

NORMATIVE LITURGICAL TEXTS AND THE ORDINAL¹

Liturgical books may be divided into two main categories. The first contains the actual liturgical texts (liturgical book proper), while the second gives a collection of normative texts regulating liturgical services (rubrical book). There are several types of normative rubrical texts depending on what part or aspect of the services their content is focused upon. These individual types did actually make their appearance in the course of liturgical history but, more often than not, we encounter the specific combinations of these various types, forming separate genre-models. The former I call pure genres, I refer to the latter as mixed genres.

In accordance with this typological approach, the extant normative texts of the Latin liturgy may be classified as belonging to one of eight different genres, of which four are pure, four are mixed. Among the pure genres the following may be listed:

- (1) the catalogue recording the selection and arrangement of liturgical items,
- (2) the symbolic, theoretical, or historical commentaries on liturgical services,
- (3) the so-called Ceremonial, describing individual liturgical roles, movements, objects, vestments, and regulating matters of musical performance,
- (4) and finally, the Directory, handling problems derived from the occurrence and concurrence of liturgical days.

The following belong to the mixed genres:

- (5) the thematically diverse Ordo, describing only one particular liturgical service,
- (6) the Customary, regulating the daily life and liturgical practice of monastic communities or cathedral and collegiate chapters,
- (7) the Ordinal, tied to one of the regional or monastic ritual variants, uniting all the pure genres and following the entire course of the liturgical year,
- (8) and finally, a supplementary group of sources, containing the rubrics of the liturgical books strictly speaking.

¹ This chapter (together with chapters III and V of this introduction) is the summary of chapters I 2–3 and II 1 (published as Miklós István FÖLDEVÁRY: “A középkori Magyarország ordináriuskönyvei” [The Ordinals of Medieval Hungary], in *Az Egyetemi Könyvtár Évkönyvei* XIII. Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Egyetemi Könyvtára, Budapest 2007. 35–86) of a doctoral thesis in Hungarian. The original work will probably be published among the “subsidiá” volumes of this series: Miklós István FÖLDEVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis. A középkori Esztergom liturgiájának normaszövegei*. [Rubrica Strigoniensis. The Normative Texts of the Medieval Esztergom Liturgy] PhD thesis, Budapest, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Nyelvtudományi Doktoriskola, Ókortudományi Program 2008. – see online (with an English summary) http://latin.elte.hu/munkatarsak/FM_files/disszertacio.shtml

These genres, depending on the historical period and region, may have different titles, and there is a certain flexibility between them.

The history of rubrical genres began in the 4th century² — or possibly even earlier if we take into account the fragmentary sources of the not yet fully developed Latin liturgy. From the earliest time the *Ordos* are unquestionably dominant. With the passage of time these books became ever more developed but they were not yet strictly differentiated from the proper liturgical texts. By the 10th century, practically everywhere the *Ordos* were assimilated by the liturgical books proper, or having incorporated the proper liturgical texts written out *in extenso*, they became the books or chapters of such character themselves. The catalogues of abbreviated liturgical items appeared contemporaneously but they only acquired real significance later, in the age of clearly structured ritual variants. With the spreading of the monastic reform movements and the *vita communis* of cathedral or collegiate chapters from the Carolingian period on, the old rules of life were rewritten or reformulated, and liturgical themes began to be incorporated into them to a greater extent and in greater detail. In the same era (of the Carolingian dynasty) the first commentaries began to appear which interpreted the whole of the liturgy as a fixed texture of symbolism.

In the period following the first millennium, the faithful adoption and propagation of the Roman tradition was no longer the sole preoccupation. It became an important concern both for the centralised monastic orders and the local, regional churches to express their own identity through liturgical means, thus formulating their carefully differentiated, vigilantly preserved, and often deliberately composed ritual variants. In the 12th and 13th centuries, contemporaneously with the flourishing of gothic architecture and scholastic philosophy, in an attempt to codify these particular liturgical usages, the *Ordinal* was developed, which, in its representative specimens, gives a synthesis of the catalogues of liturgical items, the *Ordos* describing the ceremonies of special occasions, and the liturgical commentaries. In terms of its immediate historical precedents, both in a monastic and a secular setting, the *Ordinal* most likely derives from the liturgical chapters of *Customaries*, especially of the part concerning the yearly liturgical cycle. In fact, even in a later stage, the most detailed *Ordinals* appear to form part of a *Customary* or the two genres mutually complement each other. Hence the following attributes are characteristic to the classical version of *Ordinals*:

² Such was the “apostolic” tradition of Hippolytus of Rome. For a modern reconstruction of the Latin version, with Greek fragments, see Bernard BOTTE: *La Tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution*. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster 1989⁵. (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 39).

- (1) it codifies one of the regional or monastic variants of the Roman rite,
- (2) structurally it follows the liturgical year,
- (3) and its principal feature is the catalogue of all the abbreviated items of the Mass liturgy and the Divine Office, which is supplemented, to a lesser or greater extent, with other liturgically relevant material.³

In the 13th and 14th centuries the Ordinal was the dominant genre of European rubricism, but some important changes took place. In the period under scrutiny, these changes can be summarised as follows. The first ordinals were *Ordos* loosely bound together and their typical characteristic was the heavy presence of liturgical exegesis. In the more mature specimens, the catalogue of items became more consistent and elaborate, but the other elements were still included. In particular, beginning with the 14th century, the symbolic liturgical commentaries became less and less prominent, which is not unrelated to the fact that since the 12th century liturgical exegesis had developed into a systematic and independent genre, receiving its final summary in the 13th century.⁴ In the same period a new element of the Ordinals became especially prominent, namely, the paragraphs treating questions of occurrence and concurrence.

In the 15th, and especially in the 16th, century the Ordinals underwent a change in terms of structure and content. Structurally, the earlier synthetic approach (to describe a specific liturgical action from all possible aspects) was gradually replaced by an analytical approach (to explain one particular aspect generally, including all the details). In particular those parts were lifted out of the main text that concerned the calendar or the details of ceremony, and they were attached to the book separately, either at the beginning or the end. The main text itself preserved the catalogue of items and the classical *ordines* of the liturgical year (in particular of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and Holy Week). The rearrangement of the ceremonial parts into a separate tract usually took place earlier than that of the questions regarding calendar problems because the latter presupposed the formation of an objective hierarchy of liturgical feasts, which had very little appeal to most of the particular churches.

³ As to the most important scholarly literature regarding the Ordinals, see Edward FOLEY: “The « Libri Ordinarii ». An Introduction”, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* CII (1988) 129–137; Aimé-Georges MARTI-MORT: *Les “Ordines”, les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*. Brepols, Turnhout 1991. (Typologie des sources du moyen âge 56); Éric PALAZZO: “Les ordinaires liturgiques comme sources pour l’historien du Moyen Age. A propos d’ouvrages récents”, *Revue Mabillon* LIV (1992) 233–240; idem: *Histoire des livres liturgiques. Le Moyen Age. Des origines au XIII^e siècle*. Beauchesne, Paris 1993. 228sq. Almost in each version of the numerous textual editions, there is at least a brief introduction to the genre. Among these a pioneering work of great importance is Anton HÄNGGI: *Der Rheinauer Liber Ordinarius (Zürich Rb 80, Anfang 12. Jh.)*. Universitätsverlag, Freiburg 1957. (Spicilegium Friburgense 1).

⁴ That is, in the *Rationale* of Durantus; its latest edition: Anselme DAVRIL OSB — Timothy M. THIBODEAU: *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale divinatorum officiorum* I–III. Brepols, Turnhout 1995–2000. (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 140 ?–A–B).

From the 16th century on, the needs and conditions favouring the use of Ordinals gradually ceased to exist. Among the liturgical books proper, collective genres prevailed, above all, the Missal and the Breviary, which contained all the texts of the Mass and Office liturgy with a detailed description of the relevant rubrics, thus making the analytical type of Ordinal texts completely superfluous. Due to the curialism of the 15th century and the process of Catholic restoration, the Roman rite was made more and more uniform in the direction of the Curial-Franciscan form, thus the various ritual usages only required normative texts in a few religious orders⁵ and in dioceses that steadfastly held unto their own particular traditions.⁶ The centralised regulation demanded more and more detailed rubrics concerning questions of calendar and ceremony.

As a result of this process, the Ordinal, as a separate genre, came to an end or became assimilated by other types of liturgical books. In the meantime, the Ceremonial and the Directory became the two most typical genres of modern-day liturgy. The ceremonial summarised all the ceremonies, that is, all the dramatic aspects of the liturgical services (including also the extraordinary *ordines* of the liturgical year but not touching upon questions of text selection — which, in the following, I will call ceremonial). The Directory, on the other hand, helped to solve problems related to the calendar (I will refer to these as directorial). Until the second half of the 20th century the ceremonial did not undergo any substantial change, and even later, these changes concerned mostly liturgical content and not typological aspects. The concept of the Directory was, however, significantly altered. The first Directories did not follow the basic structure of the Ordinals describing one “ideal” liturgical year, instead they treat of problems related to calendar use, covering the entire period of more or less a human lifetime. In each year then primarily questions of concurrence and occurrence are discussed. The further development of the genre was not unrelated to the fact that printing eventually became quicker and cheaper. The new, thicker Directories including “perpetual calendars” soon covered each day of a period that was at least 100 years long; it also then became customary that individual dioceses, monastic orders or religious provinces issued a new Directory each year. This is still the general practice today.

In summary, we can conclude that the Ordinary is the most characteristic and best documented genre of medieval normative liturgical texts. In the age of manuscript

⁵ Regarding the rites of religious orders still extant in the 20th century, see Archdale A. KING: *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*. Verlag Nova & Vetera, Bonn 2005.

⁶ The partial survival of particular diocesan traditions has still not been systematically studied. From this perspective especially interesting is the French (Gallican) practice of the 17th and 18th centuries because among its typical “abuses” we can find both innovations and retrospective phenomena. About the rites of Lyon and Braga, see Archdale A. KING: *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*. Verlag Nova & Vetera, Bonn 2005.

production this is the genre that survived for the longest time and spread farthest in terms of geographical locations. The various genres of the period preceding the Ordinal's development are parts of a converging process which eventually culminated in the Ordinal. In turn, the Ordinal is at the origo of the diverging process that, in the end, led to the development of the rubrical genres of our modern age.

THE USE OF ESZTERGOM (RITUS STRIGONIENSIS)

The Latin liturgy lived in many variants in the Middle Ages. In terms of their character and development history, we may distinguish two major periods and two principal types of variants in ritual. The first group comprises the variants dating to the period prior to the Romanisation at first supported and later mandated by Carolingian rulers, the second includes the post-Carolingian variants which were later discontinued in the wake of the Council of Trent.

The so-called old Latin liturgies, belonging to the first group, developed in connection with particular cities or regions and synchronically to each other; thus there are fundamental structural differences between them. Among these may be listed the Beneventan, Mozarabic, Gallican, and Ambrosian liturgies, and the rite of the City of Rome (this latter is now called Old Roman in order to distinguish it from the general label "Roman", usually applied to the later forms of Western liturgies).

In the second group are the individual variants of the so-called Franko-Roman liturgy.⁷ The original intention of the Carolingian rulers and those they commissioned for the task was to appropriate the Old Roman liturgy as faithfully as possible; they intended to make a well-regulated and unchanged observance mandatory in the entire Frankish Empire. Total uniformity, however, proved to be impossible to accomplish for two reasons. In the first place, the Old Roman liturgy of the 8th century was not fully defined and unified and it had already begun to interact with the Transalpine regions by that time. Thus from the beginning liturgists encountered a heterogeneous Old Roman tradition and they identified several differences between the earlier and the later elements of this tradition. In the second place, the austere, almost puritanical character of the Old Roman liturgy seemed somewhat foreign to the inhabitants of the Transalpine regions; its adoption would have required the abandonment of many widespread customs, texts, and gestures that were considered important com-

⁷ For a summary of the immense literature on the topic, see Cyrille VOGEL: *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources. Revised and Translated by William Storey and Niels Rasmussen*. Pastoral Press, Portland—Oregon 1986. The term "Franko-Roman" is used here deliberately as against "Romano-Frankish".

ponents of the liturgical taste of Gallican and Germanic spirituality. In this situation, the Carolingian experts felt compelled, despite their original intentions, to use the available material somewhat creatively, although what they did was marked by venerable moderation. Since their construction consisted mostly of different Old Roman elements enriched by many non-Roman additions, the result of their redactive efforts may with good reason be called Franko-Roman. This liturgy, though it lived in many variants, was structurally uniform, which cannot be said of the Old Latin liturgies. Its texts, melodies, and ceremonies were taken from one common fund.

The Franko-Roman liturgy could not become completely uniform, partly because of the insistence of the pre-Carolingian traditions, partly because of the heterogeneous character of its sources, and partly because of the fragmentation of the secular and ecclesiastical structure following the death of Charlemagne. From the very beginning, liturgical uniformity was not perfect, and later the particular local uses began spontaneously to diverge. (The only deliberate and structurally apparent difference was in the Divine Office between its secular and monastic arrangements.) Following the weakening of central government and the concomitant strengthening of particular churches, the spontaneously developed differences were perceived and jealously guarded as the guarantees of regional or institutional identity. This change in perspective favoured the process of making the differences more emphatic.

Beginning with the 10th century, when Christianity spread to new countries and new dioceses had to be created, these territories appropriated the Franko-Roman liturgy in accordance with the new paradigm. In the case of the liturgy of the young churches, the regional rites were not formed by some sort of spontaneous divergence, but as a result of a deliberate process of redaction.⁸ The same could be said for the rites of the Benedictine reform-movements and of the other, even more centralised religious orders. Consequently, from the 11th century until the end of the Middle Ages we encounter well-defined diocesan and regional uses as well as those of the religious orders. The rite of the Papal Court must be counted as one among these variants, which was also adopted by the Franciscan Order. It was not identical to the Old Roman rite of the major Basilicas in Rome; it was rather part of the Franko-Roman families of ritual.

Except for some feeble attempts earlier, a programme for making the Western liturgy completely uniform became topical and possible only in the 16th century. In this period the danger had become too real that Europe would disintegrate into a multitude of autonomous national churches. From this perspective, the individual ritual variants emphasising the national character of the particular churches were seen as favouring schismatic tendencies. At the same time, to respond to the challenge

⁸ The question is discussed and documented in further detail by FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 96sq. 119sq., based on former research.

posed by the Protestant Reformation it seemed desirable to subject the liturgy, one of the sources and most important expressions of the apostolic deposit of faith, to more rigorous doctrinal supervision. This was supported by the invention of the printing press, which gave even a financial incentive to typographers, booksellers, and the clergy for the production or use of uniform liturgical books published in numbers unknown before. (Later the typographers worked with papal privileges.) Hence, when in obedience to the resolutions of the Council of Trent the liturgical books of the Roman rite were published in normative editions between 1568 and 1614,⁹ conditions were already ripe for them to spread swiftly and be accepted widely. Although, strictly speaking, only the adoption of the new Pontifical was made obligatory and the Ritual remained completely optional, and those Breviaries and Missals that had more than 200 years of history could be maintained in liturgical use, in practice if there remained any diocese that had not adopted the “Roman”, that is, the Curial-

⁹ The originals and their recent facsimile editions are as follows: *Breviarium Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum. Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Apud Paulum Manutium, Rome 1568. = Manlio SODI — Achille Maria TRIACCA: *Breviarium Romanum. Editio princeps (1568)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 1999. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 3); *Missale Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum. Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Apud heredes Bartholomæi Faletti, Ioannem Variscum et socios, Rome 1570. = Manlio SODI — Achille Maria TRIACCA: *Missale Romanum. Editio princeps (1570)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 1998. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 2); *Ceremoniale Episcoporum iussu Clementis VIII. Pont. Max. novissime reformatum. Omnibus Ecclesiis, præcipue autem Metropolitanis, Cathedralibus, & Collegiatis, perutile, ac necessarium*. Ex typographia linguarum externarum, Rome 1600. = Achille Maria TRIACCA — Manlio SODI: *Ceremoniale Episcoporum. Editio princeps. (1600)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2000. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 4); *Martyrologium Romanum Ad novam Kalendarii rationem, & Ecclesiastica historia veritatem restitutum. Gregorii XIII Pont. Maximi iussu editum*. Ex typographia Dominici Basæ, Rome 1584. = Manlio SODI — Roberto FUSCO: *Martyrologium Romanum. Editio princeps (1584)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2005. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 6); *Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII. Pont. Max. iussu restitutum atque editum*. Apud Iacobum Lunam, impensis Leonardi Parasoli et sociorum, Rome 1595. = Manlio SODI — Achille Maria TRIACCA: *Pontificale Romanum. Editio princeps (1595–1596)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 1997. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 1); *Rituale Romanum Pauli V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Ex typographia Reverendæ Cameræ Apostolicæ, Rome 1614. = Manlio SODI — Juan Javier Flores ARCAS: *Rituale Romanum. Editio princeps (1614)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2004. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 5); *Graduale de Tempore Iuxta ritum Sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ cum Cantu Pauli V. Pont. Max. iussu Reformato*. Ex Typographia Medicæa, Rome 1614. = Giacomo BAROFFIO — Manlio SODI: *Graduale de tempore iuxta ritum sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ. Editio princeps (1614)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2001. (Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica 10); *Graduale de Sanctis Iuxta ritum Sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ cum Cantu Pauli V. Pont. Max. iussu Reformato*. Ex Typographia Medicæa, Rome 1614. = Giacomo BAROFFIO — Eun Ju KIM: *Graduale de sanctis iuxta ritum sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ. Editio princeps (1614–1615)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City 2001. (Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica 11).

Franciscan rite, by the 17th century, it was considered somewhat anomalous. This Romanisation was only withstood by some of the religious orders, but even in these cases there were significant compromises. From this time on, at least on the level of written sources, the Roman liturgy appears uniform.

Until today liturgical historians have not placed due emphasis on the post-Carolingian variants in ritual. Particular traditions have been treated as some kind of curiosity and mostly from the point of view of local or national history. Thus for a long time there was no attempt to treat such variants systematically and the occasional inquiries did not reflect upon the very essence of the phenomenon. Studies typically focused on the most unusual ceremonies, and other than this, liturgical scholars only identified the calendar, especially with reference to the sanctoral cycle, as the bearer of regional character.

Due to this focus, it was musicologists that made the breakthrough and not liturgical historians, strictly speaking. However, from the very beginning the study of the Gregorian melodic repertory was inseparable from the study of the liturgical texts. After the Gradual (the sung items of the Mass), which is rather uniform in this regard, the attention of scholars turned to the textual choices of the Antiphonal (the sung items of the Divine Office). Soon it became obvious—to a great extent as a result of research into medieval Hungarian music—that the post-Carolingian ritual variants were actually more securely and more manifestly identifiable when based on the choice and order of items within the temporal cycle (previously it had been assumed to be uniform). Even if we do not have the complete European overview so far, through this realisation it became possible to identify clearly the individual ritual variants, and all of the previous conclusions drawn on the basis of the fine arts in the service of divine worship, melodic variants, palaeography, musical notation, liturgical texts, or rubrics have been solidified.

