

Unknown Fragments of Ordines

in Medieval Hungary and Related Central European Churches*

One of the most often cited items among dom Mabillon's liturgical achievements is the *Museum Italicum*, and particularly the collection of Roman ceremonial sources in it, collected under the title *Ordines Romani*.¹ Although his publication has been rendered out of date by the critical edition of Michel Andrieu,² Andrieu's heir and disciple, Cyrille Vogel regards Mabillon's work as still indispensable on account of its elucidating commentaries and because it contains several other documents coming from later periods than those of Andrieu's interests, but forming an integral part of the genre's tradition and which can furnish us with a more accurate and subtle knowledge of the medieval Roman liturgy.³ It is Mabillon's peculiar scholarly merit that he considers his matter as continuous until his own age, thus he does not suppose any sharp break—contrary to the opinion of many XXth century historians—between the so-called old Roman use and the one influenced by Frankish or Germanic practice.⁴

For Mabillon himself this is not a question of philology or genre history to be solved. He simply follows the chronological order of the Roman sources up to the ceremonial compiled by Patrizio Piccolomini, which became the basic document of papal services during the whole modern era.⁵ Yet Mabillon's treatment—perhaps unwillingly—casts doubts on a widely accepted hypothesis,⁶ namely that the productive period of Roman ordines ended definitely with the appearance of the *Pontificale Roma-*

* Paper read at the conference “Colloque International: Mabillon et l'Europe bénédictine aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles” in honour of the 300th anniversary of Jean Mabillon's death, at the benedictine abbey of Solesmes, on the 18th of May 2007. Sponsored by the project OTKA T 047 163.

¹ Jean MABILLON OSB: *Musei Italici tomus II. complectens antiquos libros rituales sanctae Romanae ecclesiae cum commentario praevio in Ordinem Romanum*. Paris 1689. = (Patrologia Latina 78) 851–1406.

² Michel ANDRIEU: *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*. Ravenstraat 112, Louvain 1931–1961. (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 11, 23, 24, 28, 29).

³ Cyrille VOGEL: *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources. Revised and Translated by William Storey and Niels Rasmussen*. Pastoral Press, Portland—Oregon 1986. 140.

⁴ This conclusion may be drawn from his introduction (*Op. cit.* [Patrologia Latina 78] 851–857.) and his own selection: the ordines numbered by him as 11–15 are from the XIIth–XVth centuries. Another point of view is presented by Niels Krogh RASMUSSEN — Marcel HAVERALS: *Les pontificaux du haut moyen âge. Genèse du livre de l'évêque*. Ravenstraat 112, Leuven 1998. (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 49) 22–24.

⁵ Marc DYKMANS SI: *L'œuvre de Patrizi Piccolomini ou le cérémonial papal de la première renaissance I–II*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1980–1982. (Studi e Testi 293–294).

⁶ E.g. VOGEL: *Op. cit.* 139., Eric PALAZZO: *Histoire des livres liturgiques. Le Moyen Âge. Des origines au XIII^e siècle*. Beauchesne, Paris 1993. 190., 210.

no-Germanicum in the Xth century.⁷ In this compilation made originally at Mayence a considerable part of the ordines has been fixed as series and completed with liturgical texts proper. In the course of its rapid spread even Italy and Rome were eventually reached, thus making the further use of independent ordines soon needless. Accordingly, the life of the liturgical ordo as a genre would have come to an end: its direct descendants should be the rubrics of the pontificals, its functional descendants some new rubrical genres, for instance the ordinal, the customary, and later the directory or the ceremonial.⁸

The last few years I have been engaged in collecting, editing and contextualizing—on a European level—the ceremonial sources of Esztergom, an archiepiscopal see far smaller than the Roman one, yet one which has been the head of the Hungarian Church up to the present day. This work followed—on the path marked by Mabilion—a merely chronological order of the sources: not that I, being a philologist, was not interested in textual tradition, but because all the surviving documents from medieval Esztergom are more recent than the end of the first millennium, and their number is so low that more than one redaction of each is scarcely ever known. The results of this work, however, lead to the conclusion that there may have existed ordines more or less independent from the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*, created (or borrowed) and transmitted in Hungary up to the end of the Middle Ages, making it rather possible that parallel phenomena could be observed even elsewhere. In the following, I summarize the reconstruction process of “Esztergom ordines”, describing some important days of the temporal cycle. Afterwards, I survey the relationship between these and some other sources both published and unpublished, looking at their peculiarities and genres. Finally, I point out some new ways for the research on rubrics in the Central European region and the period after the first millennium.

