

Beyond the Gradual

An analysis of the recited layers of Mass propers and the impact of Regensburg on the early Hungarian liturgy

Methodological principles

Our paper is intended to introduce a pioneering project called *Missalia*, an advanced variant of the project *Gradualia*, initiated by Gábor Kiss in order to systematize the medieval variants of chanted Mass propers.¹ *Missalia* should serve to enable the analysis and comparison of the Mass proper as a whole, including not only the chanted parts in the strict sense, i.e. the layer of the Gradual (Introits, Graduals, Alleluia verses, Tracts, Sequences, Offertories, Communions), but also the so-called euchological material, i.e. the layer of the Sacramentary (Collects, Secretae, Postcommunions, Super populum prayers) and the corpus of lessons incorporated in what we call the Lectionary (Prophecies, Epistles, Gospels). Given that they belong to the same system, their analysis is indispensable for the interpretation of musical sources, on the one hand because the recited material (parts of the so-called *accentus*) is not less “music” than the genres of *concentus*, on the other hand because the layer of the Gradual in its entirety is far less variable than that of the Sacramentary or the Lectionary.

Regarding the history of prayers and lessons within the Mass proper, the achievements of the 20th century are well-known among scholars. Excellent researchers, e.g. Mohlberg, Deshusses, Beissel, Klauser, Chavasse, and others have edited and commented the early history of these items,² and their opinion now forms an almost canonised body of scholarship, repeated in all the introductions, commentaries and handbooks of liturgical history. However, their methodology proceeds on two preconceptions which hinder the fruitful analysis of single mediaeval liturgical Uses. First, their approach is genetic, i.e. it usually concentrates on the earliest sources, regardless of their special origin and historical impact, and supposes that all the later liturgical books are descendants of the former ones. Second, it seems to be influenced by the Rome-centred state of affairs of the modern age when liturgical matters were or, at least, should have been centralised.

In contrast, our project is based on the following four principles:

- (1) The three layers of the Mass proper must not be separated from one another, their relevance is equal.
- (2) The significance of specific sources can be categorically different: sources of surely identifiable, central origin and of great impact have to be preferred even when they are late ones. Printed diocesan Missals of the 15–16th century are the most valuable.³

¹ <http://earlymusic.zti.hu/gradualia/gradualia.html>.

² Mohlberg, Kunibert — Baumstark, Anton (ed.), *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber sacramentorum anni circuli der römischen Kirche (Cod. Pad. D 47, fol. 11^r–100^r)* (Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927¹, 1972²) (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 11–12, 28); Deshusses, Jean (ed.), *Le sacramentaire grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits I–III*. (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1971–1982) (Spicilegium Friburgense 16, 24, 28); Beissel, Stephan, *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches. Zur Geschichte der Evangelienbücher in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters*. (Maria-Laach: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1907) (Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Ergänzungsheft 96); Klauser, Theodor, *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum. Texte und Untersuchungen zu seiner alten Geschichte*. (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1935¹, 1971²) (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 28); Chavasse, Antoine, *Les lectionnaires romains de la messe au VII^e et au VIII^e siècle. Sources et dérivés I. Procédés de confection. II. Synoptique général. Tableaux complémentaires*. (Fribourg Suisse: Éditions Universitaires, 1993) (Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 22).

³ Their bibliographies are: Bohatta, Hanns, *Liturgische Bibliographie des XV. Jahrhunderts mit Ausnahme der Missale und Livres d'Heures*. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1911); Weale, William Henry James —

(3) A careful comparison has to be made including every single liturgical Use of the Western ecclesiastical territory of which trustable sources have survived.

(4) All of the liturgical Uses are considered as original and relatively independent systems, not as stages within a genetic chain of development.