Since systematic research into the choice and order of items in the Antiphonal was stimulated by a Hungarian group of scholars, the analysis of the Hungarian tradition from this perspective has been accomplished, and this has set an example on an international level. The ecclesiastical structure of medieval Hungary was reasonably unified and had been centrally organised within a short period of time without any substantial institutional precedents. The regions, sub-regions, dioceses, cities, and individual churches were in constant contact with each other. This historical circumstance, coupled with the fact that a very large percentage of the Hungarian sources were destroyed and that, consequently, the scholars did not have to examine a great mass of fairly similar sources, made this process much easier. The main points of

study were the structure of the Divine Office, the repertory of the items both textual and musical, and their liturgical assignation.¹⁰

The following could be determined about the Hungarian Office-tradition and, through it, about the whole rite: it possesses some characteristics that are applicable to the entirety of the Hungarian tradition, but cannot be found in their totality in any other tradition. These characteristics have parallels all over Europe, but do not indicate any single direction. This proves that the Hungarian liturgy does not appear either in part or as a whole to be the adoption of any foreign tradition. Its structure features different strata of traditions whose relationship with each other is best described in a hierarchical arrangement.¹¹

The entire Hungarian tradition is sometimes called the Esztergom Use (*ritus Strigoniensis*), after the primatial see of the country. Its central and best documented variant is the actual Use of Esztergom, whose purest representatives are Esztergom itself, Buda, with insignificant changes Pozsony (Pressburg in German, today Bratislava in Slovakia), or—at times with mild variations—the central and northern regions of historical Hungary. To this partial tradition belong the less consistently formulated practice of the Szepesség (Zipserland, today in Slovakia) and the liturgical usage of the Pauline Order,¹² which was founded by a former canon of Esztergom (hence the codification of the Esztergom Use as the proper custom of the order). The final and standard form of the Pauline usage was most probably determined only by its last pre-Tridentine redaction in the 14th century.

The second archiepiscopal see of Hungary (in the Middle Ages there were only two) was Kalocsa (later Bács or Kalocsa-Bács), which wielded authority over the southern regions of the kingdom and had its own separate usage, but its surviving sources in comparison to Esztergom are very few. There are many more sources to rely on in

¹⁰ According to the principles of René-Jean HESBERT OSB: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii* I–VI. Casa Editrice Herder, Rome 1963–1979. (Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series Maior. Fontes 7–12)—and the more recent database <http://publish.uwo.ca/~cantus/>—the project was inaugurated by DOBSZAY László — PRÓSZÉKY Gábor: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europæ. A Preliminary Report*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 1988. and fulfilled by DOBSZAY László — KOVÁCS Andrea: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europæ V/A. Esztergom/Strigonium (Temporale)*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 2004. and DOBSZAY László — KOVÁCS Andrea: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europæ V/B. Esztergom/Strigonium (Sanctorale)*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 2006.

¹¹ This arrangement and the classification of the Office variants is best described by DOBSZAY László: *Corpus antiphonarum. Európai örökség és hazai alakítás* [European Heritage and Local Application]. Balassi Kiadó, Budapest 2003. 335sqq.

¹² Regarding the Pauline rite, see TÖRÖK József: *A magyar pálosrend liturgiájának forrásai, kialakulása és főbb sajátosságai (1225–1600)* [The sources of the Hungarian Pauline Order's liturgy]. Római Katolikus Hittudományi Akadémia, Budapest 1977.

the case of Zagreb (Zágráb in Hungarian), which was a simple episcopal see, and as such, was a suffragan of Kalocsa,¹³ even though eventually it surpassed Kalocsa in importance. Zagreb was only placed under the ecclesiastical authority of Kalocsa in 1180, and so the earliest deposits of its liturgy show distinct influences of Esztergom. In the 14th century the rite of Zagreb became uniform, and to such an extent, that in the 15th to 16th centuries it possessed more and better liturgical books than Esztergom itself. In the course of the 14th century Curial and, according to some, Dominican influences became prevalent, and so the identification of the different elements of Esztergom, Kalocsa, and possibly of the Papal Court or the Dominican Order poses a difficult problem. Kalocsa and Zagreb thus make up the second major ritual territory of medieval Hungary.

The third and last major ritual territory is comprised of Transylvania (Erdély in Hungarian, now a part of Romania) and the Eastern region whose centre was the city of Várad (later Nagyvárad, now Oradea in Romania). The liturgy of these parts is better documented than that of Kalocsa, but less well documented than that of Zagreb, and a detailed analysis has yet to be published. It is important for the chronology that the earliest Hungarian source of the Divine Office most likely represents this use on an archaic level;¹⁴ from this we may infer that the most important characteristics of the major Hungarian ritual traditions were already discernible at the beginning of the 12th century. Geographically the Barcaság (Burzenland), and thus the sources from Szeben (later Nagyszeben, Hermannstadt in German, now Sibiu)¹⁵ and Brassó (Kronstadt in German, now Braşov) belonged to Transylvania, but ecclesiastically this region was under the jurisdiction of Esztergom. Consequently, its liturgical situation was similar to that of the Szepesség.

In addition to the three major ritual territories, it must be mentioned that the more “self-conscious” dioceses and the more affluent city parishes (e.g. Kassa, Kaschau in

¹³ On the Kalocsa-Zagreb variants, see KOVÁCS Andrea — DOBSZAY László: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europae VI/A. Kalocsa-Zagreb (Temporale)*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 2008.

¹⁴ Graz, Universitätsbibliothek No. 211. (olim 40/90, 4^o); its facsimile edition is FALVY Zoltán — MEZEY László: *Codex Albensis. Ein Antiphonar aus dem 12. Jahrhundert*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1963. (Monumenta Hungariae Musica 1).

¹⁵ Karl REINERTH: *Missale Cibiniense. Der Meßritus der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Kirche im Mittelalter*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln—Wien 1972. (Siebenbürgisches Archiv. Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Dritte Folge 9). For the liturgy of the Saxons of Transylvania see Karl REINERTH: *Das Helmtauer Missale. Eine Brücke zum Lande der Herkunft der Siebenbürger Sachsen*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln—Graz 1963. (Siebenbürgisches Archiv. Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Dritte Folge 3); Adolf SCHULLER(US): *Geschichte des Gottesdienstes in der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Kirche*. Hermannstadt 1928. (Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde 41).

German, now Košice in Slovakia, or Kolozsvár, Klausenburg in German, now Cluj-Napoca in Romania) deliberately tried to individualise their liturgical practice.¹⁶ From the suffragan bishoprics under Esztergom, we possess somewhat peculiar liturgical books from Veszprém,¹⁷ Pécs,¹⁸ and Eger,¹⁹ while city parishes with individual liturgical practices were to be found especially in the urban regions of Upper-Hungary and Transylvania (often inhabited by Saxon settlers). Due particularly to the transitional or deliberately individualised ritual variants, the origin of some undoubtedly Hungarian, but in character rather mixed sources has not yet been determined with real certainty.

In historical terms the Use of Esztergom is fairly constant from the first sources until the era of the printing press. Its first mature document was a book, now lost, probably compiled before the end of the 11th century according to the pattern of the Romano-Germanic Pontifical.²⁰ At this time, however, the order of the Esztergom Office was not yet finished: its completion must be dated to the period between the

¹⁶ This is discussed by SZENDREI Janka: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* [The notated sources of the Hungarian Middle Ages]. Budapest 1981. (Műhelytanulmányok a magyar zenetörténehez 1) 16sq., 27sq.

¹⁷ Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ 317. *A 14th century Pontifical of Veszprém*.

¹⁸ *Missale secundum morem alme ecclesie Quinqueecclesiensis*. Venice 1499. (RMK III 52) — the abbreviation “RMK” refers to a catalogue of incunabula and early prints published abroad for a Hungarian purpose, i.e. SZABÓ Károly — HELLEBRANDT Árpád: *Régi magyar könyvtár III. Magyar szerzőktől külföldön 1480-tól 1711-ig megjelent nem magyar nyelvű nyomtatványoknak könyvészeti kézikönyve* [Old Hungarian library III. The bibliographical manual of books written by Hungarian authors not in Hungarian, and published abroad between 1480 and 1711]. A M. Tud. Akadémia Könyvkiadó Hivatala, Budapest 1896. A recent supplement is SZABÓ Károly — HELLEBRANDT Árpád: *Régi magyar könyvtár III-dik kötet. Magyar szerzőktől külföldön 1480-tól 1711-ig megjelent nem magyar nyelvű nyomtatványoknak könyvészeti kézikönyve. Pótlások, kiegészítések, javítások I* [Old Hungarian library III. The bibliographical manual of books written by Hungarian authors not in Hungarian, and published abroad between 1480 and 1711. Annexed, supplemented, and amended]. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1990.).

¹⁹ *Ordinarius secundum veram notulam sive rubricam alme ecclesie Agriensis de observatione divinatorum officiorum et horarum canonicarum*. Cracow 1509. (RMK III 157); *Ordinarius secundum veram notulam sive rubricam alme ecclesie Agriensis de observatione divinatorum officiorum et horarum canonicarum*. Venice 1514. (RMK III 197). An earlier transcription of it was published by KANDRA Kabos: *Ordinarius secundum veram notulam sive rubricam alme ecclesie Agriensis de observatione divinatorum officiorum et horarum canonicarum. A krakói unicum könyvpéldány után*. Az Egri Egyházmegyei Irodalmi Egyesület, Eger 1905. Its modern edition with footnotes and Hungarian-English translations is DOBSZAY László: *Liber Ordinarius Agriensis (1509)*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 2000. (Musicalia Danubiana Subsidia 1). See also below, in the next chapter. Based on a lost copy, we also know of a 1515 edition of the Breviary of Eger (RMK III 205, the reference is from 1845; at the time of the catalogue’s compilation no one was aware of this edition).

²⁰ As for the fragments of the Ordines of the liturgical year, see the unpublished edition in the appendix of the aforementioned PhD thesis, i.e. FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: *Fragmenta Pontificalis antiqui Strigoniensis collata ex integris rubricis sex principalium fontium saeculorum XI–XVI., earundem synopsi atque nonnullis testibus referentiisque*.

end of the 11th-century and the production of the 12th-century Antiphonal mentioned above, but its elaborated form was only achieved later. The characteristic points of the Mass rite in the Esztergom Use, principally the processional ceremonies of Candlemas and Ash Wednesday and the ceremonies of Holy Week, are already present in the 11th century Pontifical stratum. A peculiar Mass proper is less tangible. Some of the typical textual choices and some of the characteristics of the *Ordo Missae* are already present by the end of the 12th century,²¹ but we cannot speak of a mature and fixed Mass rite of Esztergom until the first half of the 14th century.

The turn of the 13th and 14th centuries is considered the classical period in the history of the Esztergom Use. In this period the liturgy of both the Divine Office and the Mass was fixed textually and melodically by representative codices (one in each category).²² Except for a few changes, the first, 15th-century printed editions are direct descendants of these books. The printed books of the 15th and 16th centuries introduced novelties more in terms of layout and design than with regard to actual content. Among these must be counted the six known editions of the Esztergom Ordinal.

In the first decades of the Turkish-Ottoman occupation of Hungary the printing of liturgical books came to an abrupt halt, and only during and after the Council of Trent were there a few attempts to update the Esztergom rite with the publication of one Breviary,²³ two Rituals,²⁴ and one Ordinal.²⁵ On account of the international situation and the grave shortage of books these attempts were bound to failure. At the proposal and instigation of the most famous figure of the Hungarian Catholic Resto-

²¹ The first extant source of the Esztergom Mass rites is: Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár MNy 1. *A 12th century Hungarian monastic Sacramentary*, usually referred to as the Codex Pray.

²² Prague, Strahovská Knihovna (Bibliotheca Monasterii Strahoviensis) DE. I. 7, its facsimile edition is SZENDREI Janka: *Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense saeculi XIII*. Budapest 1998. (Musicalia Danubiana 17); Bratislava, Archiv Mesta EC. Lad. 3. & EL. 18, its facsimile edition is SZENDREI Janka — Richard RIBARIČ: *Missale Notatum Strigoniense ante 1341 in Posonio*. Budapest 1982. (Musicalia Danubiana 1).

²³ *Breviarium secundum usum almae et Metropolitanae Ecclesiae Strigoniensis. In promotionem divini cultus et ministerii, denuo impensis Reverendissimi Domini Nicolai Olábi, eiusdem Ecclesiae Archiepiscopi impressum Per Raphaellem Hoffhalter*. Vienna 1558. (RMK III 447).

²⁴ *Ordo et ritus sanctae metropolitanae Ecclesiae Strigoniensis, quibus Parochi et alii animarum Pastores in Ecclesiis suis uti debent*. In aedibus Collegii Caesarii Societatis Iesu, Vienna 1560. (RMK III 474); *Agendarius. Liber continens ritus et caeremonias, quibus in administrandis sacramentis, benedictionibus, & aliis quibusdam ecclesiasticis functionibus, parochi, & alii curati, in Diocesi & provincia Strigoniensi utuntur ...* Nagyszombat/Trnava 1583. (RMK I 27 — RMNy 528) — the abbreviation “RMNy” refers to a catalogue of incunabula and early prints published in Hungary, i.e. *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok 1473–1600* [Early prints in Hungary]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1971.

²⁵ *Ordinarium officii divini secundum consuetudinem metropolitanae ecclesiae Strigoniensis, a mendis purgatum et editum, opera et expensis reverendissimi domini Nicolai Telegdini episcopi Quinqueecclesiensis, et in spiritualibus administratoris archiepiscopatus Strigoniensis*. Nagyszombat/Trnava 1580. (RMK II 160).

ration, Péter Cardinal Pázmány, the national synod of 1630–1633 approved the abandonment of the Esztergom Use and the adoption of the “Roman”, that is, the Curial-Franciscan variant.²⁶ From the earlier tradition only some of the feasts of Hungarian saints and a few peculiarities of the old calendar remained, but even these were given new propers. In the wider sphere of influence of the Esztergom Use, only the cathedral of Zagreb took up the option offered by the Holy See, and it held onto its medieval practice until 1788.²⁷

THE SURVIVING HUNGARIAN ORDINALS²⁸

There are four surviving Esztergom Ordinals, one manuscript copy and three printed editions. In addition to these four books, those sources are also worth mentioning that the catalogues classify as Ordinals, although they are not, as well as those Ordinals of Hungarian origin that do not belong to the rite of Esztergom. Subsequently, the Esztergom sources will be introduced, first according to their bibliographical data and then with regard to their typological features. In terms of typology I consider the following aspects characteristic: (1) the original title of the book, (2) the people who used it, (3) its age, (4) actual content, and (5) structure. In the end, I will treat of those Hungarian sources that do not belong to the rite of Esztergom.

²⁶ See e.g. KNAUZ Nándor: “A magyar egyház régi szokásai I. A római rítus behozatala” [The Old Customs of the Hungarian Church I. The Adoption of the Roman Rite], *Magyar Sion* III (1865) 401–413; FÜZES Ádám: *A trentói reformliturgia átvétele az esztergomi érseki tartomány területén Pázmány Péter érseksége alatt. A magyarországi rítusváltás történetének és hátterének bemutatása* [The Adoption of the Tridentine Liturgy by the archiepiscopal see of Esztergom during the time of Archbishop Péter Pázmány. A Study of the History and Background of the Ritual Change in Hungary]. PhD thesis, Budapest, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Hittudományi Kar 2003. — an important chapter of it was published as FÜZES Ádám: “Rítusváltás vagy liturgikus reform? Pázmány Péter liturgikus rendteremtése a XVII. században” [A Change of Rites or Liturgical Reform? The Liturgical Program of Peter Pázmány in the 17th Century], *Præconia* I (2006) 22–33.

²⁷ The research in this field is documented with a comprehensive bibliography by CSOMÓ Orsolya: *A zágrábi székesegyház XVII–XVIII. századi processzionáléi* [The Processionals of the Zagreb Cathedral from the 17th and 18th Centuries]. DLA thesis, Budapest, Liszt Ferenc Zeneművészeti Egyetem, Egyházzenei Doktoriskola 2001.

²⁸ Among the earlier literature on this subject, see DANKÓ József: “Magyar egyházi bibliographiai érdekességek. Az ordinariusok” [Bibliographical Curiosities of the Hungarian Church. The Ordinals], *Magyar Könyv-Szemle*. A M. Nemzeti Múzeum Könyvtára, Budapest 1888. 105–139; DOBSZAY: *Liber Ordinaris Agriensis* 5sq.; FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: “Ordináriuskönyvek Magyarországon” [Ordinals in Hungary], *Magyar Egyházzene* IX (2001/2002) 397–415.

The so-called Ordinal of Szepes

The first surviving and the only manuscript Ordinal is on the first 38 folios of a Codex of mixed content at the Budapest University Library, under the library mark: Cod. lat. 73.²⁹ Its first re-edition was published at the end of the 19th century, as an appendix to the edition of the Hungarian medieval hymns, and according to very low scientific standards.³⁰ Its newest edition has already been prepared and is waiting to be published, probably as one of the later volumes in this series.³¹

The original title of the text can be found in two places. The book begins with the words: *Incipit Rubrica Strigoniensis*, whereas in the colophon *Et sic finitur rubrica totius anni de dominicis et festiuitatibus* is written.

The book was written for the collegiate chapter of St Martin in the Szepesség (Zipserland) by Ioannes Gerhardi de Aranyas, a clerk of the Szepes region who was originally from Esztergom. On the margins there are a number of annotations that were written by different people (at least four, but no more than seven). Although the book certainly comes from the Szepesség, it is clear that it is an abbreviation of the normative rubrical texts of the Esztergom Archcathedral. Insofar as its liturgical content is concerned, it is a witness of the rite of Esztergom rite and not specifically that of the Szepesség.

The date of its completion, based on the indications within the Codex itself, is estimated for the period between 1462 and 1469.

Its content is primarily directorial, and it concerns especially the votive Office Hours and commemorations. On several occasions it gives a complete or almost complete list of items; on certain days we find a detailed ceremonial description, while on others there is nothing of the sort. On one particular day, an allegorical explanation is provided, but in general it is typical for it to approach problems from a theoretical perspective. It is restricted to the liturgy of the Mass and the Divine Office, thus there is no information here about paraliturgical events or common life. Two processional orations and the formula for receiving the ashes on Ash Wednesday are written out in full.

²⁹ Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtár Cod. lat. 73. 1^r–38^v. The best and most recent description of the whole manuscript is in MEZEY László: *Codices Latini mediæ ævi Bibliothecæ Universitatis Budapestinensis*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1961. 127–129.

³⁰ DANKÓ József: *Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariæ*. Franklin, Budapest 1893. 485–571 (*Ordinarius Scepusiensis sive ...*).

³¹ It can be consulted as one of the appendices of my aforementioned PhD thesis, see FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: *Rubrica Strigoniensis ante 1469. Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtár Cod. Lat. 73. 1^r–38^v « Ordinarius Scepusiensis »*. For its detailed analysis, see idem: *Rubrica Strigoniensis 136sqq; “A középkori Magyarország ordináriuskönyvei” 48sqq.*

Structurally, the book proves to be a loose collection of liturgical notes whose main thread is the yearly cycle within which the titles referring to individual days or seasons are even graphically highlighted. The rest consists of more or less independent notes introduced by the word *item* which are rarely organised into a logical series by the temporal sequence of the ceremonies described (it is typical that the day begins with Matins and not with first Vespers). The temporal and sanctoral cycles are introduced in a mixed system where the sanctoral cycle does not contain the description of every single day. Individual feasts are treated in a general way, within the larger context of the liturgical season; only a few sporadic comments can be connected to specific liturgical days. At the end of the book, just before the colophon, there are annotations which do not fit into the annual cycle of the liturgical year. In all likelihood these notes had already formed part of an appendix to an antecedent copy of the book at hand. In the surviving copy the same kind of appendix can be found on the reverse side of the page containing the colophon.

Chronologically the next and at the same time the first printed Ordinal is the Esztergom Ordinal which happens to be the subject of our present edition. Its detailed analysis will be the task of the subsequent chapters of this introduction.