1. *From the rites of public penance in the Epitome pontificalis sæculi XI. (Zagreb, MK/BU MR 165.)*

2. *From the rites of public penance in the Missale notatum Strigoniense ante 1341 (Bratislava, AM EC. Lad. 3. & EL. 18.)*

⁷ Cyrille VOGEL — Reinhard ELZE: *Le pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle I–III*. Città del Vaticano 1963, 1972. (Studi e Testi 226–227, 269).

⁸ For the typology of some of them, see PALAZZO: *Op. cit.* 221sq., 239sq.; Aimé-Georges MARTI-MORT: *Les “Ordines”, les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, Brepols, Turnhout 1991. (Typologie des sources du moyen âge 56) 49sq. In greater detail, see the first part of my work in preparation under the title *Rubrica Strigoniensis. A középkori Esztergom liturgiájának normaszövegei* [Rubrica Strigoniensis. The Norm Texts of the Liturgy of Medieval Esztergom].

FRAGMENTS OF “ESZTERGOM ORDINES” ON THE TEMPORAL CYCLE

Beyond the liturgical books proper there are no other witnesses to worship in medieval Esztergom before the Council of Trent than a printed ordinal published in six known editions between 1496 and 1520,⁹ and an abridged, handwritten ordinal from somewhat before 1469.¹⁰ In order to supplement this rather limited material, I have transcribed and systematized all the rubrics of our most important books for the mass and the office of undoubtedly central origin, among them the two most frequently cited manuscripts of XI–XIIth century Hungary,¹¹ two representative examples from the XIII–XIVth centuries¹² and our first printed missal and breviary.¹³ Looking for sources that could supplement ordinals and could also be compared with one another, I restricted my interest to the liturgical year, leaving out all the ordines of the ritual or the pontifical concerning the administration of other sacraments or sacramentals.

By the classification of rubrical items it became clear that all the directive texts written or printed in red were to be listed into three groups:

⁹ *Ordinarius Strigoniensis Ecclesie*. Nürnberg 1496. (RMK III. 35.); *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum aliam Strigoniensem ecclesiam*. S. l. s. a. (RMK III. 70a: probably in Nürnberg, at the end of the XVth century); *Ordinarius Strigoniensis*. Venezia 1505. (RMK III. 134.); *Ordinarius Strigoniensis*. Venezia 1509. (RMK III. 165.) prepared for edition by FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: *Ordinarius Strigoniensis. Venetiis, anno Domini MCCCCCIX*. (RMK III. 165.) (manuscript); *Ordinarius Strigoniensis*. Lyon 1510. (RMK III. 166.); *Ordinarium Strigoniense*. Venezia 1520. (RMK III. 238.). The abbreviation “RMK” refers to a catalogue of incunabula and early prints abroad for Hungarian purpose: SZABÓ Károly — HELLEBRANT Árpád: *Régi magyar könyvtár III. Magyar szerzőktől külföldön 1480-tól 1711-ig megjelent nem magyar nyelvű nyomtatványoknak könyvészeti kézikönyve* [Old Hungarian Library III. A Bibliographical Handbook of Foreign Language Prints by Hungarian Authors Published Abroad from 1480 to 1711]. A M. Tud. Akadémia Könyvkiadó Hivatala, Budapest 1896. A recent supplement is SZABÓ Károly — HELLEBRANT Árpád: *Régi magyar könyvtár III-dik kötet. Magyar szerzőktől külföldön 1480-tól 1711-ig megjelent nem magyar nyelvű nyomtatványoknak könyvészeti kézikönyve. Pótlások, kiegészítések, javítások 1*. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1990.

