

Table of Contents

The Significance of the Chartvirgus Pontifical.....	3
Medieval Pontificals.....	4
The History of Research and Editions.....	5
The Problem of Liturgical Content.....	8
The Problem of Genre.....	11
The Extant Pontificals of Hungarian Origin.....	22
The Esztergom Benedictional.....	23
The Zagreb Pontifical.....	25
The Veszprém Pontifical.....	27
The Durandus-Pontificals Used in the Hungarian Kingdom.....	30
Other related sources.....	31
The Codicological Description of the Chartvirgus Pontifical.....	34
Bibliographical Data.....	34
Layout, Orthography, Grammar.....	39
Musical Notation.....	41
Decoration, Binding.....	47
The History of Research.....	47
Franjo Fancev.....	48
Germain Morin.....	48
Dragutin Kniewald.....	50
Géza Karsai.....	51
Nausica Morandi.....	53
Polikárp Radó.....	54
Zoran Hudovský and Miho Demović.....	59
Janka Szendrei.....	60
József Török.....	63
László Dobszay.....	64
Herbert Schneider.....	65
Szilvia Somogyi.....	67
Edit Madas.....	68
My Own Earlier Contributions.....	70
Date and Origin.....	72
Date.....	72
Origin.....	74
Structure and Content.....	90
Divisions and Strata of the Structure.....	91
Genre and Context.....	94
Textual Tradition.....	97
Rubrics.....	98
Liturgical Texts.....	106

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHARTVIRGUS PONTIFICAL

The manuscript upon which the present edition is based is a Pontifical from the end of the 11th century; the most important witness to the archaic period and early development of the chief medieval Hungarian ritual variant, the so-called Use of Esztergom (Strigonian Use). It contains the order of diocesan synods, the degradation from, and restitution to, the different ranks of Holy Orders, excommunication and reconciliation, special ceremonies of the liturgical year, and the sacraments of Penance and Anointing. As to its origin, there is no direct historical evidence but its liturgical content clearly identifies it as a source proper to the cathedral of Esztergom. Evidence shows that by the beginning of the 13th century it was certainly used at the cathedral of Zagreb. It seems reasonable then to suppose that soon after it was written, around the last years of the 11th century, it was taken from Esztergom to Zagreb where it is still preserved in the Knjižnica Metropolitana or Metropolitanska Knjižnica, the Library of Zagreb Cathedral under the library code MR 165.

In Hungarian scientific literature, due to the uncertainty regarding the exact genre it represents and because the name of a certain bishop Chartvirgus is specifically mentioned in it, the book is known either as the Agenda of Hartwick or simply Agenda Pontificalis. Accordingly, I will henceforth refer to it with the siglum H. At the outset I feel compelled to rebut a few false, or at least implausible, hypotheses which for decades have been considered established facts by some of the studies on the subject. Among these hypotheses primarily the following should be mentioned: the provenance of H from the city of Győr, its purportedly mixed genre, and the origin of the Hungarian ritual usages from Northern France.

The significance of H may be summarised in two short statements:

(1) From the perspective of Hungarian liturgical history the H is the first source whose material remains a stable feature in the process of transmission all the way to the 16th century. By analysing its ceremonies, it is easily discernible what was changed or preserved by the Hungarian ritual usages, that is, one can identify the accidental, variable elements and what may be considered specific either to the Kingdom of Hungary or to a certain period. It can also be determined whether the variations in our later sources are of a historical or regional origin, and in the final analysis, when and how, that is, in which ecclesiastical centres, using what sources, and under what kind of cultural, socio-political impulses was the body of Hungarian ritual variants, or more closely the Use of Esztergom, formed.