The Ordinal of Eger

The diocese of Eger, the most important suffragan of the archdiocese of Esztergom, is the only one in Hungary besides Esztergom with a medieval Ordinal that survived the vicissitudes of history.³² This printed book is known in two, in terms of content substantially identical editions: the first was published in 1509, in Cracow, and at the expense of János Haller; the second one in 1514, in Venice, commissioned by Jakab Schaller, a bookseller from Buda. The first modern edition was published in 1905, and then another in 2000. This latter edition contains the translation of the original Latin text both in Hungarian and English; its detailed footnotes are very important for understanding the liturgy of medieval cathedrals in general, and the rite of Esztergom (as well as that of Eger) in particular.

In both medieval editions, the following title is printed on the title page: *Ordinarius secundum veram notulam sive rubricam almae ecclesiae Agriensis de observatione divinorum officiorum et horarum canonicarum*. In the first sentence of the book we find the following self-description: *Ordinarium de observatione horarum canonicarum*, and then in the colophon: *Ordinarius sive rubricella ad veram notulam almae Agriensis ecclesiae*.

³² As to its bibliographical data and different editions, see above, in the previous chapter of this introduction. In addition to the different editions, it is treated also *ibidem* 149sq., as well as 59sq.

There is no doubt that this source is a witness to the liturgical practice of the cathedral chapter of Eger. In its printed version it was obviously meant to be used by all the churches of the diocese but its editor did not take much care to adapt the information, clearly set to the circumstances of the cathedral, to the more modest capacities and capabilities of smaller churches and chapels.

The dates of publishing these printed books are beyond question but it is a lot more difficult to date the supposed manuscript antecedents. It is certain that the earliest dated decision of the chapter recorded in the text is from 1458. Considering the surviving parallels it can be safely presumed that the printed Ordinal relied on manuscript antecedents which, based on the flourishing of the genre all over Europe and the facts of Hungarian liturgical history, should be dated no later than the end of the 14th century. On these pages we can hardly say more than this about the question. The consistent and modern composition (more will be said about this later) seems to suggest that the Ordinal was carefully re-edited before printing.

The main thread and guideline of the content is provided by the list of items for each liturgical day but in a less detailed fashion than in the Esztergom Ordinal. In line with its age and genre, the book contains a great deal of directorial regulation (one of its particular characteristics is the terminology used for the hierarchy of feasts e.g. *colendum, tabulatum*). Its most attractive feature is that among all the extant Hungarian sources this Ordinal provides the most detailed description of ceremonies on extraordinary liturgical occasions. In this regard, this book is doubtless our most valuable known document. With almost unflinching consistency it treats the questions of liturgical colour and the various ranks, number, and vestments of the assistance. The Ordinal is not related to Customaries but it fits in organically with the circumstances of the chapter and the cathedral school. It is a proof of the book's interest in liturgical exegesis that it often refers to the *Rationale*, and in its explanations it often appeals to the analogical mentality manifested in that document's well-known tendency to allegoresis. The Ordinal contains all the versicles written out in full for the entire liturgical year, as well as all the blessings for the Matins of All Saints.

Its structure is quite rigorous. The description of each liturgical day of the year is begun with an indication of rank and the ceremonial details (mentioned above). Then follows the treatment of the Office Hours and Mass liturgy beginning with first Vespers, if there is one, otherwise usually from None. After the list of ceremonies, there are usually very few additional notes. The temporal and sanctoral cycles are treated separately, in-between the two, it inserts the list of versicles (this editorial solution might only be the result of the last redaction). At the end of the book, in a separate section we find the *officium parvum* of the Blessed Virgin including all its variations for the different periods of the liturgical year.

The Ordinal of Miklós Telegdi

The latest surviving copy of the Esztergom Ordinal was published in 1580, in Nagyszombat (today Trnava, Slovakia), at the expense of Miklós Telegdi, bishop of Pécs, and vicar general of the archdiocese of Esztergom, in the printing press under his jurisdiction.³³ At this time Esztergom (just like Pécs) was under Turkish-Ottoman occupation and the real “seat” of the cathedral chapter was in Nagyszombat. From the point of view of typography and orthography this Ordinal is plainly a modern book. It has not yet been published in a critical edition; for some reason scholars have not paid sufficient attention to it, except for József Dankó, who mentioned it and quoted from it in his edition of the so-called Ordinal of Szepes (mentioned above).

As opposed to the earlier, medieval-type Ordinals, this book does not have a colophon and the main text contains neither a title, nor a self-description. On the title page we find: *Ordinarium officii divini secundum consuetudinem metropolitanae ecclesiae Strigoniensis, a mendis purgatum et editum, opera et expensis reverendissimi domini Nicolai Telegdini episcopi Quinqueecclesiensis, et in spiritualibus administratoris archiepiscopatus Strigoniensis*. At the same place the following reference is made to the data mentioned above: *Tirnavia in aedibus eiusdem reverendissimi do. e. qq. [domini episcopi Quinqueecclesiensis] 1580*.

The text bears witness to the ceremonial life of the cathedral chapter transferred to Nagyszombat, as it was in the second half of the 16th century. In addition to the exterior of the book, it is proved by a number of linguistic features and certain aspects of the content. In this fascinating period the rite of Esztergom was still “in force” but the Council of Trent had already been closed, and the prominent leaders could very well have known the first official editions of the Roman Breviary and Missal. Consequently, the real task of the scholars is to separate from each other the “retrospective” layer of the Telegdi Ordinal, and the “progressive” layer under Tridentine influence. According to my—admittedly tangential—investigations the Tridentine influence prevailed mostly in editorial decisions and it did not tamper with the content.

It is very difficult to understand the book’s actual content without also considering its structure (this latter will be treated in the next paragraph). The Ordinal contains less incipits than the previous sources but at least it always tries to inform the reader of the list of items for the individual liturgical day by means of frequent allusions to various liturgical books. In the main text we barely ever encounter directorial themes, whereas additional elements (*officia parva*, commemorations) are very consistently treated. The *ordines* for the extraordinary days of the liturgical year are more often described, but less extensively than in other Ordinals of Esztergom or Eger. No other

³³ As to its bibliographical data see above, in the first chapter of this introduction. It is also treated *ibidem* 158sq., as well as 67sq.

ceremonial questions receive further treatment; there are very few ceremonial texts and no liturgical allegoresis. The book is obviously very closely tied to the cathedral but as regards the life of the chapter, only one of the appendices contains relevant instructions.

In the appendix-like chapters at the beginning and at the end of the book, we are almost fully compensated for everything that is omitted in the main text itself. The main feature of the book is that instead of a text of mixed content continuously following the course of the liturgical year, it provides us with a thematic arrangement of the material into several different chapters. The part before the main text is directorial in character. It begins with a Calendar, then the following tables are included: *Tabula litterarum dominicalium* — *Aureus numerus* — *Sequitur tabula perpetua ad inveniendum festa mobilia*. Immediately before the main text we find a chapter entitled *Rubrica generales* regarding the hierarchy of feasts, their occurrence and concurrence, and questions related to the different types of items (as in modern Breviaries). The stock material begins with the title *Ordinarium officii divini de tempore*. In the beginning, within the description of the first Sunday of Advent, we find the Mass and Office Ordinary (the order of invariable texts) for Sundays and week days. Then commences the temporal part strictly speaking. The sanctorale is included in a separate part and begins with the Vigil of the feast of St Andrew. In the context of such Hungarian liturgical books it is an innovation that the sanctorale is followed by a commune. Only after the commune we find the paragraphs treating the variable orders of the Marian Office Hours, which are then complemented with certain ceremonies in honour of St Adalbert, proper to Esztergom on the free Thursdays of the summer season. The Ordinal is concluded with the tables regulating the use of liturgical colours (*De diversitate colorum*) and determining the person of the celebrant for greater feasts (*Festa, in quibus summa missa a reverendissimo domino archiepiscopo celebratur*). The latter table is closed by a page entitled *Notandum* that specifies the appointment of further liturgical roles.

Further Ordinals and books referred to as Ordinals

We do not know of any other surviving Ordinals preserving Hungarian liturgical traditions.³⁴ Polikárp Radó's catalogue mentions a Franciscan Ordinal written at Esztergom—according to its colophon—by a certain Emericus de Strigonio in 1509 (*Explicit ordinarium per manus Emerici de Strigonio. Anno 1509em*).³⁵ This Ordinal was pre-

³⁴ As to the following, see *ibidem* 167sqq., as well as 76sqq.

³⁵ RADÓ Polikárp OSB: *Libri liturgici manuscripti bibliothecarum Hungariae et limitropharum regionum*. Budapest 1973. 492sq.

served in the Franciscan Monastery of Szeged as the manuscript marked Cod. Lat. 4., but during the Second World War it was either lost or destroyed.

The so-called Codex Lányi, which is an Ordinal produced in 1519 and written in Hungarian for the use of Norbertine nuns, is a particularly valuable source.³⁶ From among the three copiers of the text, only the last one, certain Ladislaus de Kalmancsey, recorded his own name. As an Ordinal belonging to a religious order it is not a representative of the Esztergom rite, but it is an excellent witness to the contemporary Hungarian liturgical terminology, and on several occasions it makes allusions to the customs of the Archdiocese of Esztergom. At present the manuscript is preserved in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and its last modern edition was published in the 19th century.³⁷ Since then more research has been done on this important linguistic monument,³⁸ and so it would be truly worthwhile to republish it according to the standards of modern liturgical philology, along with its reconstructed Latin text. An important supplement to the Codex Lányi can be found in the rubrical chapters of the Codex Apor, which were likewise written in Hungarian for the use of Norbertine sisters.³⁹

In addition to these books that are from Hungary but not of Hungarian rite, we are aware of the existence of the following normative liturgical texts. In the Budapest University Library there are two 15th century Carthusian Ordinals with basically the same content.⁴⁰ These sources contain the general regulations of the Carthusian Order, and have no relevance to the Hungarian liturgy, except for the fact originally they were in

³⁶ Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Kézirattára K 43. *An Ordinal of Hungarian Norbertine Nuns from 1519* usually called the Codex Lányi.

³⁷ VOLF György: "A Lányi codex", in *Nyelvemléktár. Régi magyar codexek és nyomtatványok*. [The Codex Lányi, in the series Monuments of the Hungarian language. Early Hungarian Codices and Prints.] Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Bizottsága, Budapest 1878. VII XLVI–XLIX (study), 317–387 (edition).

³⁸ Cf. RADÓ: *Libri liturgici* 493; SZABÓ Dénes: *Apor-kódex*. Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet, Kolozsvár/Cluj 1942. (Codices Hungarici 2) XVIIIIsq.; GÁBRIEL Asztrik OPræm: "Breviárium-típusú kódexek. Függelékül a Lányi-kódex latin szövege", in *Emlékkönyv Szent Norbert halálának 800 éves jubileumára (1134–1934). Fejezetek a magyar premontriek nyolcszázéves múltjából*. [Breviary-type Codices. In Appendix the Latin Text of the Codex Lányi: Anthology for the 800th Jubilee of the Death of St Norbert (1134–1934). Chapters from the 800-year History of the Hungarian Norbertines] A Jászó-Premontrei Kanonokrend Gödöllői Konventje, Gödöllő 1934. 136sqq.

³⁹ Sepsiszentgyörgy (now Sfântu Gheorghe in Romania), Székely Nemzeti Múzeum XVIII. Its facsimile edition with an introductory study: SZABÓ: *Apor-kódex*, its transcription in VOLF György: "Apor codex", in *Nyelvemléktár. Régi magyar codexek és nyomtatványok* [The Codex Apor, in the aforementioned series]. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Bizottsága, Budapest 1879. VIII 241–244. The quoted passage can be found on pages 189sqq. of the facsimile edition.

⁴⁰ Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtár Cod. lat. 101. and 103. *Carthusian Customaries from the 15th Century*.

the possession of the Charterhouse of Lehnice (today Lechnica, Slovakia). The National Széchényi Library has two monastic Customaries.⁴¹ The first—a Beneventan codex of the 11th or 12th century—was only brought to Hungary in the 19th century by an antique dealer, and thus it bears no significance for Hungarian liturgical history. The other book is a copy of the Customary of Monte Subiaco from the second half of the 14th century. We do not know its history, but it is a well-established fact that by the 16th century the sources of Monte Subiaco have already reached Gyórszentmárton (now Pannonhalma), the centre of Hungarian Benedictines.⁴² Finally, we must make mention of an 11th or 12th century fragment of the Budapest University Library, which is mistakenly registered as an Ordinal in the library catalogue.⁴³ This document has been identified as a fragment of the Romano-Germanic Pontifical.⁴⁴

Although the linguistic analysis of all the Hungarian Ordinals would far exceed the dimensions of this present edition, it must be emphasised that each of the Ordinals of proved Hungarian origin shows very similar and very characteristic features, especially insofar as the terminology is concerned. Syntactically, this terminology is different from the rubrical language of our archaic sources from the period before the 15th century. While the older sources are rather stylised books going back, directly or indirectly, to the Carolingian corrections of the Old Roman *ordines*, in the Ordinals we find the informal, sketchy, and quite technical terminology of the medieval normative texts. Its mistakes are certainly not owing to the weaker knowledge of Latin but rather due partly to the complex process of handing these texts down to subsequent generations, and partly because of the much wider incidence of Latin literacy (in earlier periods the intelligencia was less numerous but more highly qualified, whereas later Latin literacy became much more frequent but on a lower level).⁴⁵ The

⁴¹ Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ 329. *South Italian Monastic Customary from the 11th and 12th Centuries* and 102. *A Monastic Customary of Subiaco from the 14th Century*.

⁴² RÁTH György: *A Pannonhalmi Szent Benedek-Rend nyomtatott imakönyvei a Breviarium Monasticum bevezetése előtt* [The Printed Prayer Books of the Benedictines of Pannonhalma before the Adoption of the Breviarium Monasticum]. Pallas Részvénytársaság Nyomdája, Budapest 1894. 3–22.

⁴³ MEZEY László: *Fragmenta Latina codicum in Bibliotheca Universitatis Budapestinensis*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1983. (Fragmenta codicum in bibliothecis Hungariae I/1) 180.

⁴⁴ Its content is identical to the texts on pages 2–3 and 8 of Cyrille VOGEL — Reinhard ELZE: *Le pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle* II. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City 1963. (Studi e Testi 227).

⁴⁵ Regarding the clerical intelligencia of the Hungarian Middle Ages, see MÁLYUSZ Elemér: *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* [Clerical Society in Medieval Hungary]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1971; MEZEY László: *Deákiség és Európa. Irodalmi műveltségünk alapvetésének vázlatja* [Literacy and Europe. A Survey on the Bases of our Literary Culture]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1979.

possibility cannot be foreclosed that the influence of the old Roman *ordines* and early Pontificals in transmitting a “Merovingian”-style language was quite formative on the development of rubrical syntax. In any case, it can be stated with certainty that the Latin language of the Ordinals is a phenomenon set apart even within the medieval Latinity of Hungary, and its terminology is highly characteristic to the traditions of Esztergom.⁴⁶

THE EDITIONS OF THE ESZTERGOM ORDINAL

At present, we know of six different editions of the Esztergom Ordinal. Subsequently, I will provide a detailed description of each of these editions, supplementing the data available in standard catalogues with my own observations. Then I shall analyse the textual critical relationship between them and give a description of the Esztergom Ordinal from the five aspects listed in the beginning of the previous chapter of this introduction.⁴⁷

In the bibliographical description first we read the place and date of publication which is followed by the index number according to the RMK catalogue. Then come the title given on the title page in diplomatic transcription, the sheet and folio numbers of the volume together with the original sheet or page numbers; the text of the colophon in diplomatic transcription and the list of the provenances (the country is only referred to if the library is outside of Hungary at present). I do not refer to the cover, the possessors nor to the hand-written marginals of the single copies but their absences are registered where it is possible. If my own further observations did not fit into the above-mentioned categories, I place them after the description continuously in the following order: the layout of the title page and its illumination (where it applies), the title immediately before the text and the first initial, the type page and the number of lines per page, the division of the text into paragraphs, the rubrication, the headings, the spaces left for musical notation, the layout of the colophon.

[Nuremberg 1493–1496]

RMK III Supplements I 5031

Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum almam Strigoniensem ecclesiam

Eightfold, a₈–l₈ = 88 unnumbered folios

⁴⁶ A detailed exposition of the topic may be found in FÖLDEVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* Part III.

⁴⁷ The basis of the detailed description is RMK III and RMK III *Pótlások* [Supplements].

There is no colophon at all; according to the catalogue it was printed in the press of Georg Stuchs.

Olmütz/Olomouc (Czech Republic), Zemský archiv v Opavě, pobočka Olomouc BCO. 139.⁴⁸ (intact)

Its actual title page is empty. The title *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum almam Strigoniensem ecclesiam* is given right at the beginning of the main text. The R initial starting the actual text is missing, there is space left for it (perhaps it was to be done by hand later). Its type page is 130x84 mm. It has two columns on each page of 40 mm width with a spacing of 3–4 mm; there are 37 lines on each page. The division of the chapters generally corresponds to the liturgical days; all the chapters begin with a small indentation and boldface capital letters. Its sheets are signed with lower case letter (a–l), the first four pages of the sheets are signed with small Roman numerals attached to the letters (i–iiii), and then pages 5–8 of the sheets are unnumbered. The printing ends on the recto of folio l₈. The text is rubricated. There are no headings. Two lines are left empty for the texts to be notated. There is no colophon, instead the word *Finis* is written in the middle of the very last line.

It does not state origin and date, the above-mentioned data are taken from the catalogue. Its attribution to the press of Georg Stuchs is confirmed by my own palaeotypical research. In the text the use of that letter type M⁴⁹ (according to the repertory of Haebler)⁴⁹ is general but this cannot be found in Nuremberg, only in the printing presses of Caspar Hochfelder, Georg Stuchs and Anton Koberger. A common characteristic of the letter M⁴⁹ used by Hochfelder and Koberger is that it is used together at least with the versions of D, O and Q that are crossed twice, but these are missing both from Stuchs' set of letters and from the edition we are describing. Stuchs' involvement is confirmed also by the use of the letter N that is crossed twice. The activity of the Stuchs press in Nuremberg is documented between 1484 and 1500. As we shall see later, the sequence between the earlier copy dated to 1496 and the copy we are describing is not clear from the point of view of textual criticism. The exterior of the latter seems older and more rudimentary. We do not have any reliable information either about the typographer or the person or institution who commissioned the print-

⁴⁸ According to the catalogue, there were two copies in the medieval Library of the Olmütz Cathedral Chapter (today Olomouc, Czech Republic). The only surviving copy has been listed in the library's old catalogue from 1941. It proves that no recent loss or theft comes into question. The mistake was probably caused by an 1498 *Missale Strigoniense* (BCO. 137.) also preserved there. The microfilm copy of the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár FM₂/2807 which I used for the present edition was recorded in 1965 from the incunabulum marked Sign. Ink. 139. of the Státní Archiv Opava Pobočka Olomouc, the predecessor of the collection cited above.

⁴⁹ Konrad HAEBLER: *Typenrepertorium der Wiegendrucke* I. Verlag von Rudolf Haupt, Halle 1905.

ing, but between 1493 and 1497 Theobald Feger was the only bookseller in Buda, and this city was the primary place for retailing printed liturgical books. The 1496 edition was, in all likelihood, also commissioned by him.

Nuremberg 1496

RMK III 35⁵⁰

Ordinarius Strigoniensis Ecclesie

Eightfold, a–m₁₀ = 12^{2/8} sheet = 98 unnumbered folios

Anno christi MCCCXCVI. per opificem Georgium Stuchs de Sultzpach. Nurnbergis. Nonas Octobris finit feliciter. (Georg Stuchs, 9 October.)

Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Inc. 1026. (Sheet a and page b₁ is missing.)

Sárospatak, Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Nagykönyvtára SS. 157.