¹⁰ Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtár Cod. lat. 73. 1^r–38^v. *Rubrica Strigoniensis ante 1469*. (so-called „*Szepesi ordinarius*”). Its XIXth century edition full of serious mistakes can be found in DANKÓ József: *Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariae*. Franklin, Budapest 1893. 485–571. (*Ordinarius Scepusiensis sive ...*). A more recent edition is provided by FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: *Rubrica Strigoniensis ante 1469*. Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtár Cod. Lat. 73. 1^r–38^v. « *Ordinarius Scepusiensis* » (manuscript).

¹¹ Zagreb, Metropolitanska Knjižnica / Bibl. Univ. MR 165. *Epítome pontificalis saeculi XI*. (so-called “*Hartvik-agenda*”); Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár MNy 1. *Sacramentarium monasticum Hungaricum saeculi XII*. (so-called “*Pray-kódex*”).

¹² Praha, Strahovská Knihovna (Bibliotheca Monasterii Strahoviensis) DE. I. 7. = SZENDREI Janka: *Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense saeculi XIII*. Budapest 1998. (Musicalia Danubiana 17); Bratislava, Archiv Mesta EC. Lad. 3. & EL. 18. = SZENDREI Janka — Richard RIBARIČ: *Missale Notatum Strigoniense ante 1341 in Posonio*. Budapest 1982. (Musicalia Danubiana 1).

¹³ *Breviarium Strigoniense*. S. l. 1484. (RMK III. 9.) = Venezia 1480. (RMK III. 1.); *Missale secundum chorum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis*. Nürnberg 1484. (RMK III. 7.).

3. *The beginning of the Holy Saturday ordo in the Sacramentarium monasticum Hungaricum sæculi XII.*
(Budapest, OSzKMNy 1.)

4. *The beginning of the Holy Saturday ordo in the Missale secundum chorom alme ecclesie Strigoniensis.*
Nürnberg 1484. (RMK III. 7.)

- 1) titles of liturgical items, services or dates,
- 2) longer and relatively late paragraphs on calendar problems,
- 3) ceremonial descriptions on important days of the year documented already in the first sources.

While items of the first group are connected only by their common terminology and those of the second one are exclusively present in late, first of all printed documents, the third group contains long passages formulated in the same manner in a majority of sources.¹⁴ This is especially strange, because the books come from a long period ranging from about 1090 to 1480, and—beside the missals and breviaries—there is a so-called “agenda pontificalis” and a sacramentary among them. The related rubrics according to the annual cycle are as follows:

- 1) Candlemas,
- 2) Ash Wednesday,
- 3) Palm Sunday,
- 4) Maundy Thursday A: office in the last three days of Holy Week,
- 5) Maundy Thursday B: reconciliation of penitents,
- 6) Maundy Thursday C: blessing of oils,
- 7) Good Friday,
- 8) Holy Saturday,
- 9) Easter Day.

First, I prepared a critical edition of all the rubrics either related to one another or not.¹⁵ In this edition, the liturgical texts proper, enclosed by the rubrics, have been reduced everywhere to their incipits, since the sources—in accordance with their genres—are not uniform with respect to quoting texts either in a brief reference or in full, even though their rubrics are remarkably similar. In this way I gained continuous

¹⁴ This was suggested at first by Gabriella Galbács working on a liturgical and musical analysis of the Holy Week according to medieval Esztergom use.

¹⁵ FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: *Fragmenta Pontificalis antiqui Strigoniensis collata ex integris rubricis sex principalium fontium sæculorum XI–XVI., earundem synopsi atque nonnullis testibus referentiisque* (manuscript) 1–50.

ordines (apart from the less characteristic rubrics mentioned above in the first two groups), which are not inferior, both in content and in extent to some shorter pieces of the *Ordines Romani*.¹⁶

5. *From the critical edition of the Epiphany play “Tractus stella”*

The texts are apparently in a close relationship, while the books are from quite different ages and genres. This lead me to suppose that the ordines are primary to their intermediaries, therefore this reorganisation of rubrics into ordines might to amount to a reconstruction of their original state before they had been compiled with other liturgical texts. To ascertain this finding, the closely related texts were compared in tables.¹⁷ With the help of these the common text has easily been detected, and also the modifications and some proper editorial features of each redaction have become well identified. This latter approach was similarly useful for learning more about the single books themselves,¹⁸ being outstandingly important for Hungarian medieval studies as well¹⁹.