After a few years of intensive work, our research group of liturgical history amassed a digital collection of sources that contains almost 800 volumes, among them copies of more than 90% of the medieval Missals ever printed.⁴ The temporal cycles of about 180 Missals are listed in a database, and to this number other Missals are added quite regularly, thus we hope that the first and most important layer of the data will be collected within months. This will form a typological net, a starting point for a more detailed analysis, including earlier, hand-written material and sources of less certain origin.

Instead of a lengthy description of our methods, an interesting case study shall be presented in the following chapters in order to demonstrate how this approach can shed new light on old questions.

A remarkable phenomenon

Already at an early stage of our project—i.e. at the first proof of the average divergence of diocesan Temporals—a striking relationship was detected between the liturgical Uses of Regensburg and Zagreb. The Uses of both bishoprics differ from their surroundings—even from the Central-European region as a whole—and the correspondences are numerous and systematic. They can in no way be considered accidental.

This observation clearly shows the advantage of a general comparative method since Regensburg customs could be examined not only in comparison with Zagreb but with due regard for the vast majority of other European Uses. It was only in this context that it became apparent that Regensburg had a rather unique Use, different not only from those of all Southern German or Bavarian episcopates, but from almost every Western liturgical Use we know. In the table below a short sample is provided of these correspondences.⁵ There are 15–16th century Missals from Brixen (now Bressanone in Southern Tirol, Italy),⁶ Regensburg,⁷ Zagreb,⁸ and Esztergom.⁹ Brixen was chosen as a typical representative of medieval Uses, especially German and Italian, while the Use of Esztergom represents the prevailing tradition of the Hungarian Kingdom.

[table 1] Ember Days in the 3rd week of Advent

Bohatta, Hanns, *Bibliographia liturgica*. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1928); Amiet, Robert, *Missels et bréviaires imprimés (supplément aux catalogues de Weale et Bohatta. Propres des saintes (édition princeps))*. (Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1990). For more and recent data one should browse the homepage *Universal Short Title Catalogue*: <http://www.ustc.ac.uk/>. On their significance, see: Nowakowska, Natalia, “From Strassburg to Trent: Bishops, Printing and Liturgical Reform in the Fifteenth Century”, *Past and Present* CCXIII (2011/Nov.) 3–30.

⁴ *The Digital Collection of Sources of the Research Group of Liturgical History*: <http://usuarium.elte.hu>.

⁵ The present tables are only short samples due to the lack of space here. For complete ones, along with more than 180 other missals, visit usuarium.elte.hu where all the sources, indices, and tables can be studied. Zagreb records have been entered by Krisztina Rudolf, other Central-European ones by Katalin Kátai, those of Bavaria and Swabia by Balázs Horváth.

⁶ *Missale secundum ritum ecclesiae Brixinensis* (Basel: Iacobus de Pfortzheim, 1511).

⁷ *Liber missalis secundum breviarium chori ecclesiae Ratisponensis* (Regensburg: 1485).

⁸ *Missale secundum chorum et rubricam almi episcopatus Zagrabiensis ecclesiae ...* (Venice: Petrus Liechtenstein, 1511).

⁹ *Missale ... secundum chorum ecclesiae Strigoniensis* (Nürnberg: Antonius Koburger, 1484), its modern edition is: Balázs Déri (ed.), *Missale Strigoniense 1484*, (Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 2008), (*Monumenta Ritualia Hungarica* 1).