(2) From the perspective of universal liturgical history the Use of Esztergom is of paradigmatic significance. This, and the ritual family of Hungarian usages organised around it, is the only liturgical variant in the whole of Europe which remained essentially unified all throughout its extensive territory for 600 years. Its origin and expansion was a result of a well-organised effort in a large region without any pre-existent ecclesiastical structures. The H is the first representative source for the Hungarian

ritual use. It stands very close to the supposed beginnings of the usage; its concept is all-encompassing and cohesive. The continuity of its characteristics with Hungarian traditions of later origin is obvious, while these characteristics cannot be deduced from the traditions of any other parts of Europe.

Hence the H provides an insight into the formation of a ritual use *in statu nascendi*: in a supple, plastic state when learned ecclesiastics, endowed with impressive knowledge of the contemporary practice and variations of the Roman Rite, were able to create a fresh and ambitious tradition with good taste and evident ingenuity, always maintaining respect for its essentially Roman features, while never curbing their own creativity. Upon closely studying the H, it unfolds before the probing eye how medieval people understood, fashioned and transmitted liturgical usages.

MEDIEVAL PONTIFICALS

Medieval Pontificals may be approached in two ways. Before we can review the scientific results and problems in connection with such Pontificals, we must separate the two basic approaches.

(1) The first possible approach is based on liturgical content. The subject strictly speaking of Pontificals comprise those ceremonies of the Latin rite that are reserved for bishops, and may not be performed by simple priests. Such are the administration of the different clerical orders, consecration of virgins, benediction of abbots and abesses, coronation of kings, dedication of churches, blessing of liturgical utensils and vestments, Confirmation, expulsion and reconciliation of penitents, consecration of oils on Maundy Thursday, synods, excommunication, solemn pontifical blessings, etc. In this category we may include those rites that are not performed by bishops but are somehow connected to their life and office, such as the traveling and reception of bishops, their participation in the Divine Office, and the way they must be treated when they are ill or dying. Each and every one of these rites is called an *Ordo*. From this perspective, studying Pontificals means studying pontifical *Ordos*.

(2) The other possible approach is based on genre, or more specifically, on the type of liturgical books in which pontifical *Ordos* should be contained. The problem is that this genre does not always and everywhere correspond to the total sum of pontifical *Ordos*. A large part of medieval Pontificals consistently features several *Ordos* that are not strictly speaking episcopal, and the opposite is also true, in the majority of cases they do not contain all of the pontifical *Ordos*. The discrepancy between content and genre, however, does not seem coincidental: the structure, thematic selection and sequence of concrete Pontificals are based on practical considerations, historical tendencies and regional or institutional preferences. From the perspective of genre, studying Pontificals means separating and identifying the practical principles of their selection and organisation.

The History of Research and Editions

The most important milestones of progress in research were the discovery, critical edition and analysis of individual sources. Consequently, the study of content has always been mixed with the study of the genre.¹ It is useful to divide the critical editions and the treatises written on them into two separate groups: the first group sheds light on the history of the Roman Pontifical, the other represents particular traditions individually.

The Roman Pontifical and its antecedents

The *Pontificale Romanum* (PR)² was the first liturgical book that became unified and exclusive within the Latin rite. The first edition (editio princeps) of the so-called Tridentine Pontifical was published in 1595–1596. The PR was the only one among the Tridentine books which was promulgated by the pope (in this case, Clement VIII) in such a way that at the same time he forbade the use of every earlier edition of both the Roman Pontifical and the proper diocesan Pontificals.³ The uniform PR remained essentially unchanged all the way until its last edition in 1961.⁴ Even this edition of John XXIII made only minor changes by the omission or abbreviation and simplification of certain Ordos.⁵ While on the level of the Missal, Breviary and Ritual even the modern age had some experience of variability in particular traditions,⁶ when it came to the Pontifical, the impression was that of a long-established, un-touchable, monolithic product.