(The title page is missing.)⁵¹

The title pages of the surviving copies are missing, and so we have no further information. The title immediately before the text is *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum ritum et consuetudinem alme Strigoniensis Ecclesie Incipit feliciter*. As in the first edition, the R initial starting the actual text is missing. Its type page is 133x84 mm, with 32 lines on each page. Paragraph indentation is used very rarely, only after lines approximately fulfilling the width of the type page, or after empty spaces left for musical notation. Its sheets are signed with lower case letters (a–m), the first pages of the sheets are signed with small Roman numerals (i–iiiij) attached to the letters (but there is no number on the first page, while on sheets l and m even the fifth page is numbered), then the rest of the pages on the sheets are unnumbered. The printing stops on the recto of folio m₁₀. The numbering is at the bottom of the recto pages, on the right, in the following line after the last line of the text, with a 12 mm indentation from the

⁵⁰ Cf. SAJÓ Géza — SOLTÉSZ Erzsébet: *Catalogus incunabulorum quae in bibliothecis publicis Hungariae asservantur* I–II. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1970. 741 (No. 2473).

⁵¹ For its detailed description see HARSÁNYI István: “A Sárospataki Ref. Főiskolai Könyvtár ősnymtatványai” [The incunabula of the Sárospatak Calvinist College Library], in *A Sárospataki Ref. Főiskola Évkönyve* I. Sárospatak 1922. 103–104. It was taken to Nizhny Novgorod (library mark there: 0696., for further information, see: E. ZHURAVLEVA — N. ZUBKOV — E. KORKMAZOWA: *Displaced Books from Sárospatak Calvinist College Library [Hungary] in the Collections of Nizhny Novgorod Regional Research Library Catalogue*. Rudomino, Moscow 1997. — [104?] f.; 8^o. HC.4511. IH.2473[4^o]. (SS.157 = 14923.1) as part of the “spoils of war” of the Soviet Red Army. The book has been returned to Sárospatak in 2006. — According to the catalogue, there were two other copies, one in Esztergom, perhaps in the Library of the Archcathedral, and one in the private Library of József Dankó in Pozsony (now Bratislava, Slovakia), but today they are both unknown.

edge of the type page. Sheet m has two additional pages; it also has pages 9 and 10. The edition is rubricated and it has no headings. Two lines are left empty for the texts to be notated which are approximately half as wide as the type page, with no staffs provided. The colophon is typeset in black, printed continuously after the last paragraph.

Although the colophon does not mention it, the printing was in all likelihood commissioned by the above-mentioned Theobald Feger, just as in the case of the other Nuremberg edition.

Venice 1505

RMK III 134, RMK III Supplements V Appendix 20

Ordinarius Strigoniensis

Eightfold, A–S = 148 folios

Ordinarius Strigoniensis. accuratissime revisus feliciter explicit: Venetiis per Lucamantonium de giunta florentinum: Impensis Johannis pap: librarij budensis impressus. Anno ab incarnatione dominica M.CCCCV. pridie kalendas augusti. Underneath it, the insignia of the typographer with lilies upside down. (Lucantonio de Giunta, János Pap, 31 July) — There are two different types of the colophon: one has *reusus* instead of *revisus*, *Liucamantonium* for *Lucamantonium*, but the lilies of the emblem are in the right arrangement.

Budapest, Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár, Budapest Gyűjtemény B0941/103. (Sheet A, pages B₁, B₈ and the last cover page are missing.)

CsíkSZereda/Miercurea-Ciuc (Romania), Csíki Székely Múzeum/Muzeul Secuiesc al Ciucului 403. (Pages A₁, I_{1–5}, K₄, K₅ are missing.)⁵²

Esztergom, Esztergomi Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár Inc. XVI. II. 129. (The title page and pages C₈, E₇ are missing, pages N₈–P₁ are severely damaged.)

Sárospatak, Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Nagykönyvtára OO. 2., olim SS. 161. (The title page, the first three and the last four pages are severely damaged.)⁵³

The title page is missing from all of the four existing copies, thus the title and its possible illustrations are not known. The title immediately before the text is *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum ritum et consuetudinem alme Strigoniensis Ecclesie Incipit feliciter*. The be-

⁵² From the Franciscan Monastery of Csíksomlyó. For its detailed description see MUCKENHAUPT Erzsébet: „A Csíki Székely Múzeum Régi Magyar Könyvtára I. Az ősnymtatványok és a 16. századi nyomtatványok katalógusa” [The Old Hungarian Library of the Székely Museum of Csík I. The catalogue of incunabula and 16th century prints], in *A Csíki Székely Múzeum Évkönyve* 2007–2008. 224 (No. 6).

⁵³ According to the catalogue, there was another copy in the private library of Elemér Varjú with one folio missing but today it is unknown.

ginning R initial is an ornate engraving with the image of a young man. Its type page is 129x82 mm with 27 lines on each page. Paragraph indentation is used rarely, only after lines approximately fulfilling the width of the type page, or after empty spaces left for musical notation. Its sheets are signed with capital letters (A–S), the first pages of the sheets are signed with small Roman numerals (i–iiij, in sheet S even the fifth page is numbered) attached to the letters, then the rest of the pages in the sheets are unnumbered. The numbering is at the bottom of the recto pages, on the right, in the following line after the last line of the text, with a 8 mm indentation from the edge of the type page. Sheet S has one additional page. The edition is rubricated and it has no headings. Two lines are left empty for the texts to be notated with various width and no staves provided. The text of the colophon—arranged in a triangle turned on one of its vertices—is printed in red, and it begins after one empty line with a black paragraph mark. The edition is rubricated and has no headings.

Venice 1509

RMK III 165

Ordinarius Strigoniensis

Eightfold, A–P₇ = 14^{7/8} sheets = 110 unnumbered and 1 empty folio

Ordinarius Strigoniensis accuratissime revisus feliciter explicit. Venetiis per Lucamantonium de givunta florentinum. Impensis Johannis pap. librarij budensis impressus. Anno domini MCCCCC. IX. quinto nonas Martij. (Lucantonio de Giunta, János Pap, 5 March)

Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Kézirattár és Régi Könyvek Gyűjteménye MTAK RM. III. 63. (The last page is missing.)

Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár RMK. III. 165. (Two copies, both intact)⁵⁴

Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca (Romania), Kolozsvári “Lucian Blaga” Központi Egyetemi Könyvtár, Különgyűjtemények Osztálya, Régi Magyar Könyvtár gyűjteménye/Biblioteca Centrală Universitară “Lucian Blaga”, Departamentul Colecții Speciale, fondul Biblioteca Veche Maghiară BMV. 72. (intact)

Sárospatak, Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Nagykönyvtára SS. 244/a. (The first and last pages are damaged.)⁵⁵

⁵⁴ One of them—bound together with a copy of the 1508 edition of the *Obsequiale Strigoniense*—was originally in the library of the count Festetich family (now Keszthely, Keszthelyi Helikon Múzeum Könyvtára) but after the Second World War this was moved to the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár. The other belonged to the collection of the Hungarian National Museum, predecessor of the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár.

⁵⁵ The book is bound together with a copy of the 1508 edition of the *Obsequiale Strigoniense*. Like the Ordinal from 1496 in Sárospatak, this print was also returned from Russia in 2006. — According to the catalogue, there were other two copies, an incomplete one in the Budapest University Library

On the title page the text is printed in red, underneath it there is an engraving used by the bookseller János Pap with the figure of a bishop and the title *S. ADALBERTVS* in the gloriole. Underneath the engraving, the monogram *IP* is printed with a cross, on the side: *Johannis Pap — Librarij Budensis*. The title before the text is *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum ritum et consuetudinem alme Strigoniensis Ecclesie Incipit feliciter*. The beginning *R* is identical to the initial of the 1505 edition. Its type page is 128x80 mm without the heading, on each page there are 30 lines and a heading. On sheets A–D the headings are printed right above the top line, with spacing that corresponds to one normal line, and from sheet E onward with a small space. Paragraph breaks are rather frequent, but only after lines that are at least two thirds the width of the type page. Paragraph marks (¶) occur all throughout, always printed in black and at the beginning of each line. The sheets are marked with capital letters (A–P), the first pages of the sheets are marked with small Roman numerals (i–iii), and then from 5 to 8 they are unnumbered. The last sheet is complete, without additions, but the last page is empty. The book is rubricated. On the left side of the headings (on the odd pages as well) right at the edge of the type page or with no more than an indentation of 2 mm, the name of the month in the genitive case is printed in black, and then the title of the paragraph or the liturgical day is printed in red. Two lines are left empty for the texts to be notated with no staffs provided, similarly to the 1496 edition. After the colophon there is a red engraving with lilies and the monogram *LA* (Lucantonius Giunta) inside it. The text of the colophon—arranged in a triangle turned on one of its vertices—is printed in red, and it begins after two empty lines with a black paragraph mark.

Lyon 1510

RMK III 166

Ordinarius Strigoniensis

Eightfold, A–R = 16^{7/8} sheets = 135 unnumbered and 1 empty folio

Ordinarius Strigoniensis accuratissime revisus feliciter explicit. Impressus Lugduni expensis Matthie milcher librarij Budensis. Et expensis Urbani kaym librarij Budensis Anno domini M.CCC.CC.X. Aprilis. ix. (Mátyás Milcher — Orbán Kaym, 9 April)

Kalocsa, Kalocsai Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár D. 3824. (intact)⁵⁶

Németújvár/Güssing (Austria), Klosterbibliothek der Franziskaner 2/13. (intact)

(Egyetemi Könyvtár) and another in the Franciscan Monastery of Csíksomlyó with the pages A₁, M₄₋₅ and P₈ missing, both unknown today.

⁵⁶ Cf. BALLAGI Aladár: *Buda és Pest a világirodalomban* [Buda and Pest in the world literature]. I. 1473–1711. Budapest 1925. 98 (no. 129).

On the title page there is an ornate, renaissance style engraving: the Blessed Virgin in a cloak, with the Christ-child in her arms, to her right there is a flower, above her head two angels holding a crown. The title preceding the text is identical to that of the previous three editions: *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum ritum et consuetudinem alme Strigoniensis Ecclesie Incipit feliciter*. (The spacing and the font type are the same as in the 1509 edition.) The beginning R initial is decorated rather simply with large floral motifs. Its type page is 135x85 mm, there are 27 lines on each page. In the beginning of the lines often there are paragraph marks, and the paragraphs are systematically separated. There is no page numbering. The sheets are marked with capital letters (A–R), even the last sheet is complete, but its last page is left empty. The book is rubricated. The use and content of headings is identical to that of the 1509 edition. Two lines are left empty for the texts to be notated with the usual width of half the type page. After the main text the colophon is begun with a paragraph mark after the space of an empty line. The text of the colophon is arranged in a triangle turned on one of its vertices but it is not followed by the insignia of the typographer.

The colophon does not mention the typographer, but the appendix of the RMK makes a tentative allusion to the workshop of Antoine Lambillon.

Venice 1520

RMK III 238

Ordinarium Strigoniense

Eightfold, A–R = 136 numbered folios

Ordinarium Strigoniense accuratissime revisum. Impressum Venetiis per dominum Lucamantonium de Giunta florentinum Expensis heredum. quondam Urbani kaym librarij Budensis Feliciter explicit. Anno domini M.CCCC.XX. Junij. xxvij. (Lucantonio de Giunta, the heirs of the late Orbán Kaym, 27 June)

Budapest, Magyar Ferences Könyvtár és Levéltár 01000666., olim M. 40. B., 312. (intact)

Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Kézirattár és Régi Könyvek Gyűjteménye MTAK Ráth 1078. (intact)

Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár RMK. III. 238. (intact)

Eger, Főegyházmezei Könyvtár U. XIII. 43. (intact)

Győr, Győri Egyházmegyei Kincstár és Könyvtár RMK. II. 24. (intact)

Sárospatak, Sárospataki Református Kollégium Tudományos Gyűjteményei Nagykönyvtára OO. 3/a., olim SS. 162/a. (intact)⁵⁷

⁵⁷ This book (also returned from Russia in 2006) is bound together with a copy of the edition of the *Obsequiale seu baptismale Strigoniense*. The 1508 date of an *Ordinarium Strigoniense* in the aforementioned

There is a woodcut on the title page: on the left a man kneeling, in the middle the Blessed Virgin with the Christ-child on her lap, on the right St John the Baptist holding a ribbon in his hands, with *Ecce A* written on it. On the verso of the title page, there is a humanistic poem that consists of four distichs in honour of Tamás Cardinal Bakócz, Archbishop of Esztergom:

Virginei fecunda parens sine labe pudoris.
 Que baiulas summum maxima nympa iovem.
 Et prebes cupido niveos aurire liquores.
 Et retines molli femina casta sinu.
 Illi funde preces renovet virtutibus orbem.
 Adiuvet hinc thomam cardineumque decus.
 Distat iter celi: celum tentabimus ire.
 Si flectas superos in tua vota deos.

The title immediately before the text is *Ordinarium seu ordo divinus secundum ritum et consuetudinem alme Strigoniensis Ecclesie Incipit feliciter*. The beginning initial is somewhat larger, within the letter R there is a man with a beard and a halo, holding a book in his right hand. Its type page is 141x85 mm, without the headings and the sheet numbers each page has 30 lines. The font size is rather large. Here the paragraph marks appear also within the line, but the paragraphs are barely ever separated. In the top right corner of the odd pages, either without indentation or with an indentation of approximately 8 mm (this is not consistent, in the beginning there is no indentation but later it becomes rather frequent) we find page numbering with Arabic numerals (the title page is unnumbered, then follow pages 2–135). The numbering of the sheets is usually in the bottom right corner in the line right after the last line of the page, with an indentation of 10 mm: capital letters from A to R, then the beginning of individual sheets is numbered with small Roman numerals (iii), but pages 5–8 are unnumbered. The book is rubricated. The headings are approximately at a distance of half a line from the edge of the type page, and arranged the same way as can be seen in the 1509 edition, that is, to the left there is the name of the month in the genitive case, printed in black, without indentation, and the name of the day in the middle, printed in red. To this is added the page numbering on odd pages. This is missing on even pages, but even here the name of the month is printed on the left side, therefore, the arrangement of the even pages does not exactly mirror that of the odd pages. For the first time on page Ciii^v there is an empty space of two lines left for musical notation indicated by two intermittent lines, later the same is red and amounts to the space of

Russian catalogue (ZHURAVLEVA — ZUBKOV — KORKMAZOWA: *Displaced Books* 155 [No. 0695a]) may belong to the *Obsequiale*, thus it is unlikely that they are dealing with an unknown edition.

four lines. At one particular place (Ov^r) there is a space of three lines left for notation. On the verso of the last page we find the colophon known from the Venetian editions: the text is arranged into a triangle turned on one of its vertices, with a paragraph mark in the beginning. After a space of three lines, this is followed by: *Registrum. ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQR Omnia sunt quaterna*, printed in black. Then, after a space of one line, comes the known insignia of the Giunta Press with the customary lilies.

The relationship between different editions

The extant editions of the Esztergom Ordinal are substantially identical to each other. The text itself only evinces deliberate changes in two editions: in the first, undated edition the incipits of the liturgical items are typically longer and often the abbreviation “etc.” is attached to them; the last edition of 1520, on the other hand, made numerous emendations to the actual content, erased some of the sentences or parts of sentences, and at times inserted entire paragraphs. The differences between the four intermediary editions are either haphazard mistakes or occasional one word corrections.

In order to determine the exact relationship between different editions the careful comparison of the textual variants had to be undertaken.⁵⁸ The result of this detailed study may be consulted in the critical apparatus of the present publication. In what follows, I shall provide a short summary of the conclusions thus reached.

The textual tradition can be divided into two principal branches. To the first group belong the two Nuremberg editions, to the other the Venetian-Lyonnese editions. It must be pointed out that the genealogical relationship between the Nuremberg or Venetian-Lyonnese editions is not identical.

The relationship between the Nuremberg editions is most likely indirect. Based primarily on its more archaic, more manuscript-like layout, the undated Nuremberg edition appears to be the earlier one. This earlier copy, however, could not be the antecedent model for the 1496 Nuremberg edition because the latter does not follow the above-mentioned longer incipits and “etc.” insertions at all. The second Nuremberg edition actually stands much closer to the Venetian branch, for instance, insofar as its editorial solutions are concerned (e.g. spelling, use of rubrics, spaces left for notation), yet in terms of the text itself it mostly follows the first Nuremberg edition. Since these two editions were prepared in the same workshop and only a few years apart, the problem may be solved along the lines of the following proposition.

⁵⁸ For a detailed textual critical analysis, see FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: *Az Esztergomi ordináriuskönyv*. [The Ordinal of Esztergom], (thesis, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Latin Nyelvi és Irodalmi Tanszék, Budapest 2002, SD 17376) XXIXsq. However, this analysis was only based on the failures of the 1509 edition and misled in some aspects.

The Stuchs Press in Nuremberg used the same manuscript in preparing both of the printed editions hence the mistakes of the original antetype show up in both (as well as in the entire textual tradition). In terms of its outward features the manuscript copy must have been quite similar to the first printed edition, that is, it was probably a larger book written in gothic letters with the text arranged in two columns. As most of the Ordinals in general, this manuscript must have contained also additional notes written in a cursive style which was much harder to read, and which the commissioner had wanted to see typeset in the same style as the rest of the book. The textual errors must have derived either from the typesetting of these cursive sections or they must be attributed to the now inaccessible pre-history of the manuscript copy.

In comparison with the manuscript antecedent, the additions of the first, undated copy are the longer incipits and the “etc.” insertions. In both cases these additions may be justified by typographical and aesthetic reasons: if the text is typeset in two columns, the lines must be filled out more frequently, and in case of such texts the artificial elongation of the lines can only be achieved by the insertion of longer incipits or “etc.” abbreviations.

The 1496-edition does not contain either of these, which would simply be impossible if the prototype copy had been the first, undated edition. Moreover, the second edition did not keep the layout of the first printed copy, nor did it follow some of its archaic spellings (e.g. *hebdomoda*, *obmittere*, the abbreviation: *ih̄s*). Wherever it was deemed necessary, the second edition restored the proper sequence of the liturgical items listed, and also made a few linguistic corrections (e.g. it makes the grammatical gender agree with the incipits: *Offerentur maius/minus* for *maior/minor*). It is very likely that after the publication of the first, undated edition the prototype manuscript underwent some corrections whose traces we can discover in the textual differences of the 1496 edition.

The Venetian-Lyonnese editions indubitably form part of a straight line of descendancy. The 1520-edition is directly related to the 1510-edition, the 1510-edition to the 1509-edition, and the 1509-edition to that of 1505. From the mistakes passed down in this direct „genealogical” line, it seems obvious that each edition was produced based on the edition immediately preceding it. The textual quality of these various editions is essentially the same, therefore, it is not possible to indicate either any significant corruption or any real revision (although specifically mentioned in the colophons). Development can only be detected in the typography: the highlighted initial letters, the engraving on the title page, headings, page numbering, and the staffs included for notation gradually appeared.

The immediate antecedent of the 1505-edition cannot be identified with any real certainty. It cannot be doubted that it still contains some of the characteristics of the 1496-edition but at the same time it has all the typical variants that differentiate the

Venetian-Lyonnese line from the Nuremberg editions. We may suppose the influence of the revised manuscript version prepared before the second Nuremberg edition, or even the existence of some other kind of contamination, since we cannot rule out the editorial use of other manuscript or printed sources. Consequently, based on the scant data available to us, it would not be responsible to form a definite judgment on the matter, so I shall also refrain from including a genealogical stem here.

It is a proper feature of the 1510-edition that, in comparison with other editions, it contains a large number of mistakes at whose origin is nothing but inadvertence (e.g. typographical errors, skipping several words). Although due to the lack of reliable historical documentation it is impossible to reconstruct the process, it is highly probable that this edition—coming only a year after the previous one—was prepared in haste and without proper care. Almost without exception these mistakes are inherited by the otherwise revised edition of 1520.

