
Denominational Identity as Seen from the Structure and Content of Bohemian Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Kancionáls

Eliška Baťová (Prague)

Those who have attempted to explore the repertoire of the Bohemian kancionáls of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have sooner or later found themselves in a problematic situation. The flood of songs, which regularly appeared, but were almost always recorded differently, made it difficult to judge not only the degree of originality of the source, but at times also its denominational character and its intended liturgical purpose. The uncertainties in kancionál studies resulted, to a considerable degree, from the fact that in the past attention focused on the manuscript of the *Jistebnice Kancionál*,¹ on the one hand, and on the other, almost exclusively on the printed production of Bohemian hymnals, the earliest of which were separated from the *Jistebnice Kancionál* by almost a century.² At least so the situation appeared to me, when I studied one of the fundamental sources for understanding Bohemian liturgical song in the Jagellonian period – the *Kolínský Kancionál*, produced for the Church of St. Bartholomew in Kolín approximately between 1512 and 1517.³ Thanks to its unique position as a link between early Utraquism and later *kancionáls*, it became possible to explore more in depth the specific structures and the liturgical peculiarities which are germane to the song books of the Bohemian Reformation, and which we should constantly consider in connection with the concept of the *kancionál*.

It is not the objective of this article to grasp all the features typical for the kancionál as a peculiar selection from the religious repertoire or to exhaust all the problems which arise in attempting to understand all the characteristic traits of the song books of the Bohemian Reformation. The problems surrounding the kancionáls have been summed up in dictionary entries, as well as in specialized studies.⁴ The task of this article is, therefore, limited to

¹ MS Prague, KNM II C 7, see Vlhová-Wörner, “The Jistebnice Kancionál – its Contents and Liturgy,” in *Jistebnický kancionál. I Graduale*, edd. Jaroslav Kolár, Anežka Vidmanová and Hana Vlhová-Wörner [Monumenta Liturgica Bohemica II] (Brno, 2005) 107–134.

² For the current state of research see Jan Kouba, “Nejstarší české písněové tisky do roku 1550” [The Earliest Czech Song Books Prior to 1550], *MM* 32 (1988) 21–92.

³ MS Kolín, Regional museum př. č. 80/88. Henceforth “*Kolínský kancionál*”. Eliška Baťová, *Kolínský kancionál z roku 1517 a bratrský zpěv na počátku 16. století* [Kolínský kancionál and the Brethren’s Songs in the Early Sixteenth Century], B.A. Thesis (Prague, 2010).

⁴ Jaroslav Bužga, “Kantional (tschechisch),” in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Friedrich Blume, vol. 7 (Kassel, 1958), col. 630–635. “Duchovní píseň v Českých zemích”

offering a supplementary view of selected liturgical and denominational traits of this literary genre.

We confront an area of research, which has been thus far rather neglected in Czech hymnological literature despite the fact that it is – from the viewpoint of the contents and structure of the song books – a matter of major importance. It is of interest to trace how, with the examination of every older sizable kancionál collection, several questions emerge which scholarship does not pose about other sources, and which frequently remain unanswered. Their brief summary already indicates the extent to which the existing approaches differ, and how disparate problems have been emphasized. Even so, one can find sufficient incentives for speculation about the liturgical and denominational traits of this literature.

The *Jistebnice Kancionál*, created sometime in the 1420s, places songs in a section between the Gradual chants and parts of the Antiphony. Recently, Jan Frei examined the structure and function of this part of the manuscript,⁵ and corrected and increased the accuracy of previous scholarship.⁶ His questions concerned, above all, the function of the songs from the first part of the section (that is, the Czech Confessions of Faith, paraphrases of the *Our Father* and the Decalogue), which – together with the following songs “about the holy truths and especially about the reception of the Body and Blood of the Lord” – the author considers primarily as pedagogical. Only the third part of this corpus, “songs in praise of God and in honour of his Mother and all the saints,”⁷ is according to him more closely tied to the liturgy.⁸ It remains puzzling, however, how the choral Credo – belonging to the liturgy – has