The standardization of the Pontifical did not start in the modern age. The PR is essentially a 15-16th-century redaction of a Pontifical that was edited sometime in the last decades of the 13th century by William Durandus, bishop of Mende, canon lawyer and liturgist (PGD). His composition proved so successful that soon after its completion and in the centuries following it was adopted by numerous episcopal sees, even that of Rome. Thus the promulgation of the PR was only the closing act in this

¹ Standard studies on the topic: VOGEL: *Medieval Liturgy* 225–271; RASMUSSEN: *Les pontificaux du haut moyen âge*, 9–32 and 431–512. These are summarised in: PALAZZO: *Histoire des livres liturgiques* 204–220. A Hungarian summary supplemented by my own observations: FÖLDVÁRY: *Liturgikus könyvek* [Liturgical Books] 16–21 and 30–31. This work, and all my other published or forthcoming writings to be quoted here, may be found on the official website for the Classical Department of the Loránd Eötvös University (Budapest), under my own profile: <http://class-phil.elte.hu/latin/munkatarsak/foldvaymiklosistvan>

² In the footnotes here I do not include the sources identified in the main text only with abbreviations, see the bibliography.

³ DYKMANS: *Le Pontifical Romain révisé* 150–157.

⁴ Facsimile: SODI—TONIOLO: *Pontificale Romanum. Editio typica*.

⁵ The differences are summarised in a table by SODI—TRACCA: *Pontificale Romanum. Editio princeps* XVII–XXI.

⁶ As to the religious uses (Cistercian, Carthusian, Præmonstratensian, Dominican, Calced Carmelite) and cathedral uses (Lyon, Milan, Toledo, Braga) which continued to exist even in the post-Tridentine period, see KING: *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*; and KING: *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*.

process of standardization. The chief factor was not the Tridentine spirit of uniformity or papal absolutism but a European trend influencing all the local authorities.

Hence the most important task of studying the sources was to see beyond the PGD in order to understand the process of tradition and composition which led up to it. Even though 16-18th-century experts have already made some important contributions to the study of old Pontificals and episcopal *Ordos*,⁷ their interests were predominantly antiquarian: they concentrated on liturgical antiques and curiosities. The systematic study of the genre began with the pioneering work of Michel Andrieu who published the 12th-century Roman Pontifical (PR12), the so-called curial version of 13th-century Roman Pontifical (PR13),⁸ the PGD, and finally the *Ordines Romani* (OR), the earliest known norm-text of the Latin rite, which he recognised as the most important source, besides the Great Sacramentaries, of every Pontifical.

From the very beginning, Andrieu was fully aware of the significance of the 10th-century Germano-Roman Pontifical (PRG) which transmitted the material of the Great Sacramentaries and the OR to the Roman Pontificals. He even prepared a new edition; the 50th, most extensive Ordo of the PRG was published posthumously, but still under his name, as the last volume of the OR. The complete edition of the PRG, making use of Andrieu's unfinished work, was published by Cyrille Vogel with the cooperation of Reinhard Elze. After the OR, PRG and Roman Pontificals, the result only needed to be fine-tuned. Niels Krogh Rasmussen, by his study of the so-called Primitive Pontificals, predating or contemporaneous with the PRG, shed further light on the transition between the OR and the PRG, while Marc Dykmans filled in the gaps between the PGD and the PR.⁹ And so the seemingly linear history of development was made complete, which is now commonly identified with the history of the Roman Pontifical. These are the principal stages:

- (1) 6-11th centuries: *Ordines Romani* and Great Sacramentaries
- (2) 9-11th centuries: Primitive Pontificals
- (3) 10th century: *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*
- (4) 12th century: first version of the *Pontificale Romanum*
- (5) 13th century: second (curial) version of the *Pontificale Romanum*
- (6) 13th century: Pontifical of William Durandus
- (7) 15th century: Roman reductions of the Durandus-Pontifical
- (8) 14-20th centuries: *Pontificale Romanum*

⁷ CASSANDER: *Ordo Romanus de officio missæ*; HITTORP: *De divinis catholicae Ecclesiae officiis et mysteriis*; MABILLON: *Museum Italicum*; MURATORI: *Liturgia Romana vetus*; AER.