6. *Comparative table of some Good Friday rubrics*

Nevertheless, it is the principal text of the ordines that could be worthy of an international interest. This principal text was demonstrated in my edition before each table by highlighting the words and sentences common in two or more sources, and ignoring some parts only contained in one of them. This typographic distinction is quite an objective one: the passages or variants which were thought to be an integral part of the principal text but did not survive in more than one place, are not stressed with a special type, thus the reader can be sure that the textual basis of the ordines is not a mere editorial idea, but a common substratum of sources relatively separated from one another in time and space.

7. *The reconstructed text of the Palm Sunday ordo*

¹⁶ E.g. ANDRIEU: *Op. cit.* III. 235–532. (ordines 20–33.).

¹⁷ FÖLDVÁRY: *Fragmenta Pontificalis* ... 51–99.

¹⁸ For more details, see my work in preparation cited above. Some of the results are already anticipated by FÖLDVÁRY Miklós István: „« Ligatis natibus ». Egy romlatlan szöveg hely tanulságai” [“Ligatis natibus”. The testimonies of a *Locus Incompactus*], *Magyar Egyháztudományi Közlemények* XII (2004/2005) 387–408.

¹⁹ Their best and most recent analysis may be found in SZENDREI Janka: *A „mos patriae” kialakulása 1341 előtti hangjegyes forrásaink tükrében* [Formation of the “Mos Patriae” as Reflected in Hungarian Notational Sources before 1341]. Balassi Kiadó, Budapest 2005.

POSSIBLE PATTERNS AND ORIGIN OF THE “ESZTERGOM ORDINES”

Of course, the question had to be asked whether the reconstructed ordines are characteristic to the Hungarian liturgical tradition, or their concordance is due to another common model or archetype beyond the regional framework. If the first hypothesis were proved, it means that no former and wide-spread pattern could be identified as standing behind the ordines, there arises a further question of their relationship to other Central European documents and to those of Hungarian but peripheral origin. In order to establish this, a collection of references was gathered from twenty-eight representative sources.²⁰ In this collection there stand the most proper and undoubtedly original paragraphs of the supposed principal document before each chapter, followed by parallels of their respective liturgical content. These were selected from three groups of sources:

- 1) early, wide-spread or Western European sources published in modern editions,²¹
- 2) other Central European (South German, Austrian, Bohemian, Polish and Aquileian) sources,²²
- 3) Hungarian sources other than those of the central rite (Zagrabian, Transilvanian, Pauline, etc.).²³

²⁰ FÖLDVÁRY: *Fragmenta Pontificalis* ... 101–137.

²¹ ANDRIEU: *Op. cit.*; RASMUSSEN — HAVERALS: *Op. cit.*; VOGEL — ELZE: *Op. cit.*; Michel ANDRIEU: *Le Pontifical Romain au moyen-âge I. Le pontifical Romain du XII^e siècle*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1938. (Studi e Testi 86); Edmond MARTÈNE: *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus etc. III*. Antwerpen 1764.

²² Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ 330. *Pontificale monasticum Germanicum sæculi XII*; Kraków, Biblioteka Kapitulna Ms. 51. (83.). *Breviarium (proprie dictum) sæculi XII*; San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Guarneriana Ms. 4. *Breviarium notatum de « San Daniele » sæculi XII*; Zagreb, Metropolitanska Knjižnica / Bibl. Univ. MR 25. *Pontificale sæculi XIV*; Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituly P 3. *Agenda ecclesie Pragensis 1294 (Tobia)*; Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ 93. *Missale Pragense sæculi XIV*; Kraków, Biblioteka Kapitulna Ms. 11. (28.). *Pontificale sæculi XV/1*; Kraków, Biblioteka Kapitulna Ms. 12. *Pontificale « Olesnickiego » sæculi XV*; Szombathely, Egyházmegyei Könyvtár Cod. Lat. 2. *Missale Salzburgerense sæculi XV*; *Breviarium ... archiepiscopatus Pragensis ...* Nürnberg 1492.