[Religious Song in the Bohemian Lands], *Hudební rozhledy* 60 (2007), 1–12. Marie-Elisabeth Ducreux, *Hymnologia Bohemica 1588–1764*, Ph.D. Dissertation (Paris, 1982). Jan Kouba, “Kancionál,” in *Slovník české hudební kultury* [Dictionary of Czech Musical Culture], ed. Petr Macek (Prague, 1997) 416–421. Jan Kouba, “Od husitství do Bílé hory” [From the Bohemian Reformation to the White Mountain], in *Hudba v českých dějinách* [Music in Czech History] (Prague, 1983) 105–141. Martin Rössler, “Gesangbuch,” in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Ludwig Finscher, v. 3 (Kassel, 1995) col. 1289–1323. Jiří Sehnal, Cantional, in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie, v. 3 (London, 2001) 733–736. Marie Škarpová, “Jak vydávat českou raněnovověkou kancionálovou píseň” [How to Edit a Song from the Early Modern Bohemian kancionáls], *Česká literatura* 2007, v. 1, 87–89.

⁵ Jan Frei, *Nové pohledy na hudební kulturu doby husitské* [New Views of the Musical Culture of the Time of the Bohemian Reformation] Ph.D. Thesis (Prague, 2003); *ibid.*, “Struktura a funkce písňového oddílu Jistebnického kancionálu” [The Structure and the Function of the Song Section of the *Jistebnice Kancionál*], in *Litera Nigro scripta manet. In honorem Jaromír Černý*, ed. Jan Baťa and others (Prague, 2009) 33–41.

⁶ Karel Konrád, *Dějiny posvátného zpěvu staročeského* [History of the Old Czech Sacred Chants], v. 2 (Prague, 1893); Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Dějiny husitského zpěvu za válek husitských* [History of Hussite Singing during the Wars of the Bohemian Reformation] (Prague, 1913).

⁷ Frei, “Struktura a funkce písňového oddílu Jistebnického kancionálu,” 35–37.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 39.

found its way into the song section.⁹ Frei likewise broaches the issue of the theological background in the structure of the kancionáls. He sees in the song section of the *Jistebnice Kancionál* an embryonic manifestation of the Brethren's theology which would distinguish essential, serviceable, and accidental matters in the work of salvation.

Another important source of speculation about the germane features of Bohemian kancionáls is a well-known book without notes produced by the printing house of Severýn in Prague in 1501.¹⁰ Although the date of imprint is the only direct information we have about the kancionál, because its only extant copy lacks a title page,¹¹ its origin – from Josef Jireček's first mention of it – has been attributed to the Brethren.¹² Arguments for this denominational identification rested largely on the Brethren's authorship of several of the songs included and on the "Brethren-like character" of the contents of their texts.¹³ Because, however, the documents of the Unity of Brethren nowhere mention this print – and a book of 1505 (no longer extant) is considered to be the first kancionál edited by the Unity¹⁴ – Josef Theodor Müller was forced to conclude that the print of 1501 was merely the matter of a private edition.¹⁵ Amedeo Molnár cast doubt on the Unity's role, failing to find a categorization in the kancionál typical of the Unity.¹⁶ Jan Kouba called into question the arguments for a Brethren-provenance, which rested on the number of concordances with the *Kancionál of Jan Roh*¹⁷ and on the Brethren's authorship of some of the songs.¹⁸ Thus, he broached the issue of the denominational indices of the kancionáls, as something significant that might lead to the recognition of the denominational character, despite a very stable repertoire.

Earlier research on the *Kolín Kancionál* also raises problems of denominational provenance and theological traits of song collections. They are indicated in a nutshell by the anonymous manuscript notation on f. 2r, which states: "a kancionál partly Catholic, partly Hussite, and partly Pikart" [*Dilem katolickej, dilem husitský a dilem pikhardytský kancionál*]. The author of the note well grasped the complexity of the manuscript's content, and thereby

⁹ Idem, *Nové pohledy na hudební kulturu doby husitské*, 75.