⁸ A new edition of the same, GOULLET—LOBRICHON—PALAZZO: *Le pontifical de la curie romaine au XIII^e siècle*.

⁹ RASMUSSEN: *op. cit.*, DYKMANS: *op. cit.*

The non-Roman (Transalpine) Pontificals

With regard to the non-Roman Pontificals, it must first be explained what is meant by “Roman” when it comes to the liturgy. In the strictest sense we call Roman the Old Roman – or applying the expressive German terminology: “stadtrömisch” – uses of the Imperial City and the “suburbicarian” dioceses, which are different from the Transalpine regions, and party even from the rest of Italy. This, insofar as it can be reconstructed, is represented only by certain parts of the OR, the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* (SGr)¹⁰ and an earlier version of the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* (SGV).¹¹ A wider application of the term is if we call those liturgies Roman that have ever been celebrated in the City, regardless of the actual place of their origin. In this sense, we may list among the Roman sources the Roman redactions of the PR12, PR13, PGD and the PR. And finally, we may call all of those uses Roman that are somehow derived from Old Roman traditions, but since in this present discourse it may be misleading, I will try to avoid it and rather talk about the Latin or Western liturgy.¹²

From this it becomes obvious that the above delineated historical formula is not as homogenous as it seems. The Primitive Pontificals, the PRG and the PGD contaminate non-Roman material with Old Roman elements, and with this mixture they in turn influence the actual Roman liturgy. Thus, while they are incorporated into the transmission of the Roman use, they also bear witness to non-Roman uses. Because this admixture and interaction is rather extensive and of early origin, it is impossible to make clear distinctions between the two types. Consequently, not to overcomplicate things, I will call the traditions of Rome and its surroundings cisalpine, and the non-Roman traditions transalpine. (This is a simplification because according to this classification the Italian – geographically cisalpine – but non-Roman traditions actually belong to the transalpine category. Some of the OR, the Primitive Pontificals, the PRG and the PGD may, in fact, be understood in the context of both the Transalpine and Roman Pontificals.

Here I will not consider individually each of the textual editions of the other Transalpine Pontificals.¹³ I only wish to highlight that these editions, unlike the Ro-

¹⁰ Earlier editions of the same, LIETZMANN: *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Ur exemplar*; MOHLBERG—BAUMSTARK: *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber sacramentorum anni circuli der römischen Kirche*.

¹¹ An earlier edition of the same, WILSON: *The Gelasian Sacramentary*.

¹² The term is used in the same sense by FÖLDVÁRY: *The Variants of the Roman Rite*.

¹³ Based on GAMBER: *Codices liturgici Latini antiquiores*, the early Pontificals published in modern editions are treated by RASMUSSEN: *op. cit.* 420–427. These are: AMIET: *Pontificale Augustanum*; METZGER: *Zwei karolingische Pontifikalien vom Oberrhein*; BARRIGA PLANAS: *El sacramentari, ritual i pontifical de Roda*; TURNER: *The Claudius Pontificals*; MAGISTRETTI: *Pontificale in usum ecclesie Mediolanensis*; MARTINI: *Il cosidetto Pontificale di Poitiers*; GREENWELL: *The Pontifical of Egbert*; BANTING: *Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals*; CROSNIER—LEBLANC DE LESPINASSE—MORIZET—FOUCHÉ: *Sacramentarium ad usum Æcclesie Nivernensis*; AVERY: *The Relation of the Casanatense Pontifical ... to Tenth Century Changes in the Ordination Rites at Rome*; DOBLE: *Pontificale Lanolatense*; WILSON: *The*

man ones, do not make up a chronological or typographical system. It was quite haphazard where, when and which Pontificals were judged by scholars to be worthy of critical editions. The editions we have today, even in the best case scenario, only refer to the parallel texts of the Roman tradition, although their relationship to this tradition is very indirect. However important they may be in relation to the a particular church or time period, sometimes they are less than instructive in terms of the liturgical history of the given ecclesiastical institutions.