²³ Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ 359. *Missale Strigoniense sæculi XV*. (so-called. “Pálóczi-misszale”); Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. Vin. Palat. 1829. *Breviarium Strigoniense sæculi XV*; Güssing, Klosterbibliothek der Franziskaner Cod. 1/43. *Missale notatum Zagrabiense sæculi XIII/1*. (so-called “Németújvári misszale”); İstanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Deissmann 60. *Missale notatum Hungaricum sæculi XIII–XIV*. (so-called “Işztambul misszale”); *Missale secundum Chorum et Rubricam Almi episcopatus Zagrabiensis Ecclesie roboratum et approbatum in sacra synodo et generali capitulo ...* Venezia 1511; Zagreb, Metropolitanska Knjižnica / Bibl. Univ. MR 46. *Breviarium Zagrabiense sæculi XV*; Zagreb, Metropolitanska Knjižnica / Bibl. Univ. MR 43. *Breviarium Colocense sæculi XIV–XV*; Roma, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. Lat. 8247. *Breviarium Varadinense 1460*; Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum 63. 74. 1. C. *Breviarium Scepusiense sæculi XV*. (so-called “Bártfai breviarium”); Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek Cod. 107. R 79. *Missale Paulinorum; Missale fratrum heremitarum Ordinis divi Pauli primi heremite. Sub regula beati Augustini doctoris eximii: summo deo militantium*. Venezia 1514; Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár

Parallels having textual connection with the “Esztergom ordines” were emphasized by being set in a frame. The collation of references has resulted in a negative answer from all points of view. This means that the collection of ordines was definitely associated with the rite of Hungary’s primatial see: it does not have any notable antecedent among sources known in Europe from the first millennium; it does not have any parallel with rubrics of related Central European Churches, and its use is limited even within the ecclesiastical province subordinate to Esztergom to the very environment of the cathedral itself. However, there are some significant textual parallels rendered by two groups of sources.

8. *A Zagrabian parallel to a passage of the Holy Saturday rubrics*

All the rubrics of the last three days of the Holy Week are attached—albeit on a different level—to the *Ordines Romani*, or rather to the ordo numbered by Andrieu as the 50,²⁴ and thus to the section describing the liturgical year in the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*.²⁵ Both Ordo 50 and the pontifical preserving it were copied nearly all over Europe during the XIth century (in the time of our oldest document treated), consequently their borrowing is of minor importance.²⁶ On the other hand, it is the very way of adopting texts which can indicate the level of independence in each of the borrowings. Regarding the relationship to their antecedent, the “Esztergom ordines” can be classified as follows:

- 1) an almost direct borrowing but in a special variant: Maundy Thursday (blessing of oils);
- 2) borrowings in a special variant with proper additions: Maundy Thursday (penance), Good Friday;
- 3) proper texts with allusions to OR 50 or PRG: Maundy Thursday (office), Holy Saturday;
- 4) definitely proper texts: Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Easter Day.

Another smaller group of parallels can be found in sources later than the first known redaction of the ordines, which bear the special features of the Hungarian rites but do not belong to their central tradition. That is the case with a couple of sentences regulating the divine office during the *sacrum triduum* in a XVth century Pauline manuscript breviary²⁷ and with a short passage on the consecration of the baptismal font on Holy Saturday in the Zagreb missal printed in 1511.²⁸ Both the Pauline Order and

Clmæ 132. *Breviarium Paulinorum sæculi XV; Breviarium ordinis fratrum eremitarum sancti Pauli primi eremite iterata castigatione recognitum cum plena rubrica*. Venezia 1540.

²⁴ ANDRIEU: *Ordines Romani* ... V. 83sqq.

²⁵ VOGEL — ELZE: *Op. cit.* II. 1sqq.

²⁶ VOGEL: *Op. cit.* 237–239.

²⁷ Budapest, OSzK Clmæ 132. 198^r–199^r.

²⁸ *Missale ... Zagradiensis Ecclesie* 83^r–94^v.

the Bishopric of Zagreb had been founded by Esztergom,²⁹ but in a more developed state of their liturgical practice they also expressed their ritual identity, sometimes even surpassing their mother Church in ceremonial organization and publishing books. Consequently the fragments are obviously remnants pre-dating the time when the rubrics peculiar to those rites were composed. The parallel of Zagreb is especially interesting, because the oldest witness of the “Esztergom ordines” was already brought to Zagreb by the end of the XIth century and was kept in use for a long time onwards.³⁰ Yet it is not the variant coming from this that we find at the relevant place in the printed missal of Zagreb but rather that of our most important XIVth century missal used later in Bratislava (Pozsony) and that of its XVth century printed descendant.³¹ Within the Zagreb rubrics—otherwise completely redrafted—this connection is an indirect reminder that the variant documented only from the XIVth century on was already existent before the formation of a special Zagreb rite.