¹⁰ [*Piesničky*] (Prague, 1501).

¹¹ MS Prague, KNM 25 F 3, ff. 22a–132b.

¹² Josef Jireček, *Hymnologia Bohemica. Dějiny církevního básnictví českého až do XVIII. Století* [History of the Czech Ecclesiastical Poetry Till the Eighteenth Century] (Prague, 1878) 13.

¹³ Bohuš Hrejsa, "Kancionály v Jednotě bratrské" [*Kancionáls in the Unity of Brethren*], *Reformační sborník* 4 (1931) 17.

¹⁴ Except for the preface of Šamotulský *kancionál* MS Prague, NK XVII F 51a, 232.

¹⁵ Joseph Theodor Müller, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, v. 1 (Herrnhut, 1922) 506.

¹⁶ Amedeo Molnár, *Boleslavští bratři* (Prague, 1952) 50.

¹⁷ Jan Roh, *Piesně chval božských* (Prague, 1541).

¹⁸ Jan Kouba, "Nejstarší český tištěný kancionál z roku 1501 jako hudební pramen" [The Earliest Czech Printed kancionál of 1501 as a Musical Source], *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et historica* 2, 1965, 89–138. Jan Kouba, "Der älteste Gesangbuchdruck von 1501 aus Böhmen," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 13 (1968) 78–112.

made more acute the question of what the apparently tripartite substance of the kancionál tells us about the denominational and liturgical traits of the document. The uncertainty about the denominational classification was further complicated by the conclusion of Miloslav Veleta, who moreover misdated the kancionál to the 1450s. Veleta considered it an important document of “one of the last outbursts of the Taborite radicalism,” which was, however, “mingled with songs typical of Rokycana’s Utraquism.”¹⁹

Entirely different questions were posed by the extant research on the printed Utraquist kancionáls from 1522 and 1531,²⁰ which resembled in both time of origin and in content the kancionáls discussed thus far. The former are still usually connected with the name of Václav Miřínský, apparently thanks to the faulty assignment of titles by Josef Jungmann.²¹ The ascription of the editorial work to this priest and author of song lyrics († after 1490)²² has led to the erroneous assumption that these kancionáls represented an edition of earlier kancionál materials which originated in the second half of the fifteenth century.²³ Perhaps thanks to Miřínský’s undiluted Utraquist identity, serious doubts were never raised about the denominational character of the kancionáls, attributed to him. In Kouba’s work we find rather thoughts on the function of the kancionál as an independent liturgical book.²⁴ This type of liturgical book, to be sure, originated only at the start of the sixteenth century, while earlier song collections form usually only an inserted section in Graduals or in other mixed manuscripts. This further raises the question about the users of these song collections which, according to Kouba, were destined to be sung exclusively by the common faithful.²⁵

The *Kancionál of Roh* of 1541²⁶ is often distinguished as an extensive work of contemporary bishops of the Brethren, especially that of Jan Roh as the editor and of Jan Augusta as the author of several texts, who continued the incomplete work of Brother Lukáš.²⁷ The extent of Pavel Severýn’s editorial intervention is, of course, not entirely clear. It was in his printing shop that

¹⁹ Miloslav Veleta, “Kolínský husitský kancionál – hudební dokument závěru husitské revoluce” [The Hussite *Kolín kancionál*: A Musical Document from the Conclusion of the Hussite Revolution], *Sborník Pedagogické fakulty v Hradci Králové, hudební výchova* 23 (Prague, 1974) 18–20.

²⁰ [*Písňe*] (Prague, 1522). [*Písňe*] (Prague, 1531).

²¹ Josef Jungmann, *Historie literatury české* [History of Czech Literature] (Prague, 1849) III, 43.

²² Jan Kouba, “Kancionály Václava Miřínského. Příspěvek k dějinám české duchovní písně doby poděbradské a jagellonské” [The Kancionáls of Václav Miřínský: A Contribution to the History of Czech Religious Song of the Podiebradian and Jagellonian Periods], *MM* 8 (1959) 11–12.

