

---

# Utraquist Liturgical Practice in the Later Sixteenth Century

---

Pavel Kolář (Prague)

## Liturgical Themes in the Protocols of the Utraquist Consistory, 1562–1570

For some time attention has been paid to the changes of the liturgical life in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia under the influence of the Bohemian – later also the European – Reformation.<sup>1</sup> Studying liturgical sources of Utraquist provenance, we encounter otherwise undocumented changes of *ordines* and rites, which pose many a question.<sup>2</sup> Were these texts widely used for the actual celebration of liturgical rites or were they private innovations of pastors which never attained general use? If these *ordines* represent concrete practice, how widespread was this practice and how was it received? Who were the authors of these *ordines* and what was their educational background? Contemporary liturgists entertain similar questions with respect to the early extant sources of Christian liturgy.<sup>3</sup> Inspired by one of the premises of the hermeneutics of suspicion, as defined by Paul F. Bradshaw,<sup>4</sup> I will focus in this article on an enumeration and concise analysis of the liturgical themes

---

<sup>1</sup> David R. Holeton, “‘All Manner of Wonder Under the Sun’: A Curious Development in the Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy,” BRRP 3 (2000) 161–172; idem, “The Bohemian Eucharistic Movement in its European Context,” BRRP 1 (1996) 23–48; idem, “The Evolution of Utraquist Eucharistic Liturgy: a textual study,” BRRP 2 (1998) 97–126. Ota Halama, ed., *Coena Dominica Bohemica: Studijní texty UK ETF v Praze* ARBI 6 (2006) 314; idem, “Utrakvistické agendy k večeři Páně” [Utraquist Agenda for the Lord’s Supper], ARBI 6 (2006) 133–151.

<sup>2</sup> David R. Holeton, “‘All Manner of Wonder Under the Sun’”; Pavel Kolář, *Svátozná teologie Jakoubka ze Stříbra a její liturgická recepce* [The liturgical theology of Jakoubek of Stříbro and its liturgical reception]. Diss. Hussite theological faculty UK. Prague, 2008.

<sup>3</sup> Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. rev. and enl. ed. (London, 2002) 18, 82. The basic question is how to interpret references to liturgical practice in records which are – as a rule – mainly of a disciplinary character. Although we can assume that at times the motive behind the disciplinary case is a personal dispute with a priest, it is my opinion that the liturgical practice in question had at least some support in popular opinion.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 14–20.

which appear in the protocols of the Utraquist Consistory from the period 1562–1570.<sup>5</sup>

### 1. *Ordo missae* and the canon of the mass

The first group of entries in the protocols of the Consistory for the given period associates the question of liturgical order (*ordo missae*) with the canon of the mass (*canon missae*):

#### 1.1. *ordo* (*missae*)

##### 1.1.1. the order of the mass is not preserved and is altered (no. 419)<sup>6</sup>

- [a.] the priest changes the collects of the mass (no. 207)
- [b.] the priest changes the text of the canon of the mass, i.e., *canon maior* (nos. 207, 246, 283)
- [c.] or omits the canon of the mass altogether (no. 354, 361)
- [d.] the priest omits the so-called *canon minor*<sup>7</sup> either in its entirety or in parts (no. 207, 246, 283)
- [e.] the priest replaces traditional prayers and responsories (n. 272)

##### 1.1.2. partial infractions of the liturgical tradition

- [a.] the priest does not properly celebrate three masses on Christmas Day (n. 227, 229, 437)<sup>8</sup>
- [b.] the priest says a mass publicly without *ministranti* (servers, acolytes) (no. 232)<sup>9</sup>
- [c.] the priest neglects vespers and lauds, i.e. the basic canonical hours (no. 246)
- [d.] a young chaplain in Litoměřice elevates the chalice before elevating the host – he was admonished even by the *ministranti*; [he also tore pearls from chasubles and used them to produce rings for the ladies] (no. 290)<sup>10</sup>
- [e.] the priest “does not turn around at the altar” (no. 354)<sup>11</sup>
- [f.] a complaint that in Kutná Hora only the “introit” was kept from the traditional chants in the Gradual; the others were apparently replaced by Czech songs (no. 354)

<sup>5</sup> *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících a jiné listiny téže strany se týkající z let 1562–1570* [Meetings and letters of the Utraquist Consistory ... 1562–1570]. Julius Pažout, ed. (Prague, 1906). For the overall context, see also David, *Finding*.