In spite of this, we may not suppose that all the dioceses in Hungary used to be affected by the “Esztergom ordines”, as if every difference documented later would be a result of secondary change. The rubrics of our two missals rather old as compared to the Hungarian average do not show any relationship with our reconstructed text, although their style is closely related to it.³² Knowing the early history of Hungarian liturgy, this indicates that it was especially the cathedrals environment, which cultiva-

²⁹ On the Pauline liturgy see TÖRÖK József: *A magyar pálosrend liturgiájának forrásai, kialakulása és főbb sajátosságai (1225–1600)* [Sources, Formation and Characteristics of the Liturgy of the Hungarian Pauline Order (1225–1600)]. Római Katolikus Hittudományi Akadémia, Budapest 1977. Apart from the liturgical books themselves there are many ceremonial details in [Gregorius GENGIJESINUS:] *Incipit directorium singulorum Fratrum officialium ordinis sancti Pauli primi heremite sub regula beati Augustini episcopi militantium — Epitoma seu brevilogia in quo omnium religiosorum profectus et profectuum adminicula. Itemque defectus et defectuum antidota describuntur — Incipiunt declarationes constitutionum ordinis fratrum heremitarum Sancti Pauli primi heremite etc. Super passus obscuros earundem: partim ex actis Capitulorum generalium: partim vero ex privilegiis ordinis eiusdem et iure canonico recollecte.* Roma 1518–1521. (RMK III. 965.) — I am indebted to Balázs Déri for calling my attention to this latent source. On the Zagreb rite see Sigismundus FERRARIUS: *De rebus Hungariae provinciae ordinis.* Wien 1637. 1–10., 115–142., „Appendix” 1–43; Balthasarius Adami de Corbavia KERCSÉLICH: *Historiae Cathedralis Ecclesiae Zagrabiensis.* Zagreb 1770. XIII; DOBSZAY László: „Árpád-kori kottás misekönyvünk provenienciája” [The Provenience of a Hungarian Notational Missal of the Árpád-Era?], *Zenetudományi dolgozatok* VI (1984) 10; KNIEWALD D. Károly: „Officium et missa de Conceptione et Nativitate B. M. V. secundum consuetudinem veterem Zagrabiensem”, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* LXXIII (1959) 5. — I thank Orsolya Csomó for her kind bibliographical aid with the Zagreb liturgy. The detailed description of Zagreb’s office is being prepared by Andrea Kovács and László Dobszay as the next volume of *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europae* edited by the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

³⁰ Zagreb, MK/BU MR 165.

³¹ SZENDREI — RIBARIČ: *Missale Notatum ...: Missale secundum chorum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis.*

³² Güssing, KBF Cod. 1/43; İstanbul, TSM Deissmann 60.

ted some kind of a scheduled, centralizing project to establish a textual tradition of rubrics surviving for more than four centuries.

The comparison of rubrics by sources can also prove the supposed process, namely that after some time a few longer, originally continuous ordines were broken down into shorter rubrics frequently interrupted by liturgical texts proper. The first known variants from the XIth–XIVth centuries are in their later equivalents partly abridged and broken up into little bits, partly completed. While in the first ones there are practically no other rubrics than those of the ordines and even these stand as closed units between liturgical texts proper, in the latter ones the former text of the ordines is scattered fragmentarily among other, more recent rubrics and alternates with liturgical texts. It is also to be emphasized that none of the ordines can be found as being apart from the others, as they always form a series in the same source — the only exception seems to be the passage on the offices beginning with Maundy Thursday, but this separation of items concerning the mass or the office is evidently a later development.³³

As suggested by the textual analysis, our oldest surviving manuscript cannot be considered as the first or even most complete witness of the rediscovered ordines. Therefore, I had to record the common features of a principal text in order to deduce the genre of the liturgical book in which these ordines and the rite laid down by them were once fixed in a way authoritative for the whole Archdiocese of Esztergom. The most important features of my supposed archetype could be defined as follows:

- 1) its first known source is from the end of the XIth century (*terminus ante quem*);
- 2) its last non fragmentary documents are from the XVth century;
- 3) its most complete redaction begins with Candlemas, thus it has a temporal and a sanctoral mixed;
- 4) it contains rubrics regarding both the mass and the office;
- 5) but it does not contain their primary material, thus it is neither an antiphonal nor a sacramentary;
- 6) it reports the rites of sacraments and sacramentals connected with the pontifical and the ritual;
- 7) there are processions in it described in detail;
- 8) its chapters bear a title beginning with the noun of “ordo”;
- 9) it originally forms a series completed with liturgical texts proper.

All of these features identify an early kind of pontifical, namely the type of book which obtained its representative shape in the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum* in the middle of the Xth century, but whose antecedents can be detected already earlier.³⁴ As

³³ The oldest and most complete witness of our representative sources, the manuscript Zagreb, MK/BU MR 165. has the ordo in question at its right place in the liturgical year.

³⁴ VOGEL: *Op. cit.* 226–230; PALAZZO: *Op. cit.* 204–209; RASMUSSEN — HAVERALS: *Op. cit.* passim.

opposed to later episcopal books, this genre is not limited to rites executed by the bishop himself,³⁵ but it is a sort of liturgical summary partly rendering single ordines as a uniform series, partly collecting all the rites (except those of the mass and the office) and even the irregular cases of the latter ones. It follows that this book was definitely not designed for practical use during services, but it was conceived to represent an encyclopedic collection of rites not adequately codified before. As such, it was especially suitable for establishing and demonstrating the tradition of a newly founded episcopal see proud of its institutional and liturgical independence.

Hence I suppose that Esztergom compiled her own, characteristic pontifical already in the early decades after the foundation of an independent Hungarian Church—according to some records even before her own antiphonal and sacramentary³⁶—following the patterns of genre given by the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*, but often departing from it in a creative manner. This pontifical, lost by now, was still regarded as an archetype while copying eminent sources of the XIIIth–XIVth century. From the XVth century on, however, its influence seems to become rather indirect by way of missals and breviaries. This collection did not unfrequently determine the choice and order of liturgical texts in the subsequent, mature Esztergom rite, but it was the textual tradition of the ordines which proved to be the steadiest of all. As the relation of the ordines with one another is closer than the contact between them and the genres of their intermediary books or the attached liturgical texts, there is a possibility that the “Esztergom ordines” describing the temporal cycle were made in the workshop and for the use of the pontifical, but drafted independently from that — in the same way as it is touched upon by Andrieu regarding the relationship between Ordo 50 and the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*.³⁷

³⁵ Such as ANDRIEU: *Le Pontifical ...*; Michel ANDRIEU: *Le Pontifical Romain au moyen-âge II. Le pontifical de la curie romain au XIII^e siècle*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1940. (Studi e Testi 87); Michel ANDRIEU: *Le Pontifical Romain au moyen-âge III. Le pontifical de Guillaume Durand*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1940. (Studi e Testi 88) — the latest being identical with the so-called “Tridentine” pontifical, which was valid up to the last decades of the XXth century: *Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII. Pont. Max. iussu restitutum atque editum*. Apud Iacobum Lunam, impensis Leonardii Parasoli et sociorum, Roma 1595. = Manlio SODI — Achille Maria TRIACCA: *Pontificale Romanum. Editio princeps (1595–1596)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1997. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 1).

³⁶ When the manuscript Zagreb, MK/BU MR 165. mentions some items of the divine office (e.g. in the Advent section or at the Easter solemn vespers), they sometimes differ from those of the Esztergom use which later became strikingly uniform.

³⁷ ANDRIEU: *Ordines Romani ...* V. 74–79. finally does not support this possibility.