²³ Kouba, “Kancionály Václava Miřínského,” 29.

²⁴ Loc. cit.

²⁵ Ibid., 30–32.

²⁶ Jan Roh, *Piesně chval božských* [Songs of Divine Praises] (Prague, 1541).

²⁷ Jan Blahoslav, *Piesně chval božských* (Šamotuly, 1561) f. iib.

the earlier-mentioned Utraquist songs had been printed ten years earlier, and he is the author of the only preface to the *Kancionál of Roh*, in which he refers to the hymnal as the fruit of his own initiative and labours.²⁸ Nevertheless the hymnal is usually viewed through the prism of later polished editions of the Brethren's Jan Blahoslav, and the questions of liturgical and dogmatic differences or agreements with Utraquist song books are not posed. Yet, such questions beg to be raised, for instance, thanks to Kouba's assertion that the Brethrens' kancionáls contain a distinct share (almost forty percent) of chant melodies with Czech texts²⁹ which, for example, is comparable to the frequency of the occurrence of this genre in the *Kolín Kancionál*.³⁰ The questions of the function and liturgical utilisation of the book are, therefore, also relevant here.

It is my opinion that the principal characteristics of the kancionáls of the Bohemian Reformation can be discovered only after a thorough comparison of the often incongruous evaluations of the hymnological repertoire and after a fresh examination of the contents of individual song books. Albeit definite conclusions must be left to future research, it is possible even now to note several interesting tendencies and characteristics of contents, which appear as basic for the exploration of the musical sources.

Features in Common

The principal feature of the content of these documents is their liturgically mixed character, that is, the fact that the kancionáls-usuáls [usuale] contain the most diverse Czech chants and songs for both liturgical and extra-liturgical use. We are explicitly informed about the contemporary manner of judging the contents of these books by their rubrics, which designate the chants of the entire temporal cycle as songs, even though, in particular titles the chants are marked as *Kyrie*, prose, etc.³¹ The contemporary view of the song, therefore, is not concerned with the liturgical genre or the construction of melody or text, but expresses more generally the concept of lay religious singing in Czech. As Kouba put it, it was "the singing of the lay participants in liturgy," which could include either the assembled faithful, or smaller groups such as the literary brotherhoods [*fraternitas literatorum* / *literátská*

²⁸ Roh, *Piesně chval božských*, f. A IIIa.

²⁹ See the information about the origin of these melodies, summarized in Kouba, *Nejstarší české písňové tisky do roku 1550*, 24, 30.

³⁰ Baťová, *Kolínský kancionál z roku 1517 a bratrský zpěv na počátku 16. století*, 67.

³¹ See, for instance, the rubric MŠ Kolín, Regional museum př. č. 80/88, f. 157a: "Počínají se písně o slavném Zmrtvýchvstání Pána Spasitele našeho, Krista Ježíše. *Kyrie velikonoční*." [The songs about the glorious resurrection of our Lord and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, begin here. The *Kyrie* of Easter.]

bratrstva].³² If all such chants are included in a single group (determined by the liturgical year), it is possible that their original liturgical placement is ignored, and that newly-composed “song” compositions may take the place of their older chant counterparts.

Although we are dealing with kancionáls belonging to denominations which differed markedly in their liturgies, their common utilisation may have been facilitated by the lay participation in the musical aspect of the liturgy, as well as the derivation from a common – gradually evolving – body of repertoire, which included the repertoire of both the Utraquists and the Brethren. The origin of this repertoire, dated evidently to the Jagellonian period and was typical of continuity with both the Hussite tradition of liturgy and the earlier pre-Hussite one. On this basis, in particular, the principle of utilising the song tropes was developed as a broadening – and in the Hussite sense perhaps also a gradual replacement – of the Latin choral chants.³³