	Brixen 1511	Regensburg 1485	Zagreb 1511	Esztergom 1484
f4 Or	Praesta	Praesta	Praesta	Praesta
f4 Coll	Festina qs Dne	Festina qs Dne	Festina qs Dne	Festina qs Dne
f4 Secr	Accepta tibi sint	Grata tibi sint	Accepta tibi sint	Accepta tibi sint
f4 Postc	Salutaris tui Dne	Conservent	Salutaris tui Dne	Salutaris tui Dne
f6 Coll	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne
f6 Secr	Muneribus nostris	Praesta ... ut dicato	Praesta ... ut dicato	Muneribus nostris
f6 Postc	Tui nos Dne	Prosint nobis	Prosint nobis	Tui nos Dne
S Or1	Ds qui conspicias	Ds qui conspicias	Ds qui conspicias	Ds qui conspicias
S Or2	Concede qs	Adesto Dne	Adesto Dne	Concede qs
S Or3	Indignos nos	Indignos nos	Indignos nos	Indignos nos
S Or4	Praesta ... ut dicato	Ds qui pro animarum	Ds qui pro animarum	Praesta ... ut dicato
S Or5	Preces populi	Miserationum	Miserationum	Preces populi
S Coll	Ds qui tribus	Ds qui tribus	Ds qui tribus	Ds qui tribus
S Secr	Sacrificiis	Sacrificiis	Sacrificiis	Ecclesiae tuae
S Postc	Qs ... ut sacrosancta	Memento nostri	Memento nostri	Qs ... ut sacrosancta
D Coll	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne
D Secr	Propitius intuere	Haec tibi Dne	Haec tibi Dne	Sacrificiis
D Postc	Sumptis muneribus	Tribue	Adiuva Dne	Sumptis muneribus

Abbreviations here and later: SacHenr = Sacramentary of Henry II | MNZag = Missale notatum from Zagreb diocese | f4 = Wednesday | f6 = Friday | S = Saturday | D = Sunday | Coll = collecta | Or = oratio | Secr = secreta | Postc = postcommunio | Sup = super populum | Dne = Domine | Ds = Deus | qs = quaesumus

How can one interpret records like these? At the period when these Missals were printed—at the end of the 15th century—both liturgical Uses (or at least their temporal Mass propers) had long ago left behind their formative periods, i.e. they were published after the age when the active framing of such a fundamental part of the liturgy could be likely. Therefore, the relationship between them must have originated earlier. In order to demonstrate continuity or discontinuity, earlier sources of the same traditions have to be examined. If the uses are continuous within themselves, we can compare the more ancient sources with one another.

The first extant Mass source which most likely originates from Zagreb is a notated Missal from the beginning of the 13th century. As for Regensburg, an even earlier witness is available in the Sacramentary of Henry II.

A notated Missal from Zagreb

The notated Missal in question, the so-called Missal of Németújvár (now Güssing in Burgenland, Austria) is the first surviving complete Missal from the Hungarian Kingdom, originating most probably from the bishopric of Zagreb (now the capital of Croatia).¹⁰ At present, it is found in the Franciscan Library of Güssing (*Bibliothek des Franziskanerklosters*) under shelfmark 1/43. The manuscript consists of 266 folios, and contains the following parts: a fragmentary calendar (from May to August), preparation for the Mass, Mass ordinary, Temporal, Sanctoral, Commune, Votive parts, and lastly a Sequential.¹¹

It is written with Gothic letters (*gothica textualis formata*),¹² László Veszprémy refers to its parallels in German Gothic scripts and in Hungarian charters from the first part of the 13th century.¹³ The analysis of musical palaeography by Janka Szendrei has verified beyond any doubt the Hungarian provenance of the codex, since this is the very first manuscript with the

¹⁰ Güssing, Klosterbibliothek der Franziskaner Cod. 1/43. Missale notatum from Zagreb (13th century).

¹¹ For further description see: Janka Szendrei, *A „mos patriae” kialakulása 1341 előtti hangjegyes forrásaink tükrében [The development of the “mos patriae” according to our sources with musical notation before 1341]*, (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2005), 210–219.

¹² Janka Szendrei, *A „mos patriae” kialakulása*, 211.