<sup>6</sup> Henceforth I will cite only the entry number of the given record in Pažout's compendium without the pagination.

<sup>7</sup> A common designation – used especially in the late Middle Ages – for the prayers and ritual acts, which constituted the preparation of the gifts (the host and the chalice with wine) on the altar. See Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*. (Missarum Sollemnia). 2vv. (New York, 1955) II, 97 n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Adolf Adam, *The Liturgical Year*, trans. Matthew O'Connell, (New York, 1981) 125.

<sup>9</sup> See Frank C. Senn, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis, 1997) 222.

<sup>10</sup> I see here an indication of the priest's weak education in liturgy.

<sup>11</sup> See also no. 276; I presume that the dean of Kutná Hora was alleged not to turn back to face the altar to sing the Preface after the Eucharistic Dialogue but remained facing the people.

### 1.1.3. an overall alteration of the order of the mass

[a.] in Kutná Hora, the following order was maintained for the celebration of the liturgy on Sunday (and perhaps also on week-days): in the morning: consecration – singing – sermon – *communio* – great sermon – dismissal (no. 376)

### 1.2. canon of the mass and *canon minor*

[a.] the priest omitted the proper words of institution when the bell ringer handed him unconsecrated wine for the communion of those for whom the consecrated wine did not suffice (n. 207)<sup>12</sup>

[b.] the omission of entire parts of the canon of the mass by some priests:

- keeping only what, according to their views, belonged “*ad substantialem Sacramenti constitutionem*” and was obligatory according to the institution of Jesus Christ: i.e. a. the words of institution (*verba essentialia*); b. *Oratio Dominica*; c. “*pias preces ex maiori a minori canone*” (no. 246)
- the omission of reference to *intercessionem sanctorum* is explicitly mentioned (n. 246); from the context of the record it may be assumed that it was a matter of a part of the original Roman canon of the mass (particularly the *Communicantes* and *Nobis quoque*)
- another part omitted was the *Memento etiam*, which was probably omitted in connection with the rejection of prayers for the dead (n. 246)

[c.] the complaint that some priests do not recite the entire canon (they make many notations concerning it in their missal), and they also leave out the *Sanctus* chant (n. 354 – Kutná Hora; the dean of Kutná Hora was apparently tested for his knowledge of the canon, as can be assumed from n. 361, and defended himself saying that he did not know the canon by heart, but always read it from the missal (whether in Latin or in Czech is not clear)

[d.] complaint that the exhortation “*Orate fratres*” is omitted and the canon of the mass is reduced to *verba consecrationis* (n. 376 – Kutná Hora)

### 2. *commemoratio sepulturae Domini*

Some records in the period under consideration concern the liturgical customs connected with the celebration of Good Friday, especially with the practice of placing the host (and the chalice) “into the tomb”:

[a.] some priests do not observe the customs connected with Good Friday (n. 209, 246, 312)

[b.] some priests place not only the host (in a pyx), but also the chalice in the tomb

- the priest in Chrudim does so just as in the case of carrying the eucharist “*ad infirmos*” (n. 76)<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Concerning this issue, see V. L. Kennedy, “The Date of the Parisian Decree on the Elevation of the Host,” *Mediaeval Studies* 8 (1946) 87–96; idem, “The Moment of Consecration and the Elevation of the Host,” *Mediaeval Studies* 6 (1944) 121–150.

<sup>13</sup> The reference is undoubtedly to the Utraquist practice bringing communion to the sick *sub utraque*. A liturgical witness to the practice is a found in the rite for the communion of the sick in the Utraquist Agenda MS Brno MNK Mk 85 ff. 40b–41a. See: David R. Holeton, “The

- the priest of Zderaz in Prague places the monstrance and the chalice “into the tomb” during appropriate chanting, but the Consistory objects to the practice of placing into the “tomb” a chalice with wine (n. 281)
- [c.] In a report to the Archbishop of Prague, the Consistory states that only a monstrance with the species of the Lord’s body is placed into God’s grave on Good Friday (n. 104)
- a priest in Litoměřice carries only a monstrance into “the tomb,” then chants are sung and an exhortation is delivered (n. 290)

### 3. *expositio eucharistiae et processio cum sacramento et genuflexio*

Another separate group consists of entries which deal with the rejection or omission of the liturgical practice of *expositio eucharistiae, et processio cum sacramento, et genuflexio* in front of the sacrament:

#### 3.1. *expositio*

[a.] some priests refuse to expose the host in a monstrance; other priests neglect this practice (n. 209, 312, p. 436). The cited reasons for the rejection or neglect of this practice include:

- the personal belief of the priest or the congregation (conscience vs. *traditiones humanae*, or a conviction that the sacrament is essentially *ad usum*): (n. 145, 209, 395, 461)
- defect of the monstrance (n. 76)
- the municipality did not release the monstrance to the priest or otherwise impeded him or there was an aversion to this practice in the town (n. 89, 131, 137, 454, 461)

[b.] the protocols indicate that the following feast days were considered appropriate for the liturgical *expositio*

- *in resurrectione Domini* [Easter] (n. 209)
- *in nativitate Domini* (n. 229)
- *in commemoratione passionis Domini* [Good Friday] (n. 89)
- *de Corpore Christi*: contrary to the Roman practice of *expositio* on every day in the octave, the Utraquist Consistory considers it obligatory solely on the octave day of *Corpus Christi* (n. 461)
- *in commemoratione coenae Domini* [Maundy Thursday] (n. 461)

[c.] The priests, who claim to reject this practice for theological reasons, are confronted by other priests who, despite their theological scruples, maintain this practice on some occasions, e.g. *in commemoratione coenae Domini* (n. 461)

[d.] the Consistory’s admonition, that the singing of the antiphon *Deus omnipotens* is resisted in Kutná Hora, is most likely connected with the theology of the *expositio* (n. 494)

---

Role of Jakoubek of Stříbro in the Creation of a Czech Liturgy: Some Further Reflections,” in: *Jakoubek ze Stříbra: texty a jejich působení*, ed. Ota Halama and Pavel Soukup (Prague, 2006) 49–86 here 73 n. 66.

### 3.2. *processio*

[a.] some priests refuse to conduct processions with the sacrament of the altar (the host in a monstrance) (n. 209)

[b.] the protocols indicate that the following feast days were deemed appropriate for the liturgical *processio cum sacramento*:

- *in resurrectione Domini* (n. 120, 209); we found brief descriptions of these processions in two entries:
  - an oration and the antiphon *Laudem dicite* and a procession inside the church (during the rain) and arrangement of the corporal [for exposition/benediction?] (n. 281)
  - a Czech oration and a procession around the church (three times) with chants and candles; the record distinguishes the chants of the choir, the children, and the laity (n. 290)
- *in nativitate Domini* or *in conversione Pauli* (n. 239)<sup>14</sup>
- *in commemoratione passionis Domini* (n. 89)
- Whitsun (n. 90): one entry implies that the Consistory did not approve “stational” liturgy with a procession and chanting (the priest claims to have sung *Quidquid petieritis*) on this feast day and the others, except for *Corpus Christi* (n. 109)
- *de Corpore Christi* (n. 90)<sup>15</sup>

[c.] in its report for the Archbishop the Consistory states that it is customary during this feast day to carry in procession both the monstrance and the chalice (n. 104)

[d.] the reasons cited for the omission of this practice (procession) include:

- the priest does not conduct a procession, because after the end of the mass the faithful leave for the market (n. 120)
- the priest in Litoměřice did not conduct a procession because it had not been done for the past forty years; most of the inhabitants refuse to participate and some even ridicule the practice (n. 290)

[e.] one entry suggests that some priests refuse or omit to conduct a morning Easter procession with banners (*cum armis*) around the cemetery or, in the afternoon, one to the holy cross (n. 76)

[f.] In some municipalities, just one procession per year is conducted, namely, *in solemnitate Paschae* [Easter] during the chanting of *Gloria Tibi* (n. 120)

[g.] the protocols also contain an odd report of *corruptione sacramenti*, which occurred during the procession on the feast day of *Nativitatis Domini* or *Conversio Pauli* (?); the priest inserted a consecrated host into a monstrance, which was dirty; when he attempted to clean it, the host most likely fell to the ground (n.239, see also n. 120)

<sup>14</sup> This can be assumed from the dating of the record: “die f. 6. post Conversionem b. Pauli.” = Friday, 26 January 1565.

<sup>15</sup> The Consistory mandated two processions on this feast day with the sacrament and prayers for a victory over the Turk in 1565 (n.301). This entry may enable us to choose a new and later dating for a part of the so-called Benešovská agenda MS Prague KNM III G 3.