In order to find the common features in the arrangement of this repertoire, it is necessary to examine more closely the structures of the kancionáls in question (see the Appendix). Even at first sight it becomes obvious that all the song books – with the exception of the *Jistebnice Kancionál* – begin with the songs of the temporal cycle (up to Trinity Sunday). The authors from the ranks of the Unity at the same time considered the section *de tempore* as songs about “substantial matters,” that is, those realised in Christ.³⁴ Only Komenský’s later *Kancionál*³⁵ offered an appropriate theological solution by fusing the songs about Christ’s life with the structure of the Creed.³⁶ This enabled all the dogmatic songs to be placed here – including the *Credo*, Decalogue, and *Pater Noster* – which otherwise had been placed among the general songs, and in later Brethren kancionáls among the songs expressing the teaching about “the matters of redemption.” The song section of the *Jistebnice Kancionál* includes anomalously the songs of the temporal cycle in the last third, while the musical versions of the *Pater Noster*, *Credo*, and Decalogue are in the first part. In this sense, therefore, it is not possible to agree with Frei’s assertion that the song section of the *Jistebnice Kancionál* anticipated the structures of the song books of the Brethren. It is not possible – in view of the earlier mentioned documents – to reduce the texts about “substantial matter” to the three basic Christian prayers, just as it is impossible to connect songs about Christ’s life with the section of the “accidental matters.”

³² Kouba, *Od husitství do Bílé hory*, 110.

³³ Baťová, *Kolínský kancionál z roku 1517*, 57–60, with references to other literature.

³⁴ Amedeo Molnár, “The Brethren’s Theology,” in: Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, trans. C. Daniel Crews (Bethlehem, PA, 1992) 390–420.

³⁵ Jan Amos Komenský, *Kancionál* (Amsterdam, 1659).

³⁶ Traditionally, the Brethren understood by “substantial matters” faith, hope, and charity, which arose from Christ’s act of redemption; see Molnár, “The Brethren’s Theology,” 407ff. Komenský’s structure of ordering is, therefore, most logical from the theological viewpoint.

Nevertheless, much of the future Brethrens' structure of the song sequencing first appeared in the earlier Utraquist books – or rather, the Brethren song books retained the traditional sequencing. This is evident from the very form of the rubrics in the smaller song sections. As against the agreements in the initial parts of our song books, we find, of course, significant deviations at the beginning and during the course of their latter parts. It is exactly here that the Brethren song books unfold their teaching about the “matters of service” [*věci služebné*], that is, about the Church and the sacraments, including the songs about the Body and the Blood of the Lord. It is true that similar themes are also found in embryonic form in this place in all the four earlier-mentioned song books (preceding the *Kancionál of Roh*), but the sequencing of the thematic entities is fundamentally distinct. The *Kolín Kancionál* and the books from 1522 and 1531 emphasise liturgical principles and the adoration of the eucharist above the theological logic of sequencing. They place the eucharistic songs either directly after the songs of the temporal cycle (*Kolín Kancionál*), or connect them with the liturgy of the mass – specifically with the chants of the *Sanctus* (books of 1522 and 1531). In the *kancionál* of 1522, dogmatic themes precede this group of songs just as in Brethren song books, but the emphasis is more on the Christian way of life than on ecclesiology. The situation is similar in the *kancionál* from 1501, the denominational identity of which is uncertain. We do find here songs about the Church, but the Brethrens' systematic thought about the matters of service [*věci služebné*] – as determined already by Molnár – is not evident. The sequencing of eucharistic songs in the book of 1531 and their context show common traits with the sequencing of the two song parts of the *Jistebnice Kancionál*. It is, therefore, my opinion that we find here the earliest preserved foundation of the sections of the “general songs” [*obecné písně*] of the future Utraquist *kancionály*. In that case, we would have to see in these parts of the *Jistebnice Kancionál* not only a didactic function of the songs included (as Frei assumes), but also, at least in part, a liturgical function.