The text of the 1520-edition is characterised by two contradictory attributes. It has to be considered an improvement that, contrary to the earlier versions, it introduced deliberate changes in terms of liturgical content. In an introduction of philological nature such as this one, there is no opportunity to analyse the subject matter in any detail, but it would be truly worthwhile to study the question whether behind most of the modifications we may suppose a reasoned programme of liturgical revision (e.g. the inclusion of missing processions, the readjustment of the system of commemorations, the abandonment of duplicate homilies, the reform of the calendar, etc.).

Some linguistic and stylistic corrections are also noticeable. In contrast, it is a real disappointment that the linguistic quality of the textual insertions proper to this edition is quite catastrophic. In all likelihood, this phenomenon should be attributed to the fact that the inserted texts were originally cursive, marginal notes in a copy of the 1510-edition, and these could not be properly and correctly deciphered by the typographer who was not competent either in Latin Grammar or in liturgical questions. These kinds of marginal notes may be found in all of the extant editions of the Esztergom Ordinal. The modifications introduced do not feature in all of the different sections of the book in equal proportion. We often encounter a certain inconsistency in their application, insofar as the modifications are not always inserted into their proper place and the contrary instructions are not consistently erased or adapted.

Typological features of the Esztergom Ordinal

We have described the various editions of the Esztergom Ordinal and their relationship in a detailed fashion. Up to now it has not seen a modern critical edition. The following summary can be made of some of its other characteristics.⁵⁹

The titles of its different versions differ somewhat but each of them uses the words *ordinarius* or *ordinarium*. The book is called *ordinarius seu ordo divinus* in the main title immediately preceding the text, the text itself, however, begins with the words *rubrica seu consuetudo* (the word *rubrica*, as a designation for Ordinals, is a particular Hungarian term).

From the actual content it is evident that the book pertains to the usage of the Esztergom Archcathedral. The *terminus ante quem* of the manuscript archetype is the earliest possible date for the publication of the first undated edition, that is, 1493. Further data in relation to provenience and chronology will be discussed in the next chapter. Its small size, simple layout, and the large number of its various editions all seem to suggest that relatively many people were in position to purchase a copy; consequently it served a practical and not a representative purpose.

The greatest part of its content is made up of lists of liturgical items that are complemented primarily with directorial regulations. It is rather poor as regards ceremonial descriptions, except for the *ordines* of the extraordinary occasions of the liturgical year: it treats the ceremonies of the Sacred Triduum and the Vigil of Whitsun in average detail. It is characteristic that no mention is made of the processions of Candlemas and Palm Sunday. This fact is so outstandingly unusual that it seems rather certain: it was left out of the printed version on purpose. The extraordinary details of Ash Wednesday, Corpus Christi, and All Souls Day are not omitted but are rather scanty. It is a special feature of the book that the celebration of Holy Orders is given on the Ember Saturday within the Octave of Whitsun. The Matins, procession, and Vespers of Easter Sunday receive a very detailed treatment. It does not contain any liturgical exegesis, appendices, or quotations written out *in extenso* (with the exception of some invitatories, the formula of receiving the ashes, the ending of the Office readings of Holy Saturday, two versicles and some short mnemonic-type poems in the Calendar). It describes exclusively the yearly cycle of the Office and Mass liturgy, therefore it contains no paraliturgical texts or data in reference to the daily life of the cathedral chapter. As it has become clear from the palaeotypical descriptions, the Ordinal often leaves empty spaces for the musical notation of certain chants and intonations.

⁵⁹ Cf. FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 125sqq., idem: "A középkori Magyarország ordináriuskönyvei" 37sqq.

The most important feature of the Ordinal's structure is that—in a manner rather unusual and archaic by that time—it unites the sanctoral and the temporal cycles, and in such a system that is unique among the known Hungarian liturgical books.⁶⁰ Beginning with the Vigil of St Andrew the Apostle, it describes each and every liturgical day of the year. The treatment of Sundays and solemn feast days begins with first Vespers, and the Mass is always described after the complete cycle of minor Hours, that is, following Nones (even on those days when the Mass was actually to be celebrated after Terce or Sext. With very few exceptions, the list of items proceeds in the sequence of celebration. After the series of individual Office Hours follow—introduced by *item*, *nota*, *notandum* or similar formulas—the additional notes.

PREHISTORY OF THE ORDINARIUS STRIGONIENSIS

In evaluating an incunabulum or early printed material, the question naturally arises whether the actual text is a faithful copy of an earlier manuscript or a new, separate compilation. If the immediate manuscript antecedents are lost (and in Hungary this is more or less the case), this question may only be decided on the basis of the printed material itself. In such situations, the inquiry has to rely principally on the book's own introduction or colophon, which at times contains relevant information regarding the printing process, or on the datable characteristics of content, structure, and language in relation to other similar sources.

The Esztergom Ordinal does not contain an introduction or colophon which may offer information about the circumstances of its composition and edition in print. Only the later editions prepared in Venice and Lyons have an explicit colophon, yet even in this case it only applies to the prior editions of Nuremberg. However, some other printed liturgical books also intended for use in Hungary do provide the reader with more details about their preparation, and there is no reason to suppose that the information thus given cannot be extended also to other books of similar age and type, for example, to the Ordinals.⁶¹ The essence of the data one may so gather can be summarised as follows. The printing was undertaken at the behest of some high secular or ecclesiastical dignitary (*e.g.* King Matthias or Osvát Thuz, bishop of Zagreb). The exemplar of the first editions was one single manuscript, which was the most reliable and representative book of the given rite. Before printing, the exemplar

⁶⁰ More will be said about this later, in the next chapter of this introduction.

⁶¹ *E.g.* *Breviarium Strigoniense*. S. l. 1484. (RMK III 9) — in fact Nuremberg = Venice 1480. (RMK III 1); *Missale secundum Chorum et Rubricam Almi episcopatus Zagrabiensis Ecclesie roboratum et approbatum in sacra synodo et generali capitulo ...* Venice 1511.

was examined; corrected and brought up to date. It is now impossible to determine whether the end result was the insertion of handwritten corrections within the original document, or the production of a new, improved manuscript. It is certain, however, that before the establishment of the printing press in Hungary, the commissioner had no way of controlling the printing process, and so it was in his best interest to provide the bookseller in direct contact with the press with a clean-cut exemplar. It is not feasible that the printing press engaged in any creative philological or redactional work.⁶²

Hence if we suppose that the Esztergom Ordinal was printed on the basis of a central commission and one representative exemplar amended by numerous modifications, our task is to identify and, insofar as possible, accurately date the material taken from the original manuscript version, as well as the stratum belonging to the last modifications. The problem is further complicated by the existence of several layers in the original manuscript material itself, both synchronically and diachronically. The existence of synchronic strata I infer from the fact that the medieval inventories of certain Western European churches indicate a number of Ordinals,⁶³ and that on one occasion even the editor of the Esztergom Ordinal mentions several Ordinals among his sources;⁶⁴ i.e. it is not at all sure that the manuscript exemplar followed one single source. As to the diachronic strata, their existence may be deduced from the references in the introduction of many Ordinals to a whole range of pre-existent literature.⁶⁵ I have personally discovered several consecutive versions of the

⁶² On the history of the early Hungarian printing press and booksellers, see e.g. Ferdinand GELDERNER: *Die deutschen Inkunabeldrucker* I. Anton Hiersemann, Stuttgart 1968; FITZ: *A magyar nyomdászat és könyvkereskedelem története* I [The History of Hungarian Printing, Publishing, and Bookselling]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1959; GULYÁS Pál: *A könyvnyomtatás Magyarországon a XV. és XVI. században* [The Printing Press in Hungary in the 15th and 16th Centuries]. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1931; HAEBLER: *Typenrepertorium der Wiegendrucke*; KÓKAY György: *A könyvkereskedelem Magyarországon* [Book Trade in Hungary]. Balassi Kiadó, Budapest 1997. NOVÁK László: *A nyomdászat története* [The History of the Printing Press]. Budapest 1927. (Grafikai Művészetek Könyvtára); SOLTÉSZ Zoltánné: *A magyar könyvnyomtatás képekönnyve 1473–1973* [An Illustrated Manual of the Hungarian Printing Press 1473–1973]. A Magyar Iparművészeti Főiskola Typo-grafikai tanszéke, Budapest 1973.

⁶³ See e.g. Georges DURAND: *Ordinaire de l'église Notre-Dame Cathédrale d'Amiens par Raoul de Rouvroy (1291)*. Société des Antiquaires de Picardie, Amiens—Paris 1934. (Mémoires des Antiquaires de Picardie 22) LXVIII–LXXII.

⁶⁴ “Quidam suffragium de Resurrectione hic perficiunt, sed, ut diligentius percepi, et in antiquis ordinariis adudum approbatis repperi, quod tantum debet perfici feria secunda Rogationum in secundis vespis.” Cf. with the present edition 92 (in reference to the Wednesday of the sixth week of Eastertide).

⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. Robert AMIET — Lin COLLIARD: *L'Ordinaire de la Cathédrale d'Aoste (Bibliothèque Capitulaire, Cod. 54, fol. 93–240)*. Imprimerie Valdotaine, Aoste 1978. (Monumenta Liturgica Ecclesiae Augustinae)

very same text in the libraries and archives of some churches with a well-documented history;⁶⁶ furthermore, even within the same version one can often detect the modifications and amendments introduced in the course of the book's usage. Based on the parallels and the judgment of common sense, I am of the opinion that the diachronic element is more emphatic. We can be rather certain that the chapters and convents usually preserved the older Ordinals that were not in use anymore, but they used only one book, and that in its latest version, to regulate their daily practice. For this reason the best way to understand the manuscript antecedents of the printed version, is to see them as members of a straight "genealogy" line that are constantly expanded, modified; and when they become obsolete or too confusing, a new, well-organised version is prepared. The sole reason for the simultaneous use of several Ordinals was if a disputed question had to be settled by reference to all the previous customs, since successive redactions could easily cause certain omissions to occur.

The different layers of modification in the Esztergom Ordinal manifest themselves chiefly on the structural level. It is clear that the basic structure of the book is as follows. Beginning with the vigil of St Andrew, the Ordinal describes the liturgical year in one continuous course (concatenating the temporal and sanctoral cycles), within which the individual liturgical days represent the basic elements of division. The liturgical days start with first vespers (if there is one) and continue with the rest of the office hours. The Mass (and on occasion the preceding procession) takes place after the none, and the day is concluded with compline. The added comments are usually attached to that particular ceremonial detail to which they specifically pertain. It should be observed, however, that each section is followed by a somewhat incoherent set of notes of uneven length which are introduced most often by the words "item", or at times by "nota" or "notandum." The larger portion of these notes could easily be inserted in the actual ceremonial description, yet they form a separate, appendix-like section. Based on the editorial logic of the manuscript copies and of the books extant in several consecutive versions, I suppose that these additional notes originally (in the former phase of redaction) were marginal comments or explanatory inserts which became part of the main text only as a result of the next redaction.

In light of these preliminary remarks, let us now examine the intrinsic evidence pertaining to the historical layers of the source at hand. Among the six known editions, only in five do we find the date of publication. The text of the different edi-

tanæ 4) 151–152; Heidi LEUPPI: *Der Liber Ordinarius des Konrad von Mure. Die Gottesdienstordnung am Grossmünster Zürich*. Universitätsverlag, Freiburg 1995. (Spicilegium Friburgense 37) 33–40.

⁶⁶ I studied the liturgical sources of Tarragona, Barcelona, Vic, and Girona (Catalonia) in the autumn of 2007.

tions is essentially unaltered, and the earliest dated edition is from 1496. The experts date the only edition without a colophon, and thus without reference to the year of publication, to 1493 in the earliest, and so this year may be considered the *terminus ante quem* of the preparation for printing. Within the text itself five different dates can be found in reference to certain decisions of the cathedral chapter, among which the earliest took place in 1478, the latest in 1484.⁶⁷ The same time period is established by the two allusions to János Flans (Beckensloer), an Archbishop of Esztergom during King Matthias' reign.⁶⁸ The *terminus post quem* for the final redaction of the exemplar manuscript is thus 1484, the same year when at the mandate of King Matthias the second, most wide-spread edition of the Esztergom Breviary was published. This was also the year when the Stuchs printing press, charged with the publication of the Breviary and the first two editions of the Ordinal, was established in Nuremberg.

It must be taken into account, however, that each decision of the cathedral chapter is quoted in the appendix-like sections, among the additional notes, while the references to Archbishop János are located very close to each other, at the beginning of certain sections, and in the same context. Hence the time references to King Matthias' reign within the Ordinal in all likelihood do not indicate the time frame of the book's actual composition, but the period of preparation for the printed edition. It is probable that the sentences written in the first person singular, in which the anonymous author of the text alludes to himself or to his work, also form part of the same layer.⁶⁹ Theoretically, they could come from different redactors, but the particular phrasing and the similar position in the text seem to point to one specific person. From these passages it emerges that the redactor is a member of the cathedral chapter of Esztergom who, as a liturgical expert and the cleric in charge of compiling the Ordinal, was in position to access all the relevant sources available at the time. Consequently we may reasonably suppose that the last version in the long "genealogy" of manuscript Esztergom Ordinals was reedited in the 70s and 80s of the 15th century, and this redactional work was accomplished by one of the canons in the cathedral chapter of Esztergom who made use of several sources accessible to him.

Another chronological reference-point is provided by the connection between the Esztergom Ordinal and the manuscript Ordinal called *Rubrica Strigoniensis* (also known as the Szepes Ordinal). The latter was given its final form (as we know it to-

⁶⁷ See in the present edition 38 and 107 (in reference to the Sunday after the Octave of Epiphany and by Corpus Christi).

⁶⁸ *Ibidem* 55–56 (in reference to the transposition of the feasts of St Hilary and St Bernard).

⁶⁹ A characteristic example can be found in reference to the feast of the Deposition of St Emeric (*ibidem* 158): "Si vis, præscripto modo poteris matutinas perficere, si autem vis, uti etiam hodie in choro Strigoniensi solemus matutinum perficere, modo infrascripto."

day) sometime between 1462 and 1469, in the collegiate chapter of Szepes. From the characteristics of its actual content it is evident that this work does not represent the ritual customs of the provostship of St Martin; instead, it contains an abridged summary of the liturgy in the Esztergom cathedral. All the typical characteristics of the Usage of Szepes are absent here,⁷⁰ while there are several references to Esztergom. The document often concerns itself with episcopal functions (which would make no sense in Szepes), designates the church of St Stephen Protomartyr (in Esztergom) as the station church, in two processional orations (written out *in extenso*) the names of St Adalbert and the Mother of God (the titles of the archiepiscopal see) are invoked, and St Adalbert occupies a special position also in the commemorations.⁷¹ From these considerations it manifestly follows that the Szepes Ordinal is an extract from one of the lost manuscript Ordinals of Esztergom, and this abridged text was compiled not later than the 60's of the 15th century. The exemplar manuscript used as its source is thus the common "ancestor" of both the printed Esztergom Ordinal and the Szepes Ordinal.

The connection between these two Ordinals is further corroborated by two other facts. First, there are passages in these books that are identical, word by word, especially in the first part of the manuscript.⁷² Second, in the Esztergom Ordinal one may find internal references to certain elements within the same book, which are not actually in the printed text, yet they can be found in the Szepes Ordinal. For instance, the long rubric concerning the office for the third and fourth week of Advent, or the particular way of donning the dalmatic on the feast of St Stephen Protomartyr (of which the printed text makes mention on Good Friday).⁷³ Obviously, none of these phenomena could be explained by the speculation that the normative liturgical text of the archiepiscopal see may have been influenced by a much less significant, peripheral extract.

We may draw two conclusions from these considerations. Given that the Szepes manuscript is most likely not the first representative of its textual tradition and its

⁷⁰ On the peculiarities of the Szepes variant of the Esztergom Use, see DOBSZAY — KOVÁCS: *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii ... Esztergom/Strigonium (Temporale)* 45–59. Here two small but important bits of detail may be mentioned: in the Ordinal the responsory for the Advent Ember Days "Festina ne tardaveris" is present, and the invitatory "Præstolantes" sung in the last week of Advent is suggested instead of "Regem venturum". Both features are contrary to the typical Szepes usage.

⁷¹ All these are summarised and documented in FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 141 and idem: "A középkori Magyarország ordináriuskönyvei" 52.

⁷² Unfortunately, these parallel places—although there is quite a number of them—have not yet been systematically juxtaposed. This work will eventually have to be done when the text will have to be prepared for publication in one of the future volumes of this subseries.

⁷³ Ibidem 146–147 and 56–58.

dependence on a standard copy in cathedral use could be a result of several intermediate editorial revisions, the so-called Szepes Ordinal dates back the manuscript antecedent of the Esztergom Ordinal at least to the first half of the 60's of the 15th century, but probably earlier. It also becomes clear that the redactorial process of preparing the Esztergom Ordinal for printing involved some omissions. Otherwise it is impossible to make sense of the fact that the shorter and sketchier Szepes Ordinal should have preserved details which do not feature in the known editions of the Esztergom Ordinal, even though these details indubitably point to the cathedral usage of Esztergom and the book itself contains references to them in different sections. It remains now to determine as accurately as possible how far back in time the supposed "genealogy" of the manuscript Esztergom Ordinals can be traced, and to identify the principles guiding the redactorial process to which the manuscript tradition was subjected before printing.

The first question can be answered based on the archaic features of the liturgical content and structure. The following elements in content allow us to date the genesis of the basic stratum of the text to a period prior to the 15th century: at the end of an additional set of notes we find mention of a decree of Pope Gregory XI (1370–1378); the organisation of abbreviated liturgical items at one place not in the liturgical but in a typological order; supplementary notes indicating multiple additions with respect to the feasts in early summer that were only introduced gradually in the period between the 12th and 14th centuries; the springtime Ember Days are not yet assigned to the first week of Lent.⁷⁴ Among the archaic structural elements we may indicate the fusion of the temporal and sanctoral cycles, especially at the end of the 15th century and in Hungary where we can find examples of such only in relatively early sources.⁷⁵ Considering that one of the great epochs of codification for the Esztergom Use strictly speaking was the turn of the 14th century, and it is also when the Ordinal as a genre flourished all over Europe, I venture to propose that the textual tradition of the Esztergom Ordinals originates in this period. The *terminus post quem* may be determined by the fact that the textual tradition of certain Esztergom *ordines*,⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Ibidem 132–133 and 44–45.

⁷⁵ E.g. Hungary's first extant sources for the Divine Office, i.e. a 12th century Antiphonal Graz, Universitätsbibliothek No. 211 mentioned above and a 13th century Breviary: Zagreb, Metropolitanska Knjižnica/Bibl. Univ. MR 67.

⁷⁶ The topic is discussed in further detail by FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 199–240. Its summary in English is accepted for publication as idem: "Unknown Fragments of Ordines in Medieval Hungary and Related Central European Churches", in *Actes du Colloque International « Mabillon et l'Europe bénédictine aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles » Solesmes 2007*. Centre Européen de Recherches sur les Congrégations et Ordres Religieux, Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Étienne 2009).

identified as the heritage of the 11th and 12th centuries, did not at all influence the phrasing of the Ordinals.

