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*. Although his publication has been rendered out of date by the critical edition of Michel Andrieu, Andrieu’s heir and disciple, Cyrille Vogel regards Mabillon’s work as still indispensable on account of its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. 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.

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. Yet Mabillon’s treatment—perhaps unwillingly—casts doubts on a widely accepted hypothesis, namely that the productive period of Roman ordines ended definitely with the appearance of the *Pontificale Romanum*.

* Paper read at the conference “Colloque International: Mabillon et l’Europe bénédictine aux XVIIe et XVIIIe 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.


no-Germanicum in the Xth century. 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 pontificales, its functional descendants some new rubrical genres, for instance the ordinal, the customary, and later the directory or the ceremonial.

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 Mabillon—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.Æ & EL. 18.)


2
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, and an abridged, handwritten ordinal from somewhat before 1469. 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, two representative examples from the XIII–XIVth centuries and our first printed missal and breviary. 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 Ordinarium Strigoniensis Ecclesie, Nürnberg 1496. (RMK III. 35.); Ordinarium seu ordo divinus secundum al-
man Strigoniensem ecclesiam. S. l. s. a. (RMK III. 70a: probably in Nürnberg, at the end of the XVth cen-
tury); Ordinarium Strigoniensis. Venezia 1505. (RMK III. 134.); Ordinarium Strigoniensis. Venezia 1509. (RMK III. 165.) prepared for edition by FÖLDDVÁRY Miklós István: Ordinarius Strigoniensis. Venezia, anno Domini MCCCCXCI. (RMK III. 165.) (manuscript); Ordinarium Strigoniensis. Lyon 1510. (RMK III. 166.); Ordinari-
um Strigoniensis. Venezia 1520. (RMK III. 238.). The abbreviation “RMK” refers to a catalogue of incu-

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

11 Zagreb, Metropolitanska Knjižnica / Bibl. Univ. MR 165. Epitome pontificialis sæculi XI. (so-called “Hartvik-agenda”); Budapest, Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár MNy 1. Sacramentarium monasticum Hungari-
cum sæculi XII. (so-called “Pray-kódex”).


13 Brevisarium Strigoniense. S. l. 1484. (RMK III. 9.) = Venezia 1480. (RMK III. 1.); Missale secundum ciborum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis: Nürnberg 1484. (RMK III. 7.).
3. The beginning of the Holy Saturday ordo in the Sacramentarium monasticum Hungaricum sæculi XII.
   (Budapest, OSzK MNy 1.)

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

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. 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. 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 principaliun fontium sæculorum XI—XVI., earundem synopsi atque nonnullis testibus referentissque (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*.\(^\text{16}\)

---

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

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.\(^\text{17}\) 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,\(^\text{18}\) being outstandingly important for Hungarian medieval studies as well\(^\text{19}\).

---

**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**

---


\(^{17}\) FÖLDVÁRY: *Fragmenta Pontificales* … 51–99.


\(^{19}\) Their best and most recent analysis may be found in SZENDREI Jánka: A „mos patriae” kiadakulása 1341 előtti hangjegyes forrásaink tükrében [Formation of the “Mos Patriæ” 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. In this collection there stand the most proper and undoubtfully 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,
2) other Central European (South German, Austrian, Bohemian, Polish and Aquileian) sources,
3) Hungarian sources other than those of the central rite (Zagrabian, Transilvanian, Pauline, etc.).

20 FÖLDVÁRY: Fragmenta Pontificalis … 101–137.
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, and thus to the section describing the liturgical year in the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*. Both Ordo 50 and the pontifical preserving it were copied nearly all over Europe during the XI\textsuperscript{th} century (in the time of our oldest document treated), consequently their borrowing is of minor importance. 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 XV\textsuperscript{th} century Pauline manuscript breviary and with a short passage on the consecration of the baptismal font on Holy Saturday in the Zagreb missal printed in 1511. Both the Pauline Order and

---

Clmæ 132. *Breviarii Paulinorum sancti XV*; *Breviarii ordinis fratrums eremitarum sancti Pauli priæ eremite iterata castigatione recognitum cum plena rubrica*. Venezia 1540.

24 ANDRIEU: *Ordines Romani* ... V. 83sqq.
27 Budapest, ŐszK Clmæ 132. 198–199\textsuperscript{r}.
28 Missale ... Zagrabiensis Ecclesie 83–94\textsuperscript{r}.
the Bishopric of Zagreb had been founded by Esztergom, 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 XI century and was kept in use for a long time onwards. 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. 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. Knowing the early history of Hungarian liturgy, this indicates that it was especially the cathedrals environment, which cultiva-


30 Zagreb, MK/BU MR 165.

31 SZENDEI — RIBARIĆ: Missale Notatum …; Missale secundum chororum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis.

32 Güssing, KBF Cod. 1/43; Istanbul, 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 form the XI\textsuperscript{th}–XIV\textsuperscript{th} 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.\footnote{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 XI\textsuperscript{th} century (terminus ante quem);
2) its last non fragmentary documents are from the XV\textsuperscript{th} 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 \textit{Pontificale Romano-Germanicum} in the middle of the X\textsuperscript{th} century, but whose antecedents can be detected already earlier.\footnote{As 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.}
opposed to later episcopal books, this genre is not limited to rites executed by the bishop himself, 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 sacramentary—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 infrequently 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

---


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. 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.

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, although they pick from an impressive plenty of sources. 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

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 Seculi XI) Cracow, Jagiellonian Library, M5. 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 Lorrainese monks. Its liturgical content bears some traces of the rites of those regions, but is essentially a construction of its own.
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 Széchenyi Könyvtár Clmæ 317. *Pontificale Veszpremiense seculi XIV.*

\(^{44}\) Kraków, BK Ms. 11. (28.)