There are two excellent works which make significant contributions towards a broader and more systematic understanding of Transalpine Pontificals, one with respect to the liturgical content, the other as regards the genre.

(1) In terms of the liturgical content, it is important to make mention of the efforts of Herbert Schneider who prepared a comprehensive edition of the episcopal Ordo of holding synods (OCC). Today, this is the only work which, based presumably on the study of all the available sources, aims to demonstrate the development of the Ordo and the relationship between its variants, thus giving an example as to how all the other Ordos should be researched in a systematic fashion. Thanks to Schneider's book, the structure of individual synodal Ordos, in and of itself, may become an important marker for the identification of a manuscript's provenance and relationship to other sources. It must be admitted, however, that keeping synods is not the most complex and most representative episcopal Ordo, nor are the extant sources the most numerous. Schneider's book is a great accomplishment but it is only a glimpse of the immense work that awaits scholars with all of the other episcopal Ordos.

(2) Pertaining to the genre, Richard Kay published a catalogue of manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals.¹⁴ Here, in addition to 1249 manuscript sources, Kay mentions also the ones that were lost, mistakenly identified as Pontificals or Benedictionals; even the printed sources. This catalogue is helpful not only in obtaining primary information but it is also a point of reference for those who would like to form an idea as to the size, proportions, geographical and temporal expansion of the available source material.

The Problem of Liturgical Content

Problems of methodology

The medieval liturgical manuscripts contain the Roman rite in a multiplicity of variants. The store of texts and gestures is extensive and mostly common, but the actual

Benedictional of Archbishop Robert; UNTERKIRCHER: *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale des Bischofs Baturich von Regensburg*. In a different context Rasmussen also quotes: WARNER—WILSON: *The Benedictional of St Aethelwood*; WOOLEY: *The Canterbury Benedictional*. To this may be added: OBERTYŃSKI: *The Cracow Pontifical*; GROS I PUJOL: *El Pontifical Romà de Vic*; PZ.

¹⁴ KAY: *Pontificalia*. The description of the manuscripts here relies on library catalogues and secondary literature, thus it is not always trustworthy when it comes to dating and provenance.

selection and arrangement of the material varies greatly. This applies already to the Mass and the Divine Office but the different variants become almost indecipherable when it comes to those *Ordos* whose structure, in comparison with the Mass and the Divine Office, is much less fixed, while their volume may even be greater (which is the case with most of the episcopal *Ordos*). The principal methodological problem of liturgical analysis is whether the variants are approached as a diachronic or synchronic system.

(1) The diachronic approach sees variants as parts of the same genealogical lineage, and aims to find a place for them within a pedigree (*stemma*). This method attributes great significance to the age of each source: the earlier ones are considered more original, the later ones are treated as offshoots, hence the latter are always understood as derived from the former. The liturgy is viewed as a spontaneous, folkloristic product in which the new elements are results of an exterior intervention or institutional reform. Intended or not, this approach is characteristic both to the scholarly literature about the Roman traditions of Pontificals and to Schneider's monograph. From this perspective we may understand why the scholars studying the Transalpine Pontificals typically place the sources they analyse within the context of the Roman tradition's parallel texts. This reflex is reinforced by the methodology of classical textual criticism, the evolutionist view of history, and the strongly centralised liturgical law of the Church of modernity.