The rubrics in the *Kolín Kancionál* indicate how much could be included in the *kancionály* under the concept of “general songs” [*obecné písně*], as well as the extent of their liturgical significance. “General songs” included here are all chants and songs which could not be inserted into the temporal or the sanctoral cycles and which, therefore, were not conjoined by the “proper” [*proprádní*] character of the texts. Often these songs expressed individual articles of denominationally defined dogmatic teaching. The neglected fact that few true chants of the ordinary (*ordinarium*) – that is, chants with constant texts without tropes – were present in the Utraquist mass, can help to explain the important place of this section in contemporary song books. In the *Kolín Kancionál*, as well as in the *Jistebnice Kancionál*, settings of the *Credo* are placed between the paraphrases of the *Pater Noster* and the Decalogue. Frei wonders, how such musical settings of the Creed found their way into the song section of the *Jistebnice Kancionál*. The explanation

for their inclusion is that they belonged to the song repertoire for the entire congregation – despite their belonging to the ordinary.³⁷ Thus, the song book of 1522 also shows that the section of the general songs [*obecné písně*] served as a space for locating the Czech chants of the ordinary. This book under the heading of *Obecné k libosti [ad libitum]* gathers in particular the chants of the *Kyrie*, while the following sections contain both chants on the Decalogue and a major group of obviously liturgical chants of the *Pater Noster*.

It is, however, necessary to note another important fact. The cycle of prayers of the *Pater Noster*, *Credo*, and Decalogue, called the *preces* (which was sung according to one common melody) was regularly performed before the solemn or high mass³⁸ and was recorded together with the prayer *Ave Maria*, which was attached to the *Pater Noster*. Regular praying of these texts also belonged among the basic duties of the literary brotherhoods [*fraternitas literatorum / literátská bratrstva*].³⁹ The incidence of these cycles [*preces*] is one of the most typical characteristics of the kancionáls of the period in question. The musical settings of the creed which are parts of the *preces* can be distinguished from the chants which are designed directly for the liturgy. In the case of the *Jistebnice Kancionál*, the latter are choral creeds, and in the case of the *Kolín Kancionál* and the song books of 1522 and 1531 they are grouped together among the other liturgical chants. It is, however, evident that – instead of the liturgical *Credo* – it was permissible to use the *Credo* from the *preces*. The song book of 1522, for instance, leaves the *Credo* out of the *preces* (even though it is noted in the rubric there!), evidently because it was previously included with the other text in a common section with the *Pater Noster*. As for the song book of 1501, it contains the *preces*, including *Ave Maria*, but texts appear that are entirely different from those in the Utraquist song books, and the arrangement resembles more that of Brethern song books.

³⁷ *Agenda Česká, to gest spis o ceremoniích a pořádcích církevních* [Bohemian Agenda, That is a Publication about Ecclesiastical Ceremonies and Orders] (Leipzig, 1581) 29. Václav Koranda the Younger, *Tractat o vebelné a božské svátosti oltární, kterak má přijímána býti od věrných křesťanuv. O rozdávanie dietkám. O zpievani českém. O lichvě* [Tractate about the Venerable and Divine Sacrament of the Altar, How it Should be Received by Faithful Christians. About Communion for Children. About Czech Chanting. About Usury] (Prague, 1493).

³⁸ *Agenda Česká, to gest spis o ceremoniích a pořádcích církevních*, 21. MS Prague, KNM II B 4, f. 500a. Zikmund Winter, *Život církevní v Čechách: Kulturně-historický obraz z XV. a XVI. století* [Ecclesiastical Life in Bohemia: A Cultural-Historical View of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century] (Prague, 1896) 852. Antonín Špaldák, “O překládání liturgických textů do češtiny za starších dob” [About Translating Liturgical Texts into Czech in Early Times] ČNM, oddíl duchovnědný, II4 (1940), 160 notes the singing of these prayers during evening services.

³⁹ Hana Pátková, *Bratrstvie ke cti Božie: Poznámky ke kultovní činnosti bratrstev a cechů ve středověkých Čechách* [Brotherhoods in Honour of God: Notes Concerning the Religious Activities of Brotherhoods and Guilds] (Prague, 2000) 38–39.