¹³ László Veszprémy, „A 12. századi magyar kódexírás alakulása [The changes of Hungarian script in the codices of the 12th century]” in *Századok CXXXII* (1998), 229.

so-called Esztergom notation in its fully developed form, typical to the Hungarian Kingdom and not found anywhere else.¹⁴

According to the consensus of scholars, the Missal dates from the beginning of the 13th century. The origin of the manuscript had been in doubt until László Dobszay convincingly argued—contrarily to Polikárp Radó’s theory, namely, that the Missal must have come from Pécs—in favour of Zagreb. Dobszay emphasised that the name of St Stephen is in the votive collect *A cunctis* at the very point where the patronage of the episcopal see is usually mentioned. The fact that only Zagreb had King St Stephen as its patron supports the manuscript’s Zagreb origin.¹⁵ According to Dobszay, an overview of the liturgical content also strengthens the likelihood of this hypothesis.

However, several features still differ from the later peculiarities of the Zagreb Use, well-documented since the first quarter of the 14th century. Some scholars drew attention to a few archaic and inconsistent features of the manuscript.¹⁶ The Temporal is mixed with the Sanctoral at the beginning of the Missal, while the two are already divided in older Hungarian codices, such as the Codex Pray,¹⁷ and in the so-called Sacramentary of St Margaret.¹⁸ Furthermore, the Ember Days of the fourth month (June) are placed within the third week after Whitsun, although already in 1078 Pope Gregory VII had ordered that they be observed within the octave of Pentecost. There are Mass propers for both Trinity Sunday (perhaps only for votive use) and the Octave Day of Pentecost, albeit by this time the first had superseded the latter. Many other inconsistencies could also be listed, e.g. remnants of weekday lessons in Epiphanytide, rather unusual in Hungary, and peculiar arrangements of certain processional rites, etc. According to Szendrei, these features are “eventualities of the redaction” and suggest an archaic exemplar, while Dobszay leaves this question unsolved.¹⁹

The Sacramentary of Henry II

The so-called Sacramentary of Henry II is a lavish manuscript, copied at Saint Emmeram’s Abbey in Regensburg in honour of the ruler.²⁰ The codex refers to Henry as king (*rex*) and not as emperor (*imperator*); hence it must have been composed between 1002 and 1014, after Henry’s election as king but before he became emperor. It is a representative book, one of the most prominent works of Ottonian illumination. Henry II had bestowed the codex upon the Bamberg Cathedral, whence in the 19th century it came into the possession of the Bavarian State Library (*Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*) in München, where, at present, it is stored under the inventory number Clm 4456.²¹

The richly illuminated manuscript is written with Carolingian minuscule and consists of 358 leaves. Its contents are: calendar, full page illustrations (e.g. the coronation of Henry), Canon of the Mass, mixed Temporal and Sanctoral, Commune, dedication, votive Masses.

Although by this time Sacramentaries of the Gregorian structure became gradually prevalent in Europe, in the Sacramentary of Henry II Gregorian and Gelasian elements are com-

¹⁴ Janka Szendrei, *A „mos patriae” kialakulása*, 240.

¹⁵ László Dobszay, „Árpád-kori kottás misekönyvünk provenienciája” [Provenance of our notated Missal from the age of the Árpáds], in *Zenatudományi dolgozatok* VI. (1984) 9–10.

¹⁶ The above cited works of László Dobszay, Janka Szendrei, and Miklós István Földváry: *Az esztergomi benedikcionále [The Esztergom Benedictional]*, (Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 2015), 25–26.

¹⁷ Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, MNy. 1, Monastic Sacramentary from Boldva (?), end of the 12th century.

¹⁸ Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 126, Monastic Sacramentary, beginning of the 12th century.

¹⁹ Janka Szendrei, *A „mos patriae” kialakulása*, 219–220. and László Dobszay, „Árpád-kori kottás misekönyvünk provenienciája”, 12.

²⁰ München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 4456. Sacramentary of Henry II (Regensburg, written at Saint Emmeram’s Abbey, 1002–1014). The digitised manuscript is available: <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0005/bsb00050763/images/>.