(2) The central concept of the synchronic approach is the use itself. Accordingly, the uses are seen as enduring phenomena with a strong identity; their differences are results of thoughtful planning and their continued existence is secured by proudly cultivated proper traditions. By their very nature uses are continuous (uninterrupted), that is, a given ecclesiastical institution rarely and only partially modifies its customs. Consequently, the actual age of the sources is indifferent, provided the identity of the ecclesiastical institution persists. The definition of uses does not exclude historical changes, only makes them relative: if changes occur, they produce subvariants within the framework of the same use. This approach has greater confidence in the printed sources of the better documented period (15-16th centuries), and is inclined to interpret the features of early sporadic material in light of the later, more "definitive" sources. Personally, based on my scholarly affinities and research experiences, I prefer the synchronic approach. This concept is explained in greater detail in the first chapters of a methodological study and casework and casework I am now preparing for publication.¹⁵

These two methods only clash with each other if one tries to apply the diachronic approach to each and every use of the Roman rite, or if one tries to deny the partial interaction between the different uses. If these are avoided, we may profit from both

¹⁵ FÖLDVÁRY: *A római rítus változatainak kutatása* [Studying the Variants of the Roman Rite] 7–18. My approach is greatly influenced by the method invented by László Dobszay and his disciples for identifying different strands of traditions within the Divine Office, e. g. within the framework of the CAO-ECE series (*Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europæ*).

of the approaches since based on a careful comparison of the different sources within the same use we can draw important conclusions about the historical changes of that use, while on the grounds of common features and overlaps we may gain a better understanding of their genealogy and relationship with other uses. Liturgical use is an intellectual concept: it is not identical to any of the sources in particular; it is abstracted by means of a comprehensive study of all of the available sources. For this reason, not even the most representative source may be treated as absolute. The most essential characteristics of a use and its relationship with other uses can only be recognised in light of its historical development. Studying the medieval liturgy is essentially studying the uses, consequently, it is a science more descriptive than historical, it is more typology than genealogy. The true character of a given use only manifests itself upon careful study of its history and interaction with other uses, thus its typology must be based on historical and comparative analysis.

The results and unresolved questions of research so far

Having said that, I now propose the question: To what extent has this mainstream methodology of studying Pontificals contributed to our understanding of liturgical content?

When it comes to Rome, our answer is: to a great extent. The *Ordos* of those Pontificals that were surely used in Rome represent different stages in the historical development of the same use. Based on these sources, we may draw reliable conclusions as to the permanent characteristics, historical changes, and external influences of the Roman use.

As regards the totality of the Latin West, however, we know close to nothing, and even what we do know, is rather misleading. The primitive Pontificals published by Rasmussen are witnesses to the archaic period of their own uses; their connection to the OR or the PRG is only indirect, and they have nothing to do directly with the use of Rome. Since their selection was based on chronology, their liturgical content lacks a perspective context. Likewise problematic is the proper interpretation of the PRG. Some of its texts originate from Roman *Ordos* or Sacramentaries, whereas other parts made their way into the Roman Pontificals precisely through the PRG, or the latest, through the PGD. The question is whence, how, and why these texts got incorporated into the PRG? References to uncertain Frankish, Gallican or Germanic underpinnings (*substrata*) leads us back to the obscurity of a poorly documented age, and often it is quite impossible to verify them. Finally, the pool base of the PGD extends beyond the PRG and the Roman Pontificals, as it absorbs and transmits texts whose origin is just as uncertain as that of the PRG's "new" material.

We do not get any closer to understanding the origin of the other Transalpine Pontificals either, if we simply examine them in comparison with the sources of the Roman tradition. Even the earliest sources are simply documents proving the existence of a particular liturgical text, gesture or structure. The phenomenon itself does not originate with the documents. Methodologically, it is more correct to analyse the *Ordos* as independent compositions; thus we place them within the history of *Ordos*

within the same use, and then we compare a version representative of that use with other more or less equivalent sources. A Transalpine Pontifical is not a degradation of Roman Pontificals but a document of a specific use parallel to that of Rome. Although we have to identify those points where a given Pontifical exhibits common features with the Roman tradition, we must emphasise that the most characteristic elements are precisely those where it deflects from the Roman traditions.