The second question is answered by the development of the printing press itself. As a result of this new technology, the normative books of Esztergom, such as the Breviary, the Missal,⁷⁷ and not much later the Ritual⁷⁸ (fulfilling also the function of the Processional), became more widely available. The expanded and unified rubrical material fixed the description of many ceremonies during the liturgical year, and so it was not necessary to include them in the Ordinal. More significantly, it was precisely the description of ceremonies that was too closely tied to the spatial features and personnel of the cathedral and this posed real difficulties as regards their adaptation to different churches. These omissions did not apply to the Sacred Triduum and Easter, probably out of respect for the traditions, and because it would have been rather difficult to separate the references to liturgical texts from the corresponding ceremonial instructions. Hence the Esztergom Ordinal left out a good deal of ceremonial descriptions, yet it kept the catalogue of abbreviated items, even though they were also available in other printed liturgical books. This could only be explained by the different users of these two types of books. Only the more affluent clerics were able to purchase the larger, representative liturgical books, while in printing the Ordinal the lower cost was obviously an important consideration. The catalogue of items was included in the Ordinal for purposes of codification; it was meant most probably to assist the revision of the accumulated manuscript material, considered either outdated or of unsure origin.

PRINCIPLES OF THIS EDITION

The objectives and the general typographical principles of *Monumenta Ritualia Hungarica* have already been explained in the first volume of the series,⁷⁹ while the theoretical justification for this sort of spelling and typography has been set forth in a different work of mine.⁸⁰ To remind the reader, I shall now give a short summary of the principles of this edition in the same exact order that the first volume cites them.

⁷⁷ *Missale secundum chorum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis*. Nuremberg 1484. (RMK III 7) Its critical edition was published as DÉRI Balázs: *Missale Strigoniense 1484*. Argumentum Kiadó, Budapest 2009. (*Monumenta Ritualia Hungarica* 1).

⁷⁸ Its first printed edition was the *Obsequiale seu baptismale secundum chorum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis*. Impensis Ioannis Pæp, Venice 1501.

⁷⁹ DÉRI: *Missale Strigoniense* LIIsqq.

⁸⁰ FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 291sqq.

Only those principles will be treated in detail that—due to the particular nature of normative liturgical texts—call for a somewhat different approach, or those that are influenced by the fact that the critical edition of the Esztergom Ordinal happens to be the synthesis of several medieval sources.

Orthography and layout

As to the structure and distribution of the text itself, I have kept the rather dense layout and highlighting of the original, but applied its principles of arrangement with greater consistency. It also had to be taken into consideration that the contemporary printing techniques, except for paragraph breaks and rubrication, did not have the use of modern technology's sophisticated and more nuanced system of visual differentiation. The text is separated into some larger divisions by centred, boldface summary subtitles. The beginning of the various seasons of the year and the names of the different months were inserted into the text in the same style and in square brackets. These titles do not feature in the original sources, their insertion is not the result of textual critical inquiry, and so they are not indicated in the critical apparatus. Each new paragraph corresponds to one particular liturgical day or some other thematic unit. The systematic use of paragraphs made it unnecessary to apply paragraph marks (¶) instead, thus these were not adopted from the original text. In the mnemonic-type verses of the Calendar the *V*-s for *versus*, which in the original, continuously typeset text serves as a substitute for line spacing, were not used. Quotations completely written out—with the exception of the invitatories whose text was often included in its entirety—were included in separate paragraphs, and these were made easily discernible by smaller font size and larger margins on both sides.

The names of each liturgical day or the titles of thematic units forming a separate paragraph were written in small caps in the beginning of each such paragraph. Within the paragraphs the titles of Offices and Masses, as well as of some other notes or subdivisions (*item*, *nota*, *notandum*) were boldfaced. Hence it became easy to find one's bearing within the text without having to change the original layout or expanding the original text with unnecessarily explanations. The units in small caps or in bold characters correspond—at least on the level of the original concept—to the titles of the original text highlighted with red.

The liturgical items and incipits are not typeset differently in the original texts; they are simply divided by means of interpunctuation. In this edition, so as to make practical use easier, three different kinds of division were applied:

(1) The incipits of well-known and easily recognisable liturgical genres have been italicised, as have the incipits referring to complete Office cycles (*Placebo*, *O decus*, *Investigabiles*, etc.) and additional tropes (*Puer natus*, *Christus surrexit*, *Fulget dies*).

(2) The quotations taken from within the texts of different items (those that did not qualify for an incipit) and the turns of phrases perhaps unfamiliar for some readers (*Domine labia, Deus in adiutorium, Converte nos, Communicantes, Confiteor* etc.) have been placed within the quotation marks preferred by neo-Latin languages (« »). The quotation marks always precede the interpunctuation.

(3) Titles that are identical to the beginning of the text of the items (*Asperges, Kyrie, Gloria/Et in terra, Credo/Patrem, Alleluia, Magnificat, Benedicamus* etc.) have not been treated as quotations but as common names; for this reason only their first letter is capitalised, even in cases when they included more than one word (e.g. *Ite missa est*). In individual cases, if the logic of the text so demanded, I deviated from this principle, for example, when the incipits of Gospel Canticles were introduced by the title *psalmus*. Another exception is, and hence written in italics, the canticle *Benedictus es* of the Masses on Ember Saturdays. This is not really an item of the Mass Proper, but it is rather rare and so it could not be expected that the average reader be familiar with it. Likewise a capital initial letter marks the beginning of Introits that are not used as incipits but as proper names for individual Sundays (*Omnis terra, Invocavit, Quasi modo* etc.). The same is true of the initial words of responsories (*Deus omnium, In principio, Si bona* etc.) in *historia* (responsory series), incipits referring to the melodic variants of the *Benedicamus* and the Mass Ordinary (*Magna Deus, Cunctipotens, Iacet granum* etc.). This is justified by the necessity to differentiate them from the incipits inserted into the description of liturgical arrangements. At two places within the text, the incipit *Exsultet* is certainly not in reference to the consecratory *prex* of the Easter Vigil but to the Easter Candle itself. In these cases the word *Exsultet* is not in italics and the first letter is capitalised.

Since this edition is a summary collection of six different books, the folio or page numbering of the originals are neither retained, nor indicated. The headings of more elaborate editions are kept partially: the names of the months on the top of odd pages and the names of the temporal seasons on the top of even pages were written with a space in-between the letters. For technical and aesthetic reasons the headings referring to particular liturgical days were not included. The words corresponding to these references have been sufficiently highlighted by the small capitals at the beginning of each paragraph.

Without exceptions, abbreviations have been written out in full. In writing out these abbreviations, I applied the word choice typical to that part of the text in which they occurred (e.g. *matutinum* in the singular), and when this could not be determined (e.g. *versus/versiculus*), the current modern terminology is used instead. All the references to the *commune sanctorum* were written out in the plural form if the original text did not spell them out completely, or if it did not indicate the singular form with making them grammatically agree with another word in singular (e.g. *de confessoribus*,

martyribus, virginibus etc.). Roman numerals, Office Hours designated by numerals (*prima, tertia* etc.) and those periods of the liturgical year that are named after numerals (*Septuagesima, Quadragesima* etc.), have been written out in text form, except for actual dates which are written with Roman numerals in small capitals.

In terms of spelling I followed the principles laid down in the first volume of this series. This edition does not follow the contemporary medieval spelling which was different in each book (and even within the same book often proved to be inconsistent.) Rather, the present edition follows the spelling used in standard large dictionaries⁸¹ and in the books edited by the Apostolic See. I decided to correct even the sort of spelling that was consistently applied in the originals, if it was not in conformity with the classical standards (e.g. *iocundus, Iohannes, letania*), though I have maintained those forms that have been preserved in modern ecclesiastical practice (e.g. *epistola, inchoare, Genitrix*). Some of the adverbial compounds and composite pronouns were written separately if it had already become a tradition in the modern editions of liturgical books to write them so (e.g. *a longe, ad invicem* etc.), but others were combined if they belonged to the sphere of vulgar Latinity (e.g. *abante, adudum* etc.). In terms of the separation and composition of words I followed the modern liturgical customs in other respects as well (e.g. *nosmetipsos*). Words of Greek origin have been faithfully transcribed according to the Greek spelling but always with the proper Latin ending (e.g. *elemosyna, acolythus, homelia*). In the transcription of proper names I decided to take into account the index of names in the new edition of the *Martyrologium Romanum*.⁸² As opposed to the first volume of this series, I have decided to use the diphthongs æ and œ. Wherever these are written separately (e.g. *Noe, Michael, Israel*), they represent two separate syllables; the trema (¨) has not been used.

In connection with the *nomina sacra*, the overabundant use of capitalisation, as seen in the Tridentine books (e.g. *angelus, rex, creator* etc.), is purposefully reduced. Even in this regard I aimed to follow the example provided by the modern editions of the Apostolic See. However, the word *Apostolus* is not written with a capital A, as it is customary in Vatican editions. All those liturgical terms (especially the names of feasts), which

⁸¹ *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Teubner, Leipzig—Stuttgart/K. G. Saur, München—Leipzig 1900–; P. G. W. GLARE: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1982.

⁸² *Martyrologium Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Ioannis Pauli pp. II promulgatum. Editio typica*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2001. Some important differences should be highlighted both in terms of their spelling and their medieval Hungarian pronunciation. These are (in the order of the year, with the original spelling in parenthesis): Præiectus (Proiectus), Brigida (Brigitta), Gerardus (Gerhardus), Godehardus (Gothardus), Pancratius (Pangratius), Petronella (Petronilla), Margarita (Margaretha), Praxedes (Praxedis), Magdalena (Magdalene), Christoferus (Christophorus), Xystus (Sixtus), Afra (Affra), Evurtius (Eurtius), Lambertus (Lampertus), Eligius (Elegius), Colomanus (Colomannus), Elisabeth (Elizabeth).

could also be interpreted as common words to be written with minor-case letters (e.g. *Adventus, Nativitas, Quadragesima, Resurrectio* etc.), are begun with capital letters.

The separation of words and syllables, just as in the first volume of this series, primarily follows etymological considerations, but it also takes account of those phonetic aspects that were already being observed in 15th-century liturgical books.

As to punctuation, the linguistic logic of the original text was applied in a somewhat independent manner. One sentence usually corresponds to one liturgical item, in the case of explicit explanations to one thematic unit with a full stop (period) at the end, except if more than one such train of thought is associated with a single predicate. In the latter case, the sentences are divided by semicolons. Question or exclamation marks were not used because in the text there are no interrogative sentences and the normative subjunctives and imperatives should not give an impression of exclamations. Colons are always used in indication of equivalency, most often in between the title of items and their corresponding incipits. Colons were omitted if the incipits, in sentences having a verbal predicate, were used as adjectives modifying the item's title. In the case of incipits taken from liturgical texts and incomplete quotations no punctuation was applied, although on certain occasions they were separated with a comma or a full stop (period). It seemed reasonable to use a comma when incipits of the same genre were listed or when several sections of the same item were juxtaposed (e.g. a responsory and its verse). A full stop (period) was used within a quotation if the fragments of different items representing diverse genres were placed one after the other.

In agreement with the original sources, in full proper sentences more abundant interpunctuation was used than is customary in modern times. Each part (clause) of a sentence having its own predicate or forming part of a list was separated with a comma, if there was no coordinating or subordinating conjunction between them. The syntactical structures involving verbal nouns and other parts of the sentences organised around a participle are interpreted as separate clauses. This is well justified by the interpunctuation and syntax of the original text: in rubrical language one can often find long participial sections without any kind of verbal predicate.

Those items that originally had been intended to be supplemented with musical notation, were not always printed—for typographical reasons—at the syntactically most fitting place in the original texts. In the present edition I have put these at their proper place, and after the item (inserting a colon in-between) I provided an indication printed in smaller font (notandum).

Critical apparatus

The main text of the critical edition follows as much as possible the first Nuremberg version with the exception of its abundant use of the “et cetera” formula and those loci where the other five editions offered an unmistakably better reading. The text was determined by the comprehensive collation of the undated, first edition and the editions of 1509 and 1520. At those places where at least two of these editions offered divergent readings I also took into consideration the parallels of the 1496-, 1505-, and 1510-editions. The incipits are always given in the longest version available.

The additional explanatory insertions are within square brackets [], the exclusions within < >. I only used these brackets if obvious mistakes had to be corrected; they were not applied simply for the sake of assisting an easier interpretation of the original text, except very rarely and when this is done it is explained in a critical note in each case (*Adi.*, *Del.*). I was much less reluctant in correcting the insertions of the 1520-edition; considering their rather corrupt state (to which I alluded earlier), they were often amended. In the main text of the present edition always the best variant of the extant sources are included. If a particular locus of the text was corrupt in all the available sources, I rather decided to keep the original even in the main text of this edition, while in the textual critical notes I have made a suggestion as to its possible correction (*Sic. Malim*). This is explained by the fact that the textual tradition of the Ordinals is extremely complex and, given that the available source material is so scarce, may even be inextricable. For this reason, the editor does well if he presents the reader with the faithful reproduction of the extant original, and only proposes his own particular, non-documented reading as one of the possible solutions. Naturally, the obvious typographical errors or corruptions that can be checked from other sources (e.g. from ceremonial books) are not included in this category. The correction of these errors or corruptions are duly referenced in my notes (*Comi.*, or in the case of corrected spelling *Corr.*).

The critical apparatus is attached to the main text in footnote references and on each page the numbering is started anew. The footnotes always pertain to the indexed word or longer phrases ending with the indexed word. In the apparatus the original text is always typeset with normal letters but the spelling is standardised and properly interpunctuated. Notes, comments, or observations within the apparatus are typeset with italics, insertions are given in parenthesis. Wherever it was deemed necessary, the abbreviated version of a given word was also included. Any version longer than a single word is given after ..., and begun with the last word also featured in the original text. Longer omissions are indicated with the words beginning and concluding the omitted text.

Appendices

The critical edition is complemented by two appendices.

(1) Following the main text, there are two indices: the first one is a detailed table of contents covering each and every paragraph within the text in the order of the liturgical year; the other is an alphabetical index of all the feast days of the liturgical year mentioned in the text. This latter also indicates the exact calendar day of the feast within the Hungarian tradition. Those readers who are less familiar with the rite of Esztergom need to be alerted to the fact that on the Sundays of Eastertide the propers of Easter Sunday were repeated, and only on Monday or the first free weekday did they celebrate the liturgical texts of the actual Sunday within the season. This is the reason why the Sundays after Easter are indicated both with the beginning of their Introids and arranged in a numerical order as separate items.

(2) The translation of the longer, ceremonial parts, that is, of the actual *ordines*. This is justified by the fact that these parts have the greatest capacity of appealing to the general reader. Only a few can read with interest the long list of directorial details, while the list of items can be followed without any serious knowledge of the Latin language. In this part, every quotation is in italics, the word “item” is consistently omitted; there is a new paragraph instead. The explanations are all in square brackets [], and the Latin terms, if they are rather particular or their meaning is not very clear, are in normal brackets (). I had no intention of reconstructing the ceremonies of the Esztergom rite, for this the systematic comparison of the surviving sources and parallels would be indispensable. The Hungarian variants, and within them the Ordinals themselves, are not always consonant. I tried to make the text intelligible, but at the same time stylistically I kept the sketchy, haphazard character of the original text. The translations of the Holy Week and Easter Sunday are complete, but for the other liturgical days, only the most interesting segments are included. All throughout, close familiarity with the Roman liturgy is presumed.

Some editions of Ordinals contain rich indices not only to liturgical days but also to different types of items and incipits. The compilation of similar indices I personally judged to be unnecessary. The Ordinal itself is an index to liturgical items grouped according to the liturgical year and ceremonial occasions. At the same time, the incipits are listed inconsistently and with considerable omissions. Those interested in the repertory and arrangement of the Office and Mass propers of Esztergom, could simply have recourse, with regard to almost every type of liturgical item, to more complete and more precise modern compilations.⁸³

⁸³ As regards the Divine Office, the most complete is DOBSZAY — KOVÁCS: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii ... Esztergom/Strigonium ... (Temporale-Sanctorale)*, but useful tables may also be found in FALVY —

For this reason, it would have made more sense to create tables or systematic summaries for the kinds of data about which the Esztergom Ordinal provides singular or at least truly significant information. Such would be the liturgical terminology and specific rubrical language, the hierarchy of feasts and Calendar problems, questions regarding the roles of liturgical assistants, the use and colour of liturgical vestments, the method of musical performance and the choice of melody for items with fixed texts but variable tunes, and those topographical data that could help the exact and reliable reconstruction of the liturgical spaces and architectural arrangement of the destroyed medieval cathedral of Esztergom. The study of these would, however, far exceed the set confines of a critical edition such as this one, for it would require a very detailed exposition well beyond the framework provided by appendices or indices. Consequently, I have treated these questions—in a manner far from complete or exhaustive—in a different work.⁸⁴

This introduction had to be restricted to the simple delineation of philological facts. Its purpose was the overview and exposition of the latest results in relevant studies, so that the original source can be placed in the proper context of liturgical and book history. The publication of the *Ordinarium Strigoniensis* in a modern edition does not mean that the studies and research in this regard have come to an end; on the contrary, it is meant to assist other scholarly fields to achieve further discoveries. This hope does not seem unreasonable if we consider that the liturgy, whose regulation the Ordinal was intended to guarantee, was a central area, indeed a decisive factor in the medieval culture of the European continent in general, and of the Hungarian Kingdom in particular.

MEZEY: *Codex Albensis*; SZENDREI: *Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense*; eadem: *The Istanbul Antiphonal about 1360*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 2002. (Musicalia Danubiana 18). For an alphabetical list of the antiphons arranged according to their proper liturgical order, see DOBSZAY László — SZENDREI Janka: *Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi* V. 1–3. *Antiphonen*. Bärenreiter Kassel, Basel—London—New York—Prague 1999. A similar comprehensive list of responsories is also being prepared for publication. I am currently working on an index to the Lectionary of Hungarian Office Books. With regard to the Mass liturgy the most complete work is DÉRI: *Missale Strigoniense*, but useful tables may also be found in SZENDREI — RIBARIČ: *Missale Notatum Strigoniense*; SZENDREI Janka — [KÉRINGER László]: *Graduale Strigoniense (s. XV/XVI)*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 1990–1993. (Musicalia Danubiana 12*-**). For hymns and sequences, see RAJECZKY Benjamin OCist: *Melodiarium Hungariae Medii Aevi. Hymni et Sequentiae*. Editio Musica, Budapest 1956¹. 1982².

⁸⁴ FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* Parts III–IV.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to those who have directly contributed to the publication of this book and whom I consider to be, as it were, the co-authors of the present volume: to Balázs Déri for suggesting the topic approximately ten years ago and for the encouragement and assistance he has given me in my scholarly efforts for the past nine years. To Edit Madas for vetting the script, to Ervin János Alácsi for the competent English translation, to Peter Doherty, the native supervisor of the English translation who passed away while engaged in this work (may he rest in peace!), to Robert A. Skeris for finishing the incomplete supervision of the text, and to all those who have been important associates in the editorial preparation of the MRH series: to László Szörényi and József Jankovics, the main editors of the series, to József Láng, the publisher, and Mária Hodosi for the cover design. Special recognition is due to the Ministry of Education and Culture and to Minister István Hiller for having generously sponsored the first two volumes of this series. In tracing down the still extant copies of the Esztergom Ordinal I received indispensable assistance from my competent colleagues among whom I am especially grateful to the following persons: Ferenc Balogh (Eger), Dénes Dienes, Árpád Tanászi, István Timári (Sárospatak), Zoltán Fáy (FKL, Budapest), Attila Józsa (Bős/Gabčíkovo), Štěpán Kohout (Olmütz/Olomouc), Judit Kolumban Mihály (Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca), Erzsébet Muckenhaupt (Csíkszereda/Miercurea-Ciuc), Mrs. Pintér, Krisztina Rác (Győr), Raphael Rindler (Németújvár/Güssing), Karolina Takács (Kalocsa), Zoltán Tarr (Keszthely), Gábor Tóth (MTAK, Budapest), Judit Vásárhelyi, Edina Zsupán (OSzK, Budapest). Finally, I am very grateful to the Discalced Carmelite nuns of Magyarszék for providing me with an ideal environment for finishing this work, and to my wife Judit Martin and my entire family for the patience and co-operation they have shown in the past decade.