²¹ For a short description of the codex, see: *Kaiser Heinrich II. 1002–1024*, ed. Kirmeier—Schneidmüller—Weinfurter—Brockhoff, (Augsburg : Konrad Theiss Verlag, 2002), 268–273.

bined: there is only one Collect for every Mass (typical to the Gregorian-type), then Secreta and Postcommunion, but at least one Super populum prayer is included at the end of each Mass, not only for Lenten weekdays (a characteristic of the Gelasian-type). The Temporal and the Sanctoral are merged into a mixed arrangement (Gregorian), but some of the items are rare, i.e. either unique or of Gelasian origin.

The comparative analysis of the Temporals

Our hypothesis is verified by the comparison of the temporal parts: the Use of Regensburg in the 15th century shows obvious continuity with the Sacramentary of Henry II, in fact, three-quarters of the items that differ from the common usage in the whole German Empire, do correspond. This is a very high proportion because most of these items are unique or Gelasian orations which have fallen to disuse and are extremely rare all over Europe.²² Of course, according to the later Gregorian practice, most of the non-Lenten Super populum prayers were omitted from the Missal of 1485.

[table 2] Ember Days in the 3rd week of Advent

	SacrHen 11th cent.	Regensburg 1485	Zagreb 1511	MNZag 13th cent.
f4 Or	Praesta	Praesta	Praesta	Praesta
f4 Coll	Festina qs Dne	Festina qs Dne	Festina qs Dne	Festina qs Dne
f4 Secr	Grata tibi sint	Grata tibi sint	Accepta tibi sint	Accepta tibi sint
f4 Postc	Conservent	Conservent	Salutaris tui Dne	Tuorum nos Dne
f6 Coll	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne
f6 Secr	Praesta ... ut dicato	Praesta ... ut dicato	Praesta ... ut dicato	Praesta ... ut dicato
f6 Postc	Prosint nobis	Prosint nobis	Prosint nobis	Prosint nobis
S Or1	Ds qui conspicis	Ds qui conspicis	Ds qui conspicis	Ds qui conspicis
S Or2	Adesto Dne	Adesto Dne	Adesto Dne	Adesto Dne
S Or3	Indignos nos	Indignos nos	Indignos nos	Indignos nos
S Or4	Ds qui pro animarum	Ds qui pro animarum	Ds qui pro animarum	Praesta ... ut
S Or5	Miserationum	Miserationum	Miserationum	Miserationum
S Coll	Ds qui tribus	Ds qui tribus	Ds qui tribus	Ds qui tribus
S Secr	Sacrificiis	Sacrificiis	Sacrificiis	Ecclesiae tuae
S Postc	Memento nostri	Memento nostri	Memento nostri	Qs ... ut sacrosancta
D Coll	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam	Excita Dne potentiam
D Secr	Haec tibi Dne	Haec tibi Dne	Haec tibi Dne	Sacrificiis
D Postc	Tribue	Tribue	Adiuva Dne	Sumptis muneribus

Upon a careful examination of the entire Temporal, one can detect a strong and systematic correspondence between the sacramental layers of the Regensburg and Zagreb Uses. Although they differ from one another on a few points, it is impressive that on several other points the 16th-century Missal of Zagreb and especially the 13th-century notated Missal of Zagreb are much closer to the Sacramentary of Henry II than the 15th-century Missal of Regensburg itself. The items of Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima Sunday or some Lenten prayers are telling examples of this affinity (see table 3).

[table 3] Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima

	SacrHen 11th cent.	Regensburg 1485	Zagreb 1511	MNZag 13th cent.
D70 Coll	Preces populi tui	Preces populi tui	Preces populi tui	Preces populi tui
D70 Secr	Concede nobis	Suscipe qs Dne	Concede nobis	Concede nobis

²² The sacramental layer of the Regensburg Use shows some distant—yet systematic—similarities only to Auxerre and Orléans, France (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 17316, Missal-Pontifical from Auxerre, last third of the 14th century; *Missale ad usum ecclesiae Aurelianensis*, (Paris: Ioannes Guiard — Ludovicus Boulenger, 1522). We could not ascertain the reason for these similarities but it seems most likely that these French Uses relied on the same Gelasian-type Sacramentary or one very much akin to it.