The analysis of the liturgical content of medieval Pontificals is still in a rudimentary stage. Schnedier's attempt is exemplary, but since the synod is a relatively rare and atypical Ordo and Schneider follows a genealogical approach, it is not adequate for demonstrating the nature and taxonomy of liturgical uses. Research must be extended to all of the Ordos within the Roman liturgy,¹⁶ more or less keeping the same arrangement in which Edmond Martène conceived his monumental work, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus* (AER)¹⁷ in the 17th century, except all the while being mindful of the definition of liturgical uses. In the meantime, every textual edition should try to analyse the liturgical content of any given source in a way that it could eventually be included in a prospective "New Martène", in the comprehensive "Usarium" of the Roman rite.

The Problem of Genre

The juxtaposition of episcopal Ordos

The basic unit of Pontificals, even in terms of genre, is the Ordo, that is, the record of all the texts and rubrics pertaining to a single ceremony. As opposed to the Mass and the Divine Office, episcopal Ordos do not form an organic series. Whereas the Mass and the Divine Office contain many variable texts in a fixed structure within the framework of the liturgical year, the Pontificals document independent ceremonies. Even if they may be inserted into the liturgical cycle, they are invariable, meaning that they are not composed of an ordinary and propers. Hence each of them stands apart, and even the longest one would not fill an entire volume. Their inclusion into a collective kind of liturgical book is useful but not necessary.

To this may be added some practical considerations. The Mass and the Divine Office, as it is performed by a particular community, always take place in the same church and in the same spaces of that same sacred building. Consequently, these books are typically static, practically form part of the liturgical utensils, and placed on the altar, analogium, ambo, lectern or choir stalls. The episcopal Ordos, on the other hand, are typically mobile ceremonies., primarily because they take place in several locations, for example, at the Baptismal font or the church gate, where a lectern is not

¹⁶ Even if not with the comprehensiveness of the OCC, there have been such attempts since the 17th century, for example, in relation to the Sacraments of Penance, Anointing, and Holy Orders. I will refer to these during the analysis of the respective Ordos.

¹⁷ For the identification and modern codicological description of his sources, an indispensable aid is provided by MARTIMORT: *La documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène*.

necessarily part of the furniture. These ceremonies are often performed outside of the cathedral where the bishop and his assistance have to dislocate, as is the case with the dedication of churches or the consecration of virgins. It is the privilege of the bishop anyway that the book be placed not on a lectern but held by the librifer, as the bishop officiates at the throne or the faldstool.

Three consequences follow from these considerations: (1) The episcopal *Ordos* are usually organised into a series in the books that contain them, even if the sequence and exact content of the series is accidental. (2) These *Ordos* are assembled into collective volumes which include the texts and rubrics as they are actually celebrated. It is useful and economical to gather the material of the Mass and Divine Office at conventual liturgies into separate books, in accordance with who prays them and where. This barely ever happens with the contents of the Pontificals. (3) Finally, the Pontificals cannot be large and heavy volumes. Only one *Ordo* is needed at one particular time, so it does not make sense to overburden either the librifer or the luggage carried by an episcopal entourage. It was a custom during the Tridentine period to separate the Pontifical into several thin yet large-print pamphlets (*fascicle*),¹⁸ and in the post-Vatican II reform liturgy there is no Pontifical anymore; the *Ordos* are included in several independent volumes.¹⁹

Thus the history of Pontificals is a history of which *Ordos* were assembled into a single volume, and in what particular order or arrangement. When it comes to liturgical content, the exclusive analysis of the specifically Roman traditions is not very informative, but as regards the genre, it is tremendously useful. The classical critical editions provide us with an authentic and representative picture about the development of Pontificals.

The great Sacramentaries

The first phase in the development of Pontificals is the so-called *libellus* where one volume contains one *Ordo*. Although the *libellus* is considered a basic concept in the scientific literature about liturgical books, it is an extremely rare occurrence among the extant sources.