APPENDIX

Ash Wednesday

Also on Ash Wednesday [the Ordinal treats of the day on several occasions], at the Mass the celebrant (missans) first goes up to the altar and then, not singing but slowly (morose) reading, blesses the ashes. After the blessing the celebrant descends from the altar and the deacon (if there is a deacon at the given place) imposes the ashes on his head with these words: *Memento homo quia cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris, pulvis es, et in pulverem reverteris, age penitentiam, ut habeas vitam æternam.* Then all those in the church come up to receive the ashes. In the meantime, one sprinkles holy water over them while the choir sings the antiphon *Inter vestibulum* and its versicle without returning to the antiphon, then immediately follows the second antiphon *Immutemur.* All that having been done, the celebrant descends and begins to sing the antiphon *Exaudi nos Domine.* Versicle: *Peccavimus cum patribus nostris. Oremus.* The deacon: *Flectamus genua, Levate.* [In Esztergom both were sung by the deacon.] Oration: *Concede nobis Domine præsidia militiæ christianæ, only on this day.* Next a procession is led to the station (locus destinatus) while singing the responsory *Emendemus.* After the responsory the Psalm *Miserere mei Deus* with *Gloria Patri* is begun whilst kneeling. *Laus tibi Domine. Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster,* then the celebrant sings: *Et ne nos inducas.* Versicle: *Domine non secundum peccata nostra. Oremus.* The deacon: *Flectamus genua, Levate.* Oration: *Exauditor omnium Deus exaudi nostrorum vocem fletuum* etc., as it is in the book, if you have it; if you do not, say your usual prayer, etc. After the oration, two children standing at the same place begin the litany, and with this the procession enters the church. The litany having been completed, the entire antiphon *Media vita in morte* is recited. Versicle: *Peccavimus cum patribus. Oremus.* The oration “super populum” of the day is said, *Per Christum Dominum nostrum, Amen.* Finally, the Mass of the day begins.

Maundy Thursday

On Maundy Thursday, that is, on the day of the Last Supper of our Lord, Jesus Christ, *Domine labia* is not said, nor *Deus in adiutorium*, nor the Invitatory. Instead the

antiphons are simply begun with their psalms, and the *Gloria Patri* is not said until Holy Saturday (including that day).

The lamentations and the readings are simply read, without blessings, and in the end they are concluded like prophecies. At the end of each reading *Christus semel pro peccatis nostris mortuus est* is not said, as it is customary in other churches on these three days; this conclusion is only used, that is, *Christus semel pro peccatis nostris mortuus est, iustus pro iniustus, ut nos offerret Deo*, at the end of the readings on Holy Saturday. The responsories are proper. The Lauds antiphons are proper. The Versicles are proper, as in the book, and after the return of the last responsory the Lauds antiphons are simply begun then follows the Benedictus antiphon, the chapter, and the hymn without a versicle. Antiphon: *Traditor autem*. Psalm: *Benedictus*, without the *Gloria Patri* and then the antiphon is repeated. Next the adolescents begin: *Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie, Domine miserere nobis*; the canons (domini) sing these verses: *Iesu Christe qui passurus* etc. as well as the next ones, so that the adolescents may sing it five times: *Kyrie eleison Christe eleison Kyrie eleison Christe eleison Kyrie eleison*. The verses having been completed, the canons and the adolescents form a procession with the hymn *Rex Christe Factor omnium*, and after each stanza the children sing: *Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie*, which is then finished in the church of St Stephen [the station church of the Esztergom cathedral]. Then whilst kneeling, the Psalm *Miserere mei Deus secundum magnam* is read without the *Gloria*. Antiphon: *Christus factus est pro nobis*, silently. *Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster*, then one reads the oration *Respice quæsumus Domine super hanc familiam tuam* immediately; there is no *Amen* at the end, instead the hymn *Hymnum dicamus Domino* follows. In the meantime the procession returns to the cathedral, repeating *Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie* after each stanza of the hymn, and then it is concluded in the choir. Whilst kneeling, the Psalm *Deus misereatur nostri* is read without the *Gloria. Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster*. Oration: *Respice quæsumus*, as above.

In the daylight Hours *Deus in adiutorium* is not said, but each psalm is simply read without the *Gloria Patri*, and after each Hour the Psalm *Miserere mei* is recited. Antiphon: *Christus factus. Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster*. Oration: *Respice quæsumus*, as above.

In Compline the Psalm *Miserere mei Deus* is not read, but another Psalm *Domine quid multiplicati* instead. Antiphon: *Christus factus. Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster*. Oration: *Respice quæsumus*. And the same way during the following days.

At the Mass four canons of higher ranks are the precentors (chorator) who, dressed in albs, process from the sacristy together with the bishop. Meanwhile the introit *Nos autem gloriari* is begun without the *Gloria* rather solemnly, with the organ. *Kyrie Cunctipotens*. The *Gloria in excelsis* and the Creed are sung because of the consecration of Chrism. Offertory: *Dextera Domini*. Preface: *Qui salutem humani generis*. The *Communicantes* is proper to the day, and the Mass proceeds in the usual order until the *Per quem hæc omnia* of the Canon. At this point the bishop descends from the altar to

the table which has been prepared for the consecration of Chrism and sits on the faldstool (pontificale) placed there. Then the deacon thrice exclaims: *Oleum infirmorum* and one of the parish priests, dressed in a black cope and simply walking, brings out the oil. After the oil has been consecrated, the same parish priest carries the holy oil back to the sacristy. The bishop ascends once again to the altar, breaks the host, gives the blessing [which is the usual benedictio pontificalis here], and having said the *Et pax eius*, there is silence. The *Agnus Dei* and the communion chant are not sung until the consecration of Chrism is completed.

Then, after receiving the Blessed Sacrament, he descends as earlier. As he sits down, the deacon once again thrice exclaims in the tone of the Epistle: *Oleum ad sanctum chrisma*. Next, two parish priests bring out the Chrism and the Oil of Catechumens under the baldachin (velum), with the two canons of the church of St Stephen walking in front in red copes, singing *O Redemptor* until the line: *Ut monetur omnis sexus* (exclusively), and candles are carried before them. Then the Chrism is consecrated in the usual manner with the crosses of the twelve priests standing there [together with the bishop they too bless the Chrism making a sign of the cross over it], and the Chrism is saluted by all of the twelve priests. Next, the Oil [of Catechumens] is similarly consecrated and saluted, just as earlier, and in the end the same twelve priests carry it back while the same canons of the church of St Stephen sing the hymn *Ut monetur*, as before, and the choir keeps responding [with the refrain]. At this point the bishop ascends to the altar and says thrice the *Agnus Dei*, always with *Miserere nobis* and not with *Dona nobis pacem*. The choir sings it the similar way. Then he reads the communion as the precentors begin to sing the same. Immediately following is the singing of the antiphon *Calicem salutaris*. All the antiphons, the psalms without the *Gloria Patri*, the antiphon *Cenantibus* and the *Magnificat* the same way. At the altar the bishop and the sacred ministers (ministri) read the same psalms. We also read the Psalm *Miserere mei Deus*. Antiphon: *Christus factus est*. *Kyrie eleison Christe eleison Kyrie eleison*. *Pater noster*. Then the ministers read the oration *Respice quæsumus*, but the bishop read the postcommunio (complenda), that is: *Refecti vitalibus alimentis*. At last the Mass is concluded with *Ite missa est* because of the consecration of Chrism, otherwise there is no *Ite missa est*, but instead the *Benedicamus Domino Cunctipotens* is sung by the precentors.

For the washing of the feet first the bells are rung twice, then for the third time the clappers are used. In the meantime a table is prepared in front of the Lady altar [most likely standing somewhere in the middle of the nave] with small plates and offerings (cum scutellis et oblatis), a basin and a water jar (cum pelvi et lavatorio). Afterwards, only the bishop, a deacon, a subdeacon, and an acolyte are vested, and no one else, and they walk behind torch bearers [if our preceding conjecture—i.e. “præcedentibus” for “præcedens”—is correct] as they process from the sacristy. They go to the table and the bishop stands by the table on the southern side. Then [the sub-

deacon], facing the East, begins the Epistle *Convenientibus vobis in unum* without any title and using the Epistle tone. That having been finished, the deacon, facing the North, begins to sing the Gospel *Ante diem festum Paschæ* solemnly [in the solemn tone] without *Dominus vobiscum*. Meanwhile the bishop girds himself with an apron. That having been done, the choir begins the antiphon *Ante diem festum*. Then the bishop, with the others assisting him, that is, the subdeacon with the basin and the deacon with the water jug, silently begins to wash and then kiss the feet of the dignitaries and older canons, on both sides, [altogether] twelve men. Then he goes back to his place, when all those rise whose feet have been washed, and the senior dignitary washes the bishop's feet while they are held and then dried by the others. All kiss the bishop's feet and go back to their places. Then with the assistance of the deacon and subdeacon, he distributes all the offerings (oblata) [most likely unconsecrated hosts to recall the Last Supper], singing the antiphon *Mandatum novum* to which the choir responds with *Ut diligatis invicem*. Afterwards the servants (satrapes) bring out wine in pitchers (in picariis) and they distribute it, but beforehand the first ranking dignitary presents some of the offerings to the bishop, singing: *Mandatum novum*, as earlier. Then, all having participated in the gifts, the bishop stands up and says: *Oremus*. Oration as in the book. Next, the rector of the cathedral school (rector scholæ) makes a speech to the attending clergy, after which all ascend to the choir, beginning the hymn: *Tellus ac æthera iubilant*, and if it proves to be too short, immediately they begin the antiphon: *Diviserunt sibi*. In the meantime the bishop washes every altar, and one half of the choir sings the Psalm *Deus Deus meus respice in* without the *Gloria Patri*, and the other half responds with the antiphon *Diviserunt sibi*.

All these having been done, Compline immediately begins simply [without singing]: *Cum invocarem, In te Domine, Qui habitat, Ecce nunc, Nunc dimittis*, without the *Gloria Patri, Domine quid multiplicati. Christus factus est*. Then one simply says: *Kyrie eleison Christe eleison Kyrie eleison. Pater noster*. Orations: *Respice quæsumus Domine* etc., *Ultimo* etc., *Subire tormentum*, and nothing more.

Good Friday

On Good Friday say the Matins as on Maundy Thursday but with its proper historia [antiphons and responsories]. Proper readings with conclusions like prophecies. Everything else, just like in the books.

While the clappers are sounded, one deacon, one subdeacon, and one acolyte vest in albs, two adolescents, who walk in front of the bishop, don copes. Then the

bishop ascends to the high altar (*altare magnum*) and reads the prophecies simply: *In tribulatione*, while the subdeacon sings the same. The tract *Domine audivi auditum tuum* immediately begins, alternately between the two sides of the choir. Next [the bishop] says: *Oremus*. The deacon: *Flectamus genua, Levate*. Oration: *Deus a quo et Iudas*, and *Amen* is answered. Then the subdeacon sings the second prophecy: *Dixit Dominus ad Moysen*. That having been completed, the choir sings another tract: *Eripe [me] Domine*, after which right away begins the Passion of our Lord, Jesus Christ [without a title], and no benediction is asked even for the Gospel (*evangelium*) [the so-called “planctus”, the last passage of the Passion]. The deacon dons a black chasuble as usual [presumably a *casula plicata*], and once carpets have been laid in between the choir stalls [on the *planum*], he sings barefoot: *Egressus Iesus trans torrentem Cedron* etc. After the Passion the bishop immediately begins the orations at the high altar, saying: *Oremus dilectissimi* etc., as in the book, but against [sic] the heretics and schismatics there is no *Per Dominum*, nor *Amen*, but as soon as the oration is done, it starts: *Pro perfidis Iudæis*, there is no *Flectamus genua*, and after the *Per eundem Dominum* there is no *Amen*, but right away [the oration] for the Gentiles is begun where there is *Flectamus genua, Levate, Per Dominum nostrum*, and also *Amen* is answered. Then the bishop goes down in front of the Lady altar [in the nave of the cathedral], where the place for the crucifix has already been decorated. Meanwhile two priests vested in red take the crucifix from behind the high altar and bring it forward passing by the side of the altar, as it were, singing the antiphon: *Popule meus*, but beforehand they put a chasuble on the crucifix completely covering it. Afterwards, two clerics studying for the priesthood (*procedentes*), who—just like on the feast of St Stephen protomartyr—wear red, solemn dalmatics inside out, begin to sing *Agios*, barefoot, kneeling, and turned towards the crucifix. The choir responds: *Sanctus Deus*. Next, they come down to the lowest step of the stairs leading down to the choir where the same way they sing the second strophe; then the third strophe is sung from the small gate on the right side of the altar of Holy Cross [at the rood screen]. Having done that, they go further and bring the crucifix all the way to the Lady altar. Then the bishop, together with the presbyters, takes the crucifix, and first lifts up the front of the chasuble a little bit, the second time a little more, the third time even higher so that the corpus be entirely visible, and alone he sings thrice the antiphon: *Ecce lignum Crucis* etc., elevating it first [regarding the elevation of the chasuble again] a little, the second time a little more, the third time even higher, while the choir responds each time, but the verse [Beati immaculati] is only sung after the third elevation. Finally the bishop, kissing the crucifix, goes back to his place. The other canons all make an offering and kiss the crucifix. In the meantime the antiphon *Dum Fabricator mundi* is sung and the adolescents begin the hymn *Crux fidelis* to which the choir responds with either the half or the whole of the stanza alternately as it is customary. Next, the bishop, standing in

front of the crucifix, reads the oration: *Domine Iesu Christe* together with the other two orations. He goes to the altar of the Holy Cross where the corporal has been unfolded. He starts: *Adiutorium nostrum* etc., says the *Confiteor Deo*, as usual, and in the end the versicle *Proprio Filio suo non pepercit Deus* etc., steps up to the altar, saying: *Aufer a nobis Domine* until the end, and takes the wine and the water for the chalice, saying nothing. Meanwhile priests, vested in red copes of different colour [sic], facing the corpus, sing the hymn *Laudes omnipotens*. One of the canons brings forth a chalice with the Blessed Body of Christ preserved in it from the day before, and takes it to the bishop at the altar, singing the strophes one by one, while the choir responds to each. With the last strophe having been sung, the bishop takes the chalice reverently, places it on the altar, and with even greater reverence he takes the Body of the Lord. Holding this sacred Body, he turns towards the people and thrice he says the communion *Hoc corpus*, each time starting it a little higher and turning towards a different corner of the altar. Then he says the *Pater noster*, reading, and the assistance responds silently: *Sed libera nos a malo*. Afterwards, he breaks the sacred Body and says: *Per omnia secula saculorum, Amen*, and nothing else. Right away he takes Communion in silence, saying nothing.

All these having been concluded, Vespers is begun at the same place alternately between the two sides of the choir, that is, only between the bishop and the entire choir [maybe a modified note both with its original and with its corrected text]. The psalms are the same as on Good Friday, they are read without the *Gloria Patri*, then come the *Magnificat* and *Miserere mei Deus*. Antiphon: *Christus factus est. Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster*. Next, the bishop says the oration: *Respice quæsumus Domine* to which there is no response, and so this blessed work (beatum opus) is concluded. The bishop goes back to the sacristy and does not give a blessing. At last, the succustos [the dignitary responsible for the church, sacred objects and vestments] prepares the holy sepulchre (sepultura) in the usual manner.

At Compline the psalms are read in the same way as on Maundy Thursday, without the *Gloria Patri* and in the very same order.

Holy Saturday

On Holy Saturday Matins as on Good Friday, except that here at the end of each reading the *Christus semel pro peccatis* etc. is said. Everything else, as in the book.

For the blessing of the fire, first the bishop comes out of the sacristy together with the entire assistance, as in the Mass, and they walk around the fire, reading the

fifteen Gradual psalms without the *Gloria Patri*, while they are throwing cross shaped candles in the fire, walking around it fifteen times. Right after this the bishop says an oration, adding all the other orations as well, and blesses the fire by sprinkling and incensing it. Having done all that, four precentors chosen from among the canons begin the hymn *Inventor rutili*, they process into the choir, while the choir itself is repeating alternately either the half or the whole of the stanza, as is usual. After the hymn, one of the canons dressed in a dalmatic sings the *Exsultet* in the usual manner, and places the grains of incense into the lamp (lucerna) or candle at the appropriate moments. When finished, *Amen* is said.

The celebrant right away says the oration without the *Flectamus genua*. Next, one of the dignitaries starts to sing the prophecy: *In principio creavit*. After the prophecy the bishop says: *Oremus*. The deacon: *Flectamus genua, Levate*; and [the bishop] prays the oration, *Amen*. Then the second, third, and fourth prophecies are sung the same way, always with *Flectamus genua, Levate*. After the fourth prophecy the tract is sung, then the fifth prophecy, the sixth, seventh, eighth, followed by another tract. Then come the ninth, tenth, and eleventh prophecies, followed by the third tract. Finally, the twelfth prophecy [before 1490 there were only four prophecies in Esztergom] with the oration right after it, without the *Flectamus, Amen* is answered. Right away the fourth tract is said or sung [presumably a later correction]. Having done that, the bishop says *Oremus* without the *Flectamus*. Oration, *Amen*.

Next, a procession is led to the baptismal font. One of the precentors begins the hymn *Rex sanctorum*, and two acolytes carry the Chrism and the holy Oil [of Catechumens] with their bottoms bound (ligatis natibus) [in cruets wrapped all around with a cotton cloth], circling around the baptismal font with a processional cross or banner, likewise all the assistance and the candle nine times [sic], while the precentors sing the hymn *Rex sanctorum*, with the choir responding. With the hymn having been finished, the bishop says the *Pater noster*, the Creed and the other prayers, as it is indicated in the book. Then he sings the versicle *Domine apud te est fons vita*. The choir: *Et in lumine. Oremus, Omnipotens sempiternus Deus adesto magnæ pietatis* etc., and then *Per omnia secula sæculorum, Amen*, and the Preface solemnly, with the melody of the *Exsultet*, and while he is singing: *Sumat Unigeniti tui gratiam de Spiritu Sancto*, he makes the sign of the cross on the surface of the water, and when he reaches: *Non inficiendo corrumpat*, here once again he touches the water in the baptismal font in the shape of the cross, and reads with his voice elevated: *Sit hæc sancta et innocens creatura*, then he also sings, making the sign of the cross over or upon it: *Sit fons vivus ✠ aqua ✠ regenerans ✠ unda ✠ purificans*; and then here: *De paradiso emanare præcepit*, he splashes a little water out in the shape of the cross, and says reading: *Hæc nobis præcepta servantibus*, and while he is saying: *Ore benedicito*, he breathes into the baptismal font in the shape of the cross; then thrice he lets the candle down into the water, singing: *Descendat in hanc plenitudinem*, at

the third time keeping it in the water: *Et totam huius aquæ substantiam*, and reads: *Hic omnium peccatorum maculæ*, all the way until the end: *Per eundem*, and *Amen* is answered. Next, reading, he pours the Chrism into the water in the shape of the cross, as it is in the book. Then he pours in the holy Oil the same way. Finally, the precentors begin to sing the litany, and when they reach: *Ut fontem istum benedicere*, thrice the bishop speaks out, first he says: *Benedicere*, secondly: *Benedicere et sanctificare*, for the third time: *Benedicere et sanctificare et consecrare digneris*, and each time he makes the sign of the cross over it.