D70 Postc	Fideles tui Ds	Fideles tui Ds	Fideles tui Ds	Fideles tui Ds
D70 Sup	Concede ... fragilitati	–	–	Concede ... fragilitati
D60 Coll	Ds qui conspicis	Ds qui conspicis	Ds qui conspicis	Ds qui conspicis
D60 Secr	Intende qs Dne	Tua sacramenta	Intende qs Dne	Oblatum tibi
D60 Postc	Assit nobis	Supplices te	Assit nobis	Supplices te
D60 Sup	Tuere qs Dne	–	–	Nostris qs Dne
D50 Coll	Preces nostras	Preces nostras	Preces nostras	Preces nostras
D50 Secr	Haec hostia	Huius nos te	Ecclesiae tuae	Sacrificium Dne
D50 Postc	Repleti sumus	Qs ... qui caelestia	Repleti sumus	Repleti sumus
D50 Sup	De multitudine	–	–	–

The notated Missal of Zagreb also fits the context above-delineated. The analysis of the Temporal verified Dobszay's hypothesis that the codex is from the Zagreb diocese; the continuity from the 13th to the 16th century—which proved to be problematic from many other perspectives—is self-evident in this respect.

Some of the otherwise scarce differences come from the fact that the notated Missal of Zagreb assigns some of the Super populum prayers which are unique in the Sacramentary of Henry II as Postcommunions for the Mass of the same day, e.g. *Deus qui in deserti regione* on the fourth and *Da quaesumus misericors Deus ut quod in Filii tui passione* on the sixth Sunday of Lent (see table 4). One Super populum prayer (*Familiam tuam quaesumus Domine propitius illustra* on the first Saturday of Lent) became typical also to the mature Use of Esztergom, as documented later.

[table 4] Fourth and sixth Sunday of Lent

	SacrHen 11 th cent.	Regensburg 1485	Zagreb 1511	MNZag 13 th cent.
D4 Coll	Concede ... ex merito	Concede ... ex merito	Concede ... ex merito	Concede ... ex merito
D4 Secr	Suscipe ... te voluisti	Sacrificiis Dne qs	Sacrificiis Dne qs	Sacrificiis Dne qs
D4 Postc	Da ... ut sancta tua	Da ... ut sancta tua	Ds qui in deserti	Ds qui in deserti
D4 Sup	Ds qui in deserti	–	–	–
D6 Coll	Plebs tua Dne	Tueatur qs Dne dextera	Tueatur qs Dne dextera	Tueatur qs Dne dextera
D6 Secr	Ops ... qui humano	Ops ... qui humano	Ops ... qui humano	Ops ... qui humano
D6 Postc	Praesta ... quia vitiis	Per huius Dne	Da ... Filii passione	Da ... Filii passione
D6 Sup	Da ... Filii passione	–	–	–

Historical background

What kind of historical factors could one identify as making up the possible background for such a liturgical correlation? When and how could a connection between Zagreb and Regensburg be established? Due to the relatively late foundation of the episcopal see of Zagreb (1094), it would be anachronistic to assume a direct Bavarian impact, since the institutional system of the Hungarian church had already been in place by that time.²³ After its foundation, Zagreb was under the control of Esztergom as a suffragan episcopate of the archdiocese,²⁴ hence it was most likely from Esztergom that Zagreb received its liturgical books which gave shape to its own liturgical Usage. This most likely means that Zagreb was not directly involved but rather inherited the result of an earlier connection between Regensburg and Esztergom.