### 3.3. *genuflexio*

[a.] some priests do not maintain a proper respect for the sacrament, which is manifest in genuflexion (n. 174, 228, 437)

[b.] some priests reject *expositio*, but still maintain genuflexion before the sacrament, as an appropriate liturgical gesture (for instance, during consecration) (n. 461)

### 4. *communion in general and specifically for infants, children, and old people*<sup>16</sup>

I include in this fourth group entries which pertain to the issue of reception of the eucharist:

[a.] priests refuse to administer communion to children after baptism (no. 227)  
[b.] priests refuse to administer communion to children in general (n. 242, 103, 377)

[c.] priests refuse to administer communion to old people (n.242)<sup>17</sup>

[d.] the faithful refuse to receive the sacrament from married priests (no. 89)

[e.] priests refuse to administer communion to children who were not brought for communion by parents (a mother) – the Consistory does not condone such an attitude on the part of the priests (n. 377)

### 5. *baptismal practice*

The fifth group consists of entries, which refer to the baptismal practice of some Utraquist priests and communities:

[a.] a priest pleads before the Consistory that he uses water from the baptismal font, which he knows – or is informed by others – is blessed (n. 232).

[b.] a priest pleads that he baptised and at the same time served as a godfather only “*in necessitate*” (n. 242)

[c.] a priest refuses to baptise illegitimate children (n. 207)

[d.] a Utraquist priest performed a baptism in the Unity of Brethren, and allegedly did so in order to prevent their own clergyman from administering the sacrament (n. 99)

[e.] a Utraquist priest (from Čáslav) refuses to baptise children of parents who are subject to a seigneurie because she maintains an unordained minister on her manor (n. 181)

<sup>16</sup> David R. Holeton devoted much research to the restoration of the eucharist (in both kinds) for children during the Bohemian Reformation. See his: “The Communion of Infants and Hussitism,” CV 27, 4 (1984) 207–225; “The Communion of Infants: the Basel Years,” CV 29, 4 (1986) 15–40; *La communion des tout – petits enfants: Une étude mouvement eucharistique en Bohême vers la fin du Moyen-Age*. [Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia, No. 50] (Rome, 1988).

<sup>17</sup> I have not yet encountered a study which deals with this issue. Mental incompetence was a traditional impediment to the reception of the sacrament and would appear too that old age is here equated with loss of mental competence and, therefore, led to exclusion from communion.

[f.] an urgent request to the Consistory for a priest so as to properly baptise infants who are seriously ill (in a time of plague) (n. 194)  
 [g.] godparents from influential families complain of deviation from the established tradition by some priests in conducting the baptismal rite (without citing concrete examples) – the Consistory exhorts the priests to act reasonably so as not to cast doubts on the validity of baptism itself (n. 437)

## 6. de intercessione sanctorum et oratione pro defunctis

References to prayers for the dead and for the intercession of the saints appear in the protocols of the Consistory:

### 6.1. *sancti*

[a.] some priests reject the concept of the intercession of the saints. Their reasons included:

- the saints should be followed more in their virtues, in their confession of faith and in patience (n. 246)
- there is only one mediator and intercessor and it is Jesus Christ (n. 168, 246)

[b.] entries in the protocols under *sancti* mention the violation of practice by “not naming them” – it is not clear whether the omissions refer to litanies, to prayers in the *propria de sanctis*, or to parts of the canon of the mass (n. 437, 494)

### 6.2. *defuncti*

[a.] some priests refuse to say masses for the dead (*missa pro defunctis*) (n. 207, 209, 246)

They challenge the traditional reference to 2 Maccabees 12: 38–46, the authority of which they consider inadequate because of its apocryphal character (n. 246).

## 7. oil blessed at the *missa chrismatis*

In the protocols we also find sporadic references to the oil blessed by the bishop during the *missa chrismatis*:

[a.] some priests refuse to accept the “sacres liquores” – the oil blessed by the bishop (n. 318)

[b.] the dean of Kutná Hora is accused of failing to convoke the priests in order to distribute to them the blessed oil (n. 376)

[c.] blessed oil is dispatched with instructions on how to deal with it properly (n. 377)

## 8. formation of clergy

There are important entries in the Consistory’s protocols that refer to questions concerning the formation of Utraquist priests:

[a.] many entries refer to the liturgical practice in the Týn Church as normative for the liturgical life of the Utraquist Church (nn. 132, 176, 179, 209, 377:

i.e. two offices daily (lauds and vespers) and the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament on Sundays;

[b.] a priest is cited because he does not know or does not observe certain traditional rites and customs, because hitherto he had served in a locality where they were not observed and, therefore, had no occasion to learn them (n. 209, 361)