FURTHER WAYS OF RESEARCH

Similar cases were not unknown even for the editor of Ordo 50. In the appendix to his monumental work Andrieu himself published a few ordines inserted only by single sources in the context of Ordo 50.³⁸ In my Central European materials chosen as references there occurred the same phenomena: sources from Austria, Bavaria or Poland also borrow large sections of the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum* with far more fidelity than their Esztergom parallels, but they interpolate—just like the Esztergom ones—several other passages which lack any direct contact with the text of Andrieu's or Vogel's editions.³⁹

Although the sampling is only enough to illustrate the situation, it still may have clear consequences. The Central European region in the Middle Ages was by no means under such a homogeneous German influence, as it is often supposed by modern scholars. The Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian, Croatian Churches and even some of the German speaking ones made up independent liturgical areas with objective peculiarities, and quite soon developed their own culture of books and textual tradition. Only in rare cases is it probable that this tradition could be traced back to local drafting: the intellectual clergy of these Churches around the time of their foundation were almost all of foreign origin, and even their books were compilations,⁴⁰ although they pick from an impressive plenty of sources.⁴¹ Thus the ordines that may be reconstructed from the rubrics of Hungarian and other Central European Churches are not only important as regards a regional rite, while considered belated on the level of universal liturgical history. It is not at all inconceivable that they have preserved some old Roman and early Frankish or Germanic ordines, which had sunk into oblivion in other parts of Europe during the spread of the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*, then

³⁸ ANDRIEU: *Op. cit.* V. 367sq. Further supplements are cited by MARTIMORT: *Op. cit.* 35–41.

³⁹ Kraków, BK Ms. 11. (28.) and Szombathely, EMK Cod. Lat. 2. are in the closest relationship with *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*.

⁴⁰ The best documentation on the composition of a Central European pontifical can be found in Zdzisław OBERTYŃSKI: *The Cracow Pontifical* (Pontificale Cracoviense Sæculi XI) *Cracow, Jagellonian Library, MS. 2057*. C. Nicholls & Company Ltd., The Philips Park Press, Manchester 1977. (Henry Bradshaw Society 100). The manuscript edited here was compiled at Tyniec abbey, manned at that time mostly with British and Lorraine monks. Its liturgical content bears some traces of the rites of those regions, but is essentially a construction of its own.

⁴¹ On foreign sources of the Esztergom rite see e.g. RADÓ Polikárp: „De originibus liturgiæ Romanæ in Hungaria sæculi XI.”, *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* XI (1959) 299–309; SZENDREI Janka: „«Lætabitur deserta» . Itáliai repertoárdarabok a közép-európai gregoriánumban” [“Lætabitur Deserta”. Italian Repertoire Pieces in Central European Gregorian Chant], *Magyar Egyházzene* IX (2001/2002) 193–204; CZAGÁNY Zsuzsa: „Magyar-normann zenei kapcsolatok a középkorban?” [Hungarian-Norman Musical Relations in the Middle Ages?], *Zenatudományi Dolgozatok* XII (1990/1991) 9–21.

that of the Roman and later the Durantus Pontificals already before or about the end of the first millennium.

In this respect there are considerable differences even within the Central European region. While the Durantus Pontifical was adopted by Zagreb already in the XIVth century,⁴² from the Hungarian town of Veszprém we have an older type of pontifical originating from the same period.⁴³ Nevertheless, in Cracow there is an archaic example in use even in the XVth century, which follows the Romano-Germanic model with great freedom and also preserves some linguistic features of the old Roman rubrics,⁴⁴ but entirely differs both from one of its contemporaries and its XIth century predecessor.⁴⁵ Obviously, these Central European traditions of the ordines can only be discovered by native scholars of each country, since it is only they who are sufficiently acquainted with the peculiar circumstances of some libraries in the region and familiar with the respective vernacular literature. However, their activity would be worthwhile to be coordinated internationally in order to restore, on the one hand, the original place and dignity of countries behind the former iron curtain on the ecclesiastical and liturgical map of medieval Europe, and to enrich, on the other hand, the general body of knowledge on the early history of the Roman rite as documented in sources after the end of the first millennium, yet of great retrospective value.

Miklós István FÖLDVÁRY

⁴² ANDRIEU: *Le Pontifical Romain ... III.* = Zagreb, MK/BU MR 25.

⁴³ Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ 317. *Pontificale Veszpremiense saeculi XIV.*

⁴⁴ Kraków, BK Ms. 11. (28.)

⁴⁵ OBERTYŃSKI: *Op. cit.*