Considering the historical circumstances, this relationship must have been the strongest during the reign of St Stephen I, as both before and after him Bavarian rulers waged war against the Hungarian Kingdom. In 991 Henry the Wrangler, Duke of Bavaria (father of St

²³ Miklós István Földváry, *Az esztergomi benedikcionále* 59.

²⁴ *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. sz.) [Early Hungarian Historical Lexicon (9–14th cent.)]*, ed. Gyula Kristó – Pál Engel – Ferenc Makk (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994), entry “Zágrábi püspökség [Bishopric of Zagreb]”.

Henry II) was in war with Géza, sovereign of the Hungarians (father of St Stephen I), and Emperor Conrad II attacked St Stephen I as early as 1030.²⁵ In contrast, between these two dates—when Regensburg was the capital of the Holy Roman Empire—Emperor St Henry II was St Stephen’s brother-in-law. They were not only relatives but there was also a kind of personal amity between them.²⁶ Both families were famous for their piety and sincere practice of Christianity.

Despite the scarcity of the surviving source material, traces of an intensive Hungarian-Bavarian relationship can be detected during the time of the Hungarian Kingdom’s foundation. A number of priests and religious came to Hungary with the entourage of Bd. Gisela, St Stephen’s wife, and St Henry II’s sister. Bruno, bishop of Augsburg, brother of Henry and Gisela made a visit to Hungary in 1008, while in 1012 Anastasius, bishop of Esztergom took part in the dedication of the Bamberg Cathedral.²⁷ Moreover, we are aware of a specifically liturgical interaction: Arnulf of St Emmeram (Regensburg) notes in his hagiography of St Emmeram that during his visitation to Hungary he composed a history (a series of antiphons and responsories) in honour of St Emmeram which was right away learnt and performed by Anastasius, bishop of Esztergom along with his cathedral chapter.²⁸

Consequently, the liturgical contents of a Regensburg Sacramentary must have come to Zagreb through Esztergom. It is Esztergom whose earlier liturgical practice was preserved by Zagreb as a residual memory.²⁹ That archaic features disappear from the centre and survive in its peripheral surroundings is a well-known phenomenon of cultural transmission. Both legal texts and liturgical sources testify that in Esztergom there was a deliberate change to Gregorian reform ideas at the turn of the 11th and 12th centuries. The *Micrologus* of Bernold of Constance, a programmatic work of Pope Gregory VII’s liturgical priorities was copied into the so-called Codex Pray, a Hungarian Sacramentary from around the end of the 12th century, and its official adaptation is confirmed already by the acts of a provincial synod of Esztergom from the year 1100.³⁰ Rubrics taken from the same *Micrologus* and decisions suggested by its text follow in other 12–14th century manuscripts of Esztergom.³¹

It has already been established that the Sacramentary of Henry II served as a master copy for some of the cathedrals in the Holy Roman Empire, too.³² Of course, it is not suggested that the whole Sacramentary was slavishly copied in order to create a new liturgical Use, yet its application as a kind of sourcebook or chrestomathy is undeniable. Related research has also

²⁵ Gyula Kristó, *Magyarország története 895–1301 [History of Hungary 895–1301]*. (Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 1998), 87., 111.

²⁶ In the Legend of St Stephen, the Emperor’s attribute is *amicus* ‘a friend, allied’: “Accidit post haec defuncto beati regis amico, Romanae dignitatis augusto Henrico pio ...” *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum* I–II., ed. Imre Szentpétery (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia — Magyar Történeti Társaság, 1938), 423.

²⁷ Gyula Kristó, *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196) [Hungarian Foreign Policy (896–1196)]*, 48.

²⁸ László Veszprémy, „Anastasius esztergomi érsek műveltségéről [On the erudition of Anastasius, Archbishop of Esztergom]”, in *Századok* (1985) 137–141. Hungarian translation and commentary of some parts of the Emmeram biography: *Az államalapítás korának írott forrásai [The written sources of the state foundation]*, ed. Gyula Kristó (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1999), 170–176.

