missals and gradually adopted the reformed Roman rite, often abandoning centuries of diocesan tradition in so doing.

The *Missale Romanum* of Pius V retained seven prayers at the preparation of the gifts followed by the *Orate fratres*. All of these prayers were those already established in the local Roman use and had appeared in the printed editions of the Roman Missal.<sup>33</sup> Adam of Tábor's Latin rite, depending on how they are counted, contains about the same number as well as two alternative positions for the *Orate*

---

*Jahrhundert* [Freiburg, 1983] 195). Luther, in his *Deutsche Messe* (1526), directs "The Office and Consecration follow in this wise: Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the night that he was betrayed, took bread ..., " communion following immediately upon the *verba* over the cup (*ibid.* 38). This is a step beyond his *Formula Missae* (1523) in which he allows for the Salutation and Sursum Corda with the *verba* following immediately upon the Sanctus (*ibid.* 34-5).

32) All of these can be found in Pahl, *Coena Domini I*: Luther (33-34), Zwingli (185), Canmer (396), and John III (124).

33) *Missalis Romani editio princeps: Mediolani anno 1474 prelis mandata* [Bibliotheca «Ephemerides Liturgicae» Collectio «Subsidia» Supplementa 3] (Rome, 1996) 166-167. None of these prayers, except the prayer at the lavabo and the *Orate fratres*, were retained in the *Missale Romanum* of Paul VI.

*fratres et sorores*<sup>34</sup> The basic character of the two sets of prayers, however, is quite different. The genealogical trail of the texts found in the Táborský book lead not southward to Rome but westward to the Rhineland.<sup>35</sup> Unlike the traditional Roman prayers which are clearly prayers to accompany the offering of the elements to God,<sup>36</sup> the prayers at the preparation of the paten and chalice that had evolved in the German and, subsequently, Bohemian tradition were much more immediately concerned with the blessing of the elements. Thus, in the Táborský text when the priest places the paten and chalice on the corporal spread on the altar, we find the following formulae:

+ Sanctifica quesumus Domine hunc panem, ut nobis Corpus unigeniti Filii Tui fiat + in nomine Patri\* + et Filii + et Spiritui\* Sancti. Amen.

+ Sanctifica quesumus Domine hunc calicem, ut nobis sanguis unigeniti Filii tui fiat + In nomine Patri \* + et Filii + et Spiritui\* Sancti.<sup>37</sup>

Each formula accompanied, as it was by four signs of the cross, could not but help create a theology which implied that the words and actions of the priest had as much to do with effecting the hallowing of the elements as did the action of God. This cannot but have diminished any sense (albeit vestigial) of the classic understanding of eucharistic praying which holds that the eucharistic gifts are hallowed by God within the eucharistic prayer as a whole. That, along with the loss of any sense that the eucharistic prayer was an integral whole and the *verba* constituted but one part of that whole, made it possible to treat the latter as an independent unit. Thus, it probably did not seem highly unusual to interpolate the *verba* into the elaborate preparation of the paten and chalice between the epistle and gospel.

From the colophon, it is clear that Václav Čáslavský was in the custom of copying books like the one he made for Adam of Tábor and providing them for other Utraquist priests.<sup>38</sup> How widespread this rite was used is difficult to ascertain. I have yet to discover any similar manuscripts. It is clear, however, from the texts

34) It is interesting that Adam's text contains the more inclusive version of the prayer preceded by a salutation making it clear that it is the whole congregation which is being addressed rather than the other clergy alone. It is difficult to know if this is merely another example of the text's conservatism or if it represents a theology of the eucharist in which the eucharistic offering is understood to be the work of the entire assembly rather than that of the presiding priest alone the actual text containing, as it does, the formula *sacrificium meum* rather than the formula *sacrificium meum et vestrum* found in some mediæval texts and now restored in the *Missale Romanum* of Paul VI. See: Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: its Origins and Development* (New York, 1955) II:84 ff.

35) As can be seen from the studies of Tirost and others (see n.12 above) these prayers, which began as "private" or "devotional" prayers for the celebrating priest, varied widely between region and even diocese until the general adoption of the *Missale Romanum* of Pius V.

36) E.g. the prayers *Suscipe, sancte Pater, Offerimus tibi*, and *Suscipe, sancta Trinitas* with their respective formulae: "Receive, Holy Father ... this unblemished sacrificial offering..."; "We offer you, Lord, the chalice of salvation..."; and "Receive, O Holy Trinity, the offering we make to you..." The prayers of the Roman tradition all posit that, while the gifts are "offered" to God by the priest at the Preparation of the Gifts (Offertory), they are later, in the context of the eucharistic prayer blessed/consecrated by God.

37) MS Prague KNM III F 17 f.20b. The Latinity of the scribe Václav Čáslavský is erratic. This is his typical formulation of the persons of the Trinity. \* = *sic*.

38) *Ibid.* f.1a . Václav Čáslavský claims that the book for Adam of Tábor is like those he has "transcribed for each/every priest for godly use".

extant that there was a great pluralism in the liturgical use of late Utraquism. This appears to have ranged from the ongoing use of printed editions of the Prague Missal at one end of the spectrum to the use of the highly Lutheranised *Agenda Czeska*<sup>39</sup> on the other. The middle position seems to have been the practice of using a Czech translation of the texts from the Prague use for the whole rite except for the Canon from the *post-Sanctus* to the *Per ipsum* when the Latin text was used.<sup>40</sup>

This pluralism of use cannot not but reflect the wide range of liturgical theologies that appear to have existed within Utraquism – a spectrum of theologies that cannot have been easy to contain within a single church without considerable struggle. The lack of documents makes it difficult to estimate what percentage of the Utraquist population (more precisely, clergy) was represented by the various positions along this spectrum. As more liturgical texts come to light, it will become easier to chart the evolution of Utraquist liturgy. As this take place, however, the seventeenth century English commentator appears to have been right, at least in matters liturgical: All manner of wonder under the sun can be found in Bohemia.

---

39) (Leipzig, 1581). The Czech and Latin prefaces to this text (A3a; B2b) make a laboured point on how this work has been carefully compared with various German church orders and confessions for doctrinal compatibility noting that the only deviations from the German “norm” is the celebration of the feasts of Jan Hus, the Sending of the Apostles and the Transfiguration which, while universally observed throughout Bohemia are, nonetheless, to be considered adiaphora.

40) I draw this conclusion from the several manuscripts e.g. MS Prague NK XVII F 3 which contains noted Czech prefaces on ff. 139a - 146a and then continues immediately with “Na wieky wiekow. Amen.” followed by a Czech translation of the introduction to the Lord’s Prayer. Another text, MS Prague XVIII G 21 contains a complete eucharistic rite in Czech but, after the prefaces (ff.363a - 371a), appears the rubric “Infra canonem” immediately followed by “Po wsseczky wieky wiekuow” and the introduction to the Lord’s Prayer.