The litany having been completed, the baptismal font is closed, and the organ begins the Easter *Kyrie*, and the bishop or the celebrant goes up to the altar and dons a white chasuble. At the same place, he says the *Salve regina*, as usual, the versicle *In omni tribulatione*, one oration, and the whole *Adiutorium nostrum*. He says the introductory prayer (accessus) *Per passionem* at the end of the versicle *Proprio Filio suo*. Then stepping up [to the altar], as usual, he sings the Easter *Gloria in excelsis* together with its *Et in terra*, and the bells are rung until the *Qui sedes*. Everything else is said in the customary fashion. There is no Creed, nor Offertory, nor does the organ play the Offertory, only substitutes it (subsistitur). To be noted: after the Epistle the succentor [the dignitary responsible for singing and ceremonies] immediately begins: *Iam Dominus optatas*. Preface: *Te quidem Domine*. The Alleluia *Confitemini* is sung by the precentor all the way through, but the *Alleluia* is repeated by the choir. After the beginning or intonation the choir begins right away the tract: *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes. Communicantes: Et per hanc sanctissimam noctem*. The solemn *Sanctus* is sung, but the *Agnus Dei* is not said. The *Pax Domini* is said, although the pax is not given. There is no Communion chant, but after the reception of communion the antiphon *Alleluia alleluia alleluia* is sung which is repeated by the choir. Psalm: *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*, without the *Gloria Patri*. Antiphon: *Vespere autem sabbati* which is repeated by the choir. Psalm: *Magnificat*, without the *Gloria*. Then the bishop sings: *Dominus vobiscum*. The choir: *Et cum spiritu tuo. Oremus*, and he finishes the Mass with the oration of the Missal: *Spiritum nobis Domine*. The precentors begin, singing the *Benedicamus Domino* with three *Alleluia*-s, just like at Compline [space left empty for notation].

At Compline neither the *Converte nos* nor the *Deus in adiutorium* is said. The celebrant (plebanus) is a canon wearing a white cope, who has been appointed by the succentor, two children are the precentors. *Alleluia. Cum invocarem*. Every psalm without the *Gloria*. Antiphon: *Alleluia. Pascha nostrum Christus est alleluia. Nunc dimittis*. In the end the celebrant says: *Dominus vobiscum*. The choir: *Et cum spiritu tuo. Oremus. Spiritum nobis, Deus qui illuminas, Per Dominum*. The *Benedicamus Domino* is sung by children, like here: *Benedicamus Domino alleluia alleluia alleluia*: [space left empty for notation].

Easter Sunday

For Matins on Easter Sunday the bishop vests as usual; sacred ministers, crosier-bearer, mitre-bearer (astans), two torch-bearers, and no one else. As usual, there is *Domine labia mea aperies*, as well as *Deus in adiutorium*, everything else just like in the book. The verses for the two responsories are sung by children, and after the last homily [that is, the third division of the homily] the responsory is played by the organ.

Before the last homily is finished, the procession is formed with two banners, two large torches, precentors dressed in copes, one acolyte, two cruets with water and wine, two thurifers, one deacon, one subdeacon, as they have been tabulated [the appointments for the different liturgical roles were written up on a board]; and once the organ starts the responsory, they process out of the sacristy in front of the bishop, they walk to the altar of the Holy Cross, down to the holy sepulchre where a table has been prepared. The precentors sing the verse of the responsory, standing face to the holy sepulchre, with their backs to the Lady altar, the reprise is sung by the choir. The responsory having ended, the bishop, standing in front of the table, says the antiphon: *Surrexit Dominus de sepulcro alleluia alleluia*, the choir: *Qui pro nobis*. Then the bishop reverently takes the pyx [the Blessed Sacrament has been placed in it the day before]. He begins the Introit *Resurrexi*, the choir sings it until the very end but without the verse, standing to the side of the Lady altar. In the meantime the bishop goes up to the Lady altar, he unfolds the corporal, takes the Lord's Body, holding the paten underneath it, and he thrice sings turning towards the people: *Pax vobis ego sum alleluia*, and as if giving benediction with the holy Body, he keeps turning to the sides of the altar, singing on a higher and higher pitch. That having been done, the organ immediately starts then *Te Deum laudamus*, and the clergy processes into the choir, alternating with the entire choir in the manner of a half choir [i.e. the processing clergy and those sitting in the choir]. After the *Te Deum laudamus* the bishop says the versicle *Surrexit Dominus vere alleluia, Et apparuit Simoni alleluia. Deus in adiutorium meum intende*, and the antiphons of Lauds are sung in the usual way. There is no chapter, instead the *Hæc dies* is sung which is begun by the precentors, and the *Alleluia Pascha nostrum* is intoned by the succentor, it is finished by the entire choir, and finally the *Alleluia* returns [in the Mass, if a sequence was sung, it usually did not return] etc. Afterwards, the singers right away the Benedictus-antiphon. Then is said: *Dominus vobiscum*, and the oration of the day. *Benedicamus Domino*, like here: [space left empty for notation].

During the entire Octave the *Deus in adiutorium* is always said in Prime and all the other [minor] Hours, there is no *Kyrie*, nor the customary hymns, but immediately after the *Deus in adiutorium* the antiphon *Angelus autem Domini* is begun with all the oth-

ers. Psalms: *Deus in nomine, Beati immaculati, Retribue servo, Confitemini Domino, Laudate Dominum omnes gentes.* Then the antiphon is repeated. At this point the Gradual *Hæc dies* is sung with the verse appointed for this day, and likewise the Alleluia. Next, the orations *Spem nobis Domine* and *Domine sancte Pater* are said. Preces: *Exsultabunt sancti in gloria.* Antiphon for Terce: *Erat autem.* Psalms: *Legem pone* and the others. Gradual: *Hæc dies* and the verse of the day. The Alleluia the similar way, and always the Collect of the day. For Sext and None the same way.

For Mass, instead of the *Asperges me* the *Vidi aquam* is sung. Versicle: *Quoniam apud te est fons vitæ alleluia.* Oration: *Deus qui ad æternam vitam in Christi resurrectione* etc., as in the Capitulare [in Esztergom, it also contained processional material], *Per eundem Christum.* Responsory for the procession: *Cum rex gloriæ* and *Triumphat Dei Filius*, all the way to the end, it is [finished] in the church of St Stephen Protomartyr. Here the celebrant says the versicle: *Surrexit Dominus de sepulcro.* Oration: *Deus qui paschale nobis remedium, Per Christum Dominum nostrum.* Then, standing at the same place, at the rood screen (pulpitum), the precentors sing: *Salve festa dies.* The choir repeats alternately either the half or the whole of the strophe. That having been completed, right away the precentors start the antiphon *Sedit angelus*, and with this they turn back to the cathedral, the choir stands by the rood screen, to the right of the Lady altar, while the canons stand along the two sides of the same altar, and the choir sings the antiphon all the way to the end. Next, four or six children go up to the place from where the Gospel is sung on solemn feast days [most likely to the top of the rood screen], and sing the verse *Crucifixum Dominum.* Then the whole choir sings: *Nolite metuere.* The choir returns to the stalls (redit ad chorum), and the same way it sings to the end. Then, placing the book in the sacristy exactly opposite to the column, the canon precentors sing the second verse, that is: *Recordamini.* The choir responds: *Alleluia.* Then one of the priests says the versicle: *Surrexit Dominus vere alleluia, Et apparuit Simoni.* Oremus, *Suscipe Domine preces nostras*, as in the Capitulare, *Per eundem*, and on the following Sundays, all the way until Ascension Thursday, the ceremony is conducted the same way. Finally, the organ starts playing the Introit: *Resurrexi et adhuc*, and it continues just like in the book. The verse in the Gradual keeps changing. Until *Quasi modo* Sunday only one oration is said, and the Alleluia also keeps changing. The Preface is always the same until Saturday: *Te quidem Domine.* The sequence (prosa) throughout the Octave: *Victimæ paschali*, and after the sequence the choir always sings the *Christus surrexit* with this melody: [space left empty for notation], and it is also played by the organ. During the whole Octave there is a proper *Communicantes*, as well as a proper *Hanc igitur.*

In second Vespers first always *Kyrie* is sung, and until Friday second Vespers always begins with it, as it is customary to be sung at Mass, but on the first three days it is played by the organ. Yet if you prefer, you may so determine that the organ play it all

through the Octave, as at Mass; but if you so will, in the following weekdays until the Octave Day you could order that the *Kyrie* not be played by the organ but be intoned by the precentors and the choir should follow. The *Kyrie* having been finished, the precentors immediately begin the antiphon *Angelus autem Domini*. Until Friday, each day three antiphons and three psalms are sung in choir. Then the precentors intone the Gradual *Hæc dies* and the choir continues, its verse is played by the organ. The daily Alleluia is always begun and finished by the choir, and the Alleluia is always repeated. Normally, the precentors right away begin the Magnificat-antiphon of the day. During the third psalm, the following prepare themselves for the procession: first, a strong (nervosus) man dressed in a cope carries a banner with the image of the Blessed Virgin; second, a torch-bearing child, dressed in a solemn cope; third, a student for the priesthood, dressed in a cope, with incense and the incense boat [navicula]; fourth, a student for the priesthood in the order of acolytes, wearing a white dalmatic, carrying the Gospel Book (plenarium); fifth, an acolyte wearing an alb, carrying the Chrism in cruets with their bottoms bound [wrapped all around with a cotton cloth]; sixth, a student for the priesthood or a strong man carrying the Easter Candle (Exsultet); seventh, an acolyte wearing an alb, carrying the Oil in cruets with their bottoms bound; eighth, a deacon wearing a white dalmatic without anything else; ninth, a priest with a thurible, wearing a white cope; tenth, torch-bearing children dressed in solemn copes; eleventh, a strong man wearing a cope, carrying another banner with the image of the Crucified Lord. As soon as the antiphon begins, the procession sets out and lines up in front of the choir [presumably on the planum]. The *Magnificat* and the antiphon having been sung, the celebrant (præsidents) says: *Dominus vobiscum. Et cum. Oremus.* The oration of the day, *Per eundem Dominum nostrum* etc. *Amen*, and nothing else. Then the procession descends to the baptismal font, while the organ starts playing the *Vidi aquam*, and the choir walks towards the altar of Sts Fabian and Sebastian [it was in the apse of the southern side nave which means that the choir left the stalls through the gate on that side]. Those who have been vested, process towards the altar of the Holy Cross, on the left side [through the rood screen which, most likely, had two gates], one after the other, one by one, slowly, but beforehand the canons walk out and sit down along the two sides of the Lady altar. The celebrant, together with those who have been vested, nine times circles the baptismal font. That being done, those who have been vested, line up in procession, one after the other, before the altar of the Holy Cross, while the celebrant sits down on the chair that has been prepared at the same place. After the organ finished the *Vidi aquam*, the precentors sing the verse in front of the Lady altar, facing the altar, and the organ plays the *Gloria Patri*, while the precentors and the entire choir, to whom it pertains, sing the whole [of the reprise]. Then the precentors start singing the [other] two antiphons: *Respondens autem angelus* and *Cito euntes*, together

with the psalms, singing alternately in choir arrangement. Once these are over, the celebrant, standing at the baptismal font, says the versicle: *Quoniam apud te*. The choir: *Et in lumine tuo*. Oremus, *Deus qui omnes in Christo renatos* etc., *Per eundem Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum*, and *Amen* is answered. At this point, the organ starts the responsory *Christus resurgens ex mortuis*. The appointed precentor canons and some children with good voices, and whoever else wants to join, go up above the altar of the Holy Cross [to the top of the rood screen], and sing the verse *Dicant nunc Iudæi*; there is no *Gloria Patri*, but immediately follows the reprise on the organ, and once the organ has started the reprise, the canons right away go up to the choir stalls, joined by the choir itself, but towards the altar of Sts Fabian and Sebastian. Those who have been vested, go into the sacristy, but the celebrant, in the company of the torch-bearers and precentors, goes to the choir through the rood screen. Once he is returned, he says the versicle: *In resurrectione tua Christe alleluia*. The choir: *Cælum et terra*. Oremus, *Præsta quæsumus omnipotens Deus ut qui resurrectionis dominicæ*, *Per eundem Dominum*, and *Amen* is answered. *Dominus vobiscum*. *Et cum spiritu*. The *Benedicamus Domino* is sung by the precentors, and nothing else. Finally, the bishop gives his blessing.

After the blessing, Compline begins. *Converte nos Deus*. *Deus in adiutorium*. Two children sing: *Alleluia*. Psalms: *Cum invocarem* and so forth. After the psalms, the *Alleluia alleluia alleluia* returns. *Hæc dies quam fecit Dominus*. *Alleluia* is sung and repeated at the end. Afterwards, the antiphon *Alleluia resurrexit Dominus* is sung. *Nunc dimittis*. Orations: *Spiritum nobis Domine*, *Deus qui illuminas*. *Benedicamus Domino*, as it is here: [space left empty for notation]. Commemoration (suffragium) at the Lady altar: *Regina cæli*, with the oration: *Deus qui per gloriam resurrectionis*.

Vigil of Whitsun

At Mass, the bishop or another celebrant comes out of the sacristy with the assistance. He begins the prophecy *Tentavit Deus*; if he wants to, he can sing it himself, if not, someone else can sing it. Tract: *Cantemus*. Second prophecy: *Scriptis Moyses*. Tract: *Attende Domine*. Third prophecy: *Apprehendent septem mulieres*. Tract: *Vinea fecunda*. Fourth prophecy: *Audi Israel*. After this, an oration is said and the tract *Sicut cervus* is sung. Right away, the celebrant says an oration. While these are going on, the following line up in procession: first a banner, upon which an image of the Blessed Virgin is painted; a torch-bearer, an acolyte carrying the incense and the incense boat; one subdeacon who has been tabulated, carrying the Chrism; one student for the priesthood in the order of acolytes or a strong man carries the Easter Candle; the Oil is

carried by an acolyte; then comes the tabulated deacon; the thurible is carried by a priest who is followed by children carrying torches, and finally another banner. All these should wear copes, except for the acolytes who wear albs, and the two sacred ministers, that is, the deacon and the subdeacon, who shall wear white dalmatics. Finally, they should process out and line up in front of the choir in the usual way. The precentors sing the hymn *Rex sanctorum*, and the choir continues, while they go down in front of the altar of Sts Fabian and Sebastian. The procession, which has been lined up before the choir, now goes together with the celebrant down to the baptismal font towards the altar of the Holy Cross. There the celebrant, in the company of those who have been vested, circles the baptismal font nine times, while the hymn *Rex sanctorum* is finished. Then the celebrant says: *Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie. Pater noster, Et ne nos. Credo in Deum*. Next, he begins to consecrate the baptismal font, as is customary on Holy Saturday. That being done, the precentors begin the litany. Once the litany is finished, the organ or the precentors begin the *Kyrie eleison*, and process into the choir. In the meantime, the celebrant goes into the sacristy, dons solemn vestments, and together with the sacred ministers, he walks in front of the high altar. He makes his public confession, and sings the Easter *Gloria in excelsis*, without the bells tolling. Then the celebrant says: *Dominus vobiscum*. Oration: *Præsta quasumus omnipotens Deus ut claritatis tuæ* etc. Epistle: *Cum Apollo esset Corinthi*. The Alleluia *Confitemini Domino* is begun by the precentors, and the choir responds *Alleluia*, the precentors start it once again, and they finish it together. The choir begins the Tract *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*, its second verse is played by the organ or sung by the other half of the choir.

For the singing of the Gospel lights are not carried, only incense. Gospel: *Si diligitis me mandata mea*. Creed is said. Offertory: *Emitte Spiritum tuum*. Preface: *Qui ascendens super omnes calos*, with its proper *Communicantes*. Solemn *Sanctus*. Communion: *Ultimo festivitatis*.

At Mass, incense is used all the way until the elevation.

Ember Saturday within the Octave of Whitsun

At the Mass of the day the Introit (officium): *Caritas Dei. Kyrie Cunctipotens*. With the *Et in terra* done, the consecrating bishop (dominus ordinans) calls forth the acolytes, and begins to ordain them, while the prophecies are sung, as is customary. After the prophecies the precentor begins: *Benedictus es Domine Deus*. Once that is over, the bishop has those to be ordained stand on two sides: the ones to be ordained subdeacons towards the bell, the other ones to be ordained deacons towards the Lord's

Body [that is, towards the so-called Pastophorium], and the ones to be ordained priests in the middle. Together with these and the sacred ministers he right away begins the litany on his knees, and then he stands up and says: *Ut hos electos benedicere*, then once again he kneels down and thus continues. All these having been done, he has those who are to be ordained subdeacons called forth by the canon succentors, and once they are ordained, he has them stand back in line. Standing erect, he says: *Pax vobis*. The choir: *Et cum spiritu tuo. Oremus*. Orations as in the book. After the oration, one of the newly ordained ones dons a dalmatic, and begins the Epistle: *Convenit univ[er]sa civitas*. Then the Alleluia is started by the precentors, and it is repeated by the choir. The Alleluia having been sung, the canon succentor begins the sequence *Veni Sancte Spiritus*. After the sequence the bishop (dominus ordinarius) has those who are to be ordained deacons called forth, and once he has ordained them, he has them stand back in line. One of them dons a dalmatic and starts singing the Gospel: *Surgens Iesus de synagoga*. The Gospel having been sung, the Creed is said. After the word *Patrem* the bishop has those who are about to be ordained priests called forth, and once he has ordained them with all the [necessary] ceremonies, he says: *Dominus vobiscum. Et cum Spiritu tuo*. The choir then begins the Offertory. Preface: *Qui ascendens super omnes caelos*, with the proper *Communicantes*. Solemn *Sanctus*. Following the *Agnus Dei*, the Communion chant is not started, only after the solemn promise, namely: *Promittis te domino archiepiscopo eiusdemque successoribus*, the precentor, therefore, only begins the Communion after this. After the Communion the bishop gives penance to those ordained, and, finally, addresses pious admonitions to them, at the discretion of His Paternity (quemadmodum suae paternitati placuerit), and at last [he finishes thus]: *Ite in orbem*.

Corpus Christi

At the appointed hour the entire clergy shall gather in the cathedral, dressed in solemn chasubles, others in copes, holding relics in their hands. Meanwhile, all the religious from the monasteries [nearby] and the pastors of parishes come to the gate of the castle [where the cathedral was also located] in procession. At this point the bishop, together with the sacred ministers, processes out of the sacristy, holding the Blessed Sacrament in his hands. The precentors begin the hymn: *Tantum ergo sacramentum* in front of the sacristy, and the choir continues, while the celebrant (dominus praesidens) walks reverently before the high altar, with great care places the holy Body on the altar, and standing in front of the altar, he begins solemnly the *Asperges me*. Versicle: *Ostende nobis Domine*. Oration: *Præsta quæsumus omnipotens Deus per hanc sanctifi-*

cata. The oration being finished, the precentors start the responsory *Homo quidam*, and with this the procession sets out towards the church of St George [a church in the city of Esztergom], at the same place the procession goes to the Lady chapel and to the church of St Ambrose, and finally it goes [back] up to the castle. After the procession, somebody says the versicle: *Posuit fines*. Oration: *Fac nos Domine divinitatis tuæ*.

During the procession the baldachin is carried by the servants of the archbishop.

All Saints

As soon as Compline is done, the *Libera me* begins, and procession is led into the narthex; one of the canons or the celebrant dons a black cope, and begins [the Office] of the Dead. There the *Placebo Domino* is led by two canon precentors, in the usual manner. That being done, the canon succentor starts the responsory *Ne recorderis* [while] we go back to the choir. After the responsory the Vigil [Matins] of the Dead is immediately begun in the choir, and all the canons should be present. It is sung slowly (morose) with nine readings, and the last responsory is always the *Libera me Domine*, at the end of which the antiphon *Michael præpositus paradisi* is sung with its proper oration.