In all the examined sources, the least regularity is evident in the placing of songs about the saints and their cults, which vacillate between a connection with the temporal cycle and the very end of the *kancionál*.

Concluding my examination of certain common characteristics, discernible from the song books of the Bohemian Reformation, I should mention yet another interesting feature, which is the manner of work with the *kontrafaktura*, that is assignment of existing melodies – especially chant ones, but also some song melodies – to new texts. In most cases, the assignment of the melody is not arbitrary. It depends on the content and liturgical function of the text with which the melody was most commonly associated. The melodies are, therefore, employed as certain symbols, as bearers of certain extra-musical – in this case liturgical – information. The most typical example of this practice is the contents of the Lenten sections, where songs with choral melodies lose their original liturgical character due to the assignment of new Czech texts, yet they harken back to the original liturgical place due to the musical reference to certain holidays. Melodies of favourite Advent (Marian) and Christmas *cantiones* receive a similar treatment.

Another area, which, of course, deserves separate attention, is an analysis of how the songs and the chant compositions contained in these *kancionáls* were specifically used in either the Utraquist or the Brethren liturgy. It would also be desirable to speak about several common characteristics. Their discovery, however, requires a detailed exploration interconnecting tiny fragments from many sources dispersed over time. This will be covered elsewhere.⁴⁰

Denominational Features

The analysis of the selected Bohemian *kancionáls*, according to their structure, indicated that from the viewpoint of denominational identification one can rely only on relatively narrow criteria of the liturgical context in the section of songs on the Body and Blood of the Lord, or on the character of the teachings about the Church. This approach led us, for instance, to a rejection the Brethrens' provenance of the song book of 1501. Yet, this approach is inadequate and could be misleading. The search for denominational features requires an examination of the content of the song texts, especially those designated as "general songs" [*písně obecné*].

Even an examination of the content, however, may not be an unambiguous indicator of the denominational nature of a *kancionál*, because on a number of issues the dogmatic standpoints do not differ distinctly between the Brethren and the Utraquists. The problem is most blatant in the issue of the veneration of the saints. While the celebration of saints' days and prayers for their intercession were normal in the Utraquist Church of the Jagellonian

⁴⁰ See also Baťová, *Kolínský kancionál z roku 1517*.

period,⁴¹ it is also possible to find viewpoints resembling those of the Taborites and the Unity. A particular example is the *Knížka proti ošemetné poctě a pokryté svatých* of the priest Martin,⁴² the critical tenor of which also makes its appearance in several texts of the *Kolín Kancionál* and in the song book of 1522. In the *Kolín Kancionál* we find, of course, side by side with the radical standpoints also entirely conservative texts with prayers for the intercession of saints. This vacillation may indicate a confusion in the minds of the creators or the patrons of the hymnal, or it may reflect actual conflicts in the Utraquism of the time. The song book of 1522, to the contrary, treats the issue of saints more systematically and consistently in an iconoclastic direction.

An area in which denominational identity can be discovered more reliably is in the eucharistic songs. Their detailed analysis should be left to liturgical experts, but even so I wish to note at least several of the most substantial features. The Utraquist song books mostly proclaim a firm belief in the real presence of Christ in the language of transubstantiation, accompanied by sallies against the *sub una* opponents of communion in both kinds and against the “Pikarts.” The lay chalice is consistently defended, as is the other Utraquist hall mark – the communion of infants and small children. In contrast, the Brethern show considerable reticence on the issue of the chalice. Their cue seems to come from the *Zprávy kněžské* by Brother Lukáš, who – having discussed the true belief in the Body of the Lord – adds gingerly: “Also concerning the other part, the chalice, the faith commands a belief in both, etc.” [*Těž o druhé částce kalicha má na dvě z viery držáno býti etc.*]⁴³ In my opinion, it is in this reticence concerning the chalice that we see proof that the song book of 1501 is really a product of the Unity. Just as in the *Kancionál of Roh*, most of the eucharistic songs, known from earlier sources, are absent. The theology of these two song books is very consistent, relying on the concept of enjoying “Christ’s participation” [*účastnost Kristova*],⁴⁴ which is set forth in the *Zprávy kněžské* [The Priests’ Rules]⁴⁵ of Lukáš, published in 1527, as well as in the Unity’s *Otázky o rozhřešování, zpovědi a přijímání Těla a Krve Páně pro obecný prostý lid* [Questions of Absolution, Confession, and Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord for the Common Simple Folk] from 1536.⁴⁶ We find repeated stress on the sacramental communion through faith and as a memorial. Some of