²⁹ Miklós István Földváry, *Az esztergomi benedikcionále*, 60.

³⁰ Levente Závodszy, *A Szent István, Szent László és Kálmán korabeli törvények és zsinati határozatok forrásai. (Függelék: a törvények szövege) [Legal texts and synodal acts from the age of Kings Saint Stephen, Saint Ladislav, Coloman the Learned. Appendix: the text of the laws]* (Budapest: Szent István Társulat 1904¹. Pápa: Jókai Mór Városi Könyvtár 2002²) 200.

³¹ Miklós István Földváry, „A liturgiamaғыаразат nyomai a XIV. század előtti Magyarországon. A Pray-kódex *Micrologus*-a és annak környezete [Traces of liturgical commentaries from pre-14th-century Hungary. The *Micrologus* of the Codex Pray and its contexts]”, in Balázs Déri (ed.): *Oratoris officium. Tanulmányok a hetvenéves Adamik Tamás tiszteletére [Studies in honour of Tamás Adamik for his 70th birthday]*. L’Harmattan — ELTE BTK Latin Nyelvi és Irodalmi Tanszék, Budapest 2008. 87–98.

³² *Kaiser Heinrich II. 1002–1024*, ed. Kirmeier—Schneidmüller—Weinfurter—Brockhoff, (Augsburg: Konrad Theiss Verlag, 2002), 269.

demonstrated that in making the liturgical Use of Esztergom, its creators used numerous sources with great creativity.

Summary

In this study, some new principles and methods have been proposed in order to describe and classify the Mass proper of medieval liturgical uses, pre-eminently the necessity of a Europe-wide sampling and the importance of early printed material. As a case study, a recent discovery has been presented which demonstrates a close and exclusive link between the euchological layers of the late printed Missals of Regensburg and Zagreb. This relationship could be traced back to, and became even more obvious in, the early 13th century, and on the strength of the available historical evidence, a conclusion could be drawn that it had originated in the first decades of the 11th century. In this period, and in this period only, is it feasible to suppose that Regensburg exerted a strong influence on the composition of the early Hungarian Sacramentary. The later, “classical” variant of the Esztergom Use gained its stable form by adopting Gregorian reforms at the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, while Zagreb preserved its primordial features, at least in its set and system of Mass prayers.

An additional benefit of this research is that the Zagreb origin of the first surviving Missal from Hungary could be confirmed in spite of its relative distance from the mature Zagreb tradition.

However, the implications of these findings are remarkable not only from a methodological point of view or as regards single sources and traditions. They mean that the Hungarian liturgy was consciously founded and duly arranged during the reign of St Stephen — an idea attested by late medieval cultural memory³³ and assumed or argued by competent scholars.³⁴ We can also add that developing proper liturgical forms and traditions was considered a paramount issue within the process of creating medieval institutions and cultural identities.

³³ “Habent itaque omnes ecclesiae, habet et nostra Strigoniensis, mox, ut primum felicibus auspiciis fundata est, receptos, et ad haec usque tempora observatos, a Catholica unione nequaquam dissidentes sacrorum ritus.” Cf. *Agendarius. Liber continens ritus et caeremonias, quibus in administrandis sacramentis, benedictionibus, & aliis quibusdam ecclesiasticis functionibus, parochi, & alii curati, in Diœcesi & provincia Strigoniensi utuntur* ... Nagyszombat (today Trnava, Slovakia) 1583¹, 1596², unnumbered page, sheet numbering A4^f.

³⁴ László Dobszay, „A középkori magyar liturgia István-kori elemei? [Elements of the medieval Hungarian liturgy from the age of Saint Stephen?]”, in *Szent István és kora [Saint Stephen and his age]*, ed.: Ferenc Glatz — József Kardos (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1988), 151–155 and Miklós István Földvály: *Az esztergomi benedikcionále*, 29.