[c.] expressions of regret that young priests carry with themselves Luther's and Zwingli's books (n. 246)

[d.] the Consistory notes that the candidates for priesthood are familiarised with the Reformation by their *praeceptores* (n. 272)

[e.] the Consistory finds that some priests "did not attend any lectures and did not learn much; they do not know what kind of books they use, whether German or others" (n. 81)

[f.] a chaplain defends himself against complaints by the Consistory that he was never properly instructed and, consequently, did not know how to act during a procession with a monstrance (hence it fell to the ground) (n. 109, 132)

[g.] the priest may be required by the Consistory, on his appointment to a new locality, to present himself in a church to be tested on his practical knowledge of the missals, the rites and liturgical gestures (n. 283)

[h.] the Consistory doubts that rural priests know enough Latin to use the missal properly (n. 283)

[i.] priests are admonished by the Consistory to study at home Christian homilies and learn the texts of the prayers of the mass (n. 301)

## 9. *varia*

This last group covers entries concerning liturgical matters that are rare, marginal or very specific:

[a.] the protocols refer to expressions "*kantilény*" and "*české kancí*" (little vernacular songs) which designate chants that do not belong to the traditional liturgical repertoire and begin to penetrate into the liturgical celebrations of the Utraquist Church; the Consistory disapproves of this practice (n.168, 227, 354, p. 437)

- it seems that these expressions are also used to characterise a practice, in which Czech songs replace the traditional *ordo missae* or its parts (n. 472)

[b.] in the protocols we find a complaint that priests do not properly observe the liturgical directives for weekdays (*feriae*):

- sometimes only Sunday is observed (n. 354) and, elsewhere, only Sunday and one weekday (n. 376):
  - Monday, Tuesday, Thursday (n. 139)
  - Wednesday and Saturday (n. 116)

[c.] some priests do not observe "the lesser fasts" (n. 168)

[d.] priests are reminded to conduct "Sunday worship at the morning preaching" on harvest festival days [*posvícení*] (i.e., to say mass?) (n. 189)

[e.] priests are admonished to shave so that remnants of the sacred species (bread and especially wine) would not remain attached in their beards and thus dishonour the eucharist (n. 201).

[f.] the Archbishop's request to conduct prayers for victory over the Turks in a prescribed liturgical form (on Sun-Mon-Wed-Fri: ringing three times along with a sermon; sung daily at None; litanies sung with the boys on Wednesdays and Fridays) is rejected by the Utraquist clergy on the grounds of not being bound by obedience to the archbishop; the Consistory, instead, mandates the singing of Czech litanies (n. 316).<sup>18</sup>

[g.] the Consistory's protocols reveal a conflict between the town government and the Consistory for authority in liturgical matters (n. 431, 472)

[h.] complaint of the Consistory that in Kutná Hora "the votives are changed" (i.e., the practice of votive masses is opposed?) (n. 494)

[i.] the Archbishop's request for the return of relics, which are located in Utraquist churches and in which he is interested (n. 533)

[j.] a priest in his testament bequeaths: a silver and vermeil pyx, a gilded silver chalice, a small vermeil spoon for administering the Blood of the Lord to children, corporals, a silver "chrism" (to keep the holy oil), cassock and stole, a missal bound in white leather (n. 544)

[k.] believers *sub una* ask for use of Czech in the reading of the Epistle, the Gospel, and some other prayers, because of their incomprehensibility (in Latin) many attend other churches or stay at home, where they read and sing Czech texts (n. 561).

The protocol entries open up other interesting questions:

[A.] The question of central authority: We saw that despite the Consistory's efforts to maintain order in liturgical practice, certain deviations among Utraquist priests and communities kept cropping up, as the protocols show. What was the real authority and the actual power of enforcement of the Utraquist Consistory in the area of liturgical practice?

[B.] The question of a single *ordo*: the Consistory's protocols imply the maintenance of an official Use and that there was something that could be considered an authoritative version or "*editio typica*," of the Utraquist liturgical books. Other than the historic "Prague Use" of the Roman rite, we know of no such books. It seems that the use of the Týn Church of Prague was seen as the liturgical norm (n. 132, 176, 179, 209, 377).

<sup>18</sup> In 1456 Calixtus III asked for a long bell ringing at noon along with prayers for protection against the Turk. The date of institution of the "Turkish bell" along with the prayers prescribed by the Archbishop would have been outside the practice of Utraquists who, nonetheless, appear to have devised an equivalent custom. [Ed.]