⁴¹ See *Pasionál* (Prague, 1495), based on Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea sanctorum sive Lombardica historia*.

⁴² Martin Zatecký [?], *Knížka proti ošemetné poctě a pokryté svatých od kněze Martina, faráře u svatého Jindřicha v Praze sepsaná i kázaná okolo léta 1517* [A Book against the Mischievous and Concealed Veneration of Saints, Written and Preached around 1517 by Priest Martin, the Parson at St. Henry’s in Prague] (N.p., 1593).

⁴³ Jiří Just, *Bratrské agendy k Večeři Páně* [Brethrens’ Agenda for the Lord’s Supper], ARBI 6 (2006) 53.

⁴⁴ Molnár, *Boleslavští bratři*, 53.

⁴⁵ Just, *Bratrské agendy k Večeři Páně*, 55.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 79–80.

these expressions may be found – thanks to the rapid diffusion of texts across denominational lines – also in the Utraquist kancionáls (for instance in the song book of 1522), but here they occur in the context with other songs that clearly manifest a veneration of the eucharist as well as an explicit defence of transubstantiation. These explicitly Utraquist features are absent from the song book of 1501, as well as from the subsequent hymnals of the Unity.⁴⁷

The most basic distinction between the Utraquist and Brethrens' kancionáls – despite the many agreements in contents and theological interpretation – is, however, without a doubt the external liturgical frame, within which the songs and the Czech chants are set. While the Utraquists endorsed certain reformational changes deriving from early Christian tradition, nevertheless their liturgy as a whole was firmly rooted in the ritual of the medieval Church of Bohemia. The active participation of the lay people led to some liturgical modifications, but the basic structure of the liturgy was preserved: driven by established texts and aimed focused on the eucharistic prayer of a canonically ordained priest. The Unity's biblical reductionism from the start opposed the ecclesiastical tradition of the Utraquists and of the *sub una*. Even after the reforms of Lukáš the focus of worship remained on reading, preaching, and collective singing. Despite the return to a more traditional form of worship under Lukáš, the quintessentially Brethrens' "explicatory" [výkladový] approach remained the leitmotif of their worship, in which the songs and chant were not merely a response to the action at the altar, but also in itself one of the vehicles of the liturgy. This homiletical and biblical (rather than liturgical) character of the Brethrens' songs is evident not only from their later more well-developed kancionáls, but already from the song book of 1501.

Abbreviations Used:

KoIM	MS Kolín, Regional museum př. č. 80/88 (Kolínský kancionál, ca 1512–1517)
PrM II C 7	MS Prague, KNM II C 7 (Jistebnický kancionál, 1420s-1430s)
1501	[<i>Piesničky</i>] (Prague, 1501)
1522	[<i>Písně</i>] (Prague, 1522)
1531	[<i>Písně</i>] (Prague, 1531)
1541	Jan Roh, <i>Písně chval božských</i> (Prague, 1541)

(Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David)

⁴⁷ See the statement of the Agenda of Brno from the 1520s-1530s: "Znáti také sluší, co se koli přes to přidává, zdvihání, do monstrancí stavení a jiných vymysluov nad rozkázání Páně, jest hřích ohyzdného neposlušenství, ano i modlářská nepravost" [It is also proper to know that whatever is added: elevation, exposition in the monstances, and other inventions beyond the Lord's commands, that is a sin of abominable disobedience and idolatrous unrighteousness]; see Just, *Bratrské agendy k Večeři Páně*, 43–44, 82.