[C.] The question of the liturgical formation of Utraquist clergy: the protocols (see section 8 of part 1 “Liturgical Formation” above) indicate a low educational level of some Utraquist priests, and that a few may have acquired their liturgical training in a Protestant milieu (e.g. at German Lutheran universities). The low level of liturgical sophistication may help to explain the reasons and motivation for the changes in the traditional Prague liturgical use. It may also shed light on the impression of a certain liturgical provisorium in the extant liturgical manuscripts.<sup>19</sup>

[D.] The question of liturgical eclecticism: the analysis of the Consistory’s protocols and the liturgical manuscripts has revealed certain local (geographic) variations and looseness in the *ordo missae* and ceremonies. It is likely that the varying degree of education and also the specific theological outlook promoted a considerable eclecticism and at times radical editorial work, leading to idiosyncratic *agenda* and *ordines*, which the priests copied in a selective manner to use in their parish work. This manner of their composition forces us patiently to collect and sort the contemporary liturgical materials which are accessible to us. Only then may we be able to map out the network of sources, from which the editors of the parish *agendas* derived the texts of prayers, liturgical orders, etc.

Translated from the Czech by Zdeněk V. David

---

<sup>19</sup> See the analysis of liturgical manuscripts in the second part of this article which is to follow in BRRP 9.

## Appendix

### A List of Priests and Localities Mentioned in the Utraquist Consistory's Protocols

[Numbers refer to the entries in *Jednání a dopisy konsistoře pod obojí způsobou přijímajících a jiné listiny téže strany se týkající z let 1562–1570*. Julius Pažout, ed. (Prague, 1906).]

- 076 – priest Mikuláš, chaplain in Chrudim
- 081 – priest Jiřík at St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 089 – priest Jan, dean of Chrudim
- 090 – Chrudim
- 099 – Jan Turek, parish priest in Sušice (later at St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague)
- 103 – Prague priests, especially Jan Sobolín
- 104 – archbishop's message to the emperor, containing the Consistory's report about the practice of the Utraquist Church
- 109 – priest Jiřík and chaplain Duchek at St. Peter (Prague?)
- 116 – priest Jan, dean of Jičín
- 120 – priest Jan, dean of Český Brod
- 131 – parish of St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 132 – priest Šimon, chaplain in Jičín
- 137 – parish of Chrudim
- 139 – parish of Čáslav
- 145 – parish of St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 168 – Jan Turek, at St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 174 – candidates for priesthood
- 176 – parish in Hradec Králové
- 179 – town of Strašecí, a residence of Archduke Ferdinand's court
- 181 – priest Jan and dean Václav in Čáslav
- 189 – the priests of Prague
- 194 – parish of St. Michael in the New Town of Prague
- 201 – priest Jiří at St. Peter in the New Town of Prague
- 207 – parish priests of Prague
- 209 – priest Jan at St. Michael in the New Town of Prague
- 227 – parish priests of Prague
- 228 – newly ordained priests
- 229 – priest Jan Turek at St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 232 – priest Jan at St. Michael in the New Town of Prague and priest Jan Turek
- 242 – priest Jan Habart, dean of Kutná Hora
- 246 – parish priests of Prague, especially Jan Turek and priest Jan at St. Michael in the New Town

- 272 – candidates for priesthood
- 281 – priest Václav, parish priest of Zderaz (Prague)
- 283 – priest Jan, parish priest of Žabokliky near Kadaň
- 290 – priest Mikuláš, dean of Litoměřice
- 301 – Prague priesthood
- 312 – priest Václav, parish priest of Zderaz
- 316 – clergy of Prague
- 318 – report of Jan Klechendrych, parish priest of Vlašim, about other priests
- 354 – complaint by priest Pavel, chaplain in Kutná Hora, against his dean
- 361 – priest Jan, dean of Kutná Hora
- 376 – priest Bartoloměj, parish priest of St. Barbara in Kutná Hora, accuses his dean
- 377 – priest Jiřík Agricola, archdean of Hradec Králové
- 395 – priest Mikuláš, the parish priest of the Týn Church
- 419 – priest Matěj, dean of Beroun
- 431 – parish of Hradec Králové
- 437 – the priests of Prague
- 454 – Jan Turek, parish priest at St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 461 – Jan Turek, parish priest at St. Nicholas in the Old Town of Prague
- 472 – parish of Chrudim
- 494 – parish of Kutná Hora
- 544 – parish priest of Zlatníky
- 561 – Volyně