If several *Ordos* are included in one book we usually speak of a Collection of *Ordos*. These Collections were not assembled under any pretence of completeness or according to a unified principle of organisation. The primary documents of such a methodology are the great Sacramentaries and the OR, the secondary documents are the Primitive Pontificals.

The first real liturgical book of the Latin rite is the Sacramentary. It contains all those parts of the Mass that the celebrant has to pray. The ceremonies outside of Mass were first included in the appendix of these Sacramentaries or in-between its major parts, while the ceremonies in direct and organic connection to the liturgical

¹⁸ I have seen such booklets in London, at the Library of Westminster Cathedral.

¹⁹ In fact, the 'Pontificale Romanum' of 1968 only contains the ordinations. Later even the title 'Pontificale' is dropped, and it is replaced by 'Ordo'.

year were placed at the appropriate junction of the main text. The table below demonstrates how the different episcopal *Ordos* fit into the structure of the *SGV*:²⁰

(1) INSERTED INTO THE TEMPORAL

- (a) public penance: between Quinquagesima and Sexagesima Sundays
- (b) ordination of priests and deacons: Lenten Ember days
- (c) rites of catechumenate: during Lent
- (d) reconciliation of penitents, consecration of oils: Maundy Thursday
- (e) Baptism, Confirmation: Holy Saturday
- (f) rites of catechumenate in case of illness, reconciliation of heretics: Octave of Easter

(2) BETWEEN THE TEMPORAL AND THE SANCTORAL PARTS

- (a) dedication of churches and baptisteries
- (b) minor orders
- (c) episcopal consecration
- (d) consecration of virgins

(3) IN THE APPENDIX

- (a) votive ceremonies
- (b) Matrimony
- (c) exodiastic rites²¹
- (d) various blessings
- (e) Penance

The *SGF*,²² a Frankish reduction of the *SGV*, is somewhat broader but it follows the same logic. The structure of the *SGF* is here explained in accordance with the so-called *Sacramentarium Gellonense*:

(1) INSERTED INTO THE LITURGICAL YEAR

- (a) public penance, annunciation of Ember days: between Quinquagesima Sunday and Ash Wednesday
- (b) rites of catechumenate: during Lent
- (c) reconciliation of penitents, consecration of oils: Maundy Thursday, Holy Week
- (d) Baptism, Confirmation: Holy Saturday
- (e) annunciation of Ember days: following the Third Sunday after Pentecost

(2) IN THE APPENDIX

- (a) various blessings for the people
- (b) episcopal blessings²³

²⁰ A useful summary about the content of the *Sacramentaries* and *SAn* treated below may be found in VOGEL: *op. cit.* 65–66., 76–78., 83–84., 86–87.

²¹ The collective term ‘exodiastic’ is used to describe different kinds of rites connected to illness and death.

²² Other oft-quoted editions of the Frankish *Gelasianum*, e.g. MOHLBERG: *Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alamannischer Überlieferung*; CAGIN: *Le Sacramentaire gélisien d’Angoulême*. A newer edition of the latter: SAINT-ROCH: *Liber sacramentorum Engolismensis*.

²³ By episcopal blessing here the solemn threefold pontifical blessing is meant, as opposed to the

- (c) prayers for the Divine Office and meals
- (d) Baptism, clinical Baptism, Reconciliation
- (e) exorcism
- (f) consecration of churches, liturgical utensils and vestments
- (g) Holy Orders (ordinations)²⁴
- (h) Benediction of abbots and abbesses, religious rites
- (i) consecration of virgins
- (j) coronation of kings
- (k) Matrimony
- (l) exodiastic rites
- (m) blessing of water
- (n) ordeals²⁵

Significantly less episcopal Ordos are included in the SGr. It was prepared specifically for use at the stational liturgies of the Popes, and so it contains much less material than the Gelasiana. If it contains any rites not directly connected to the Eucharistic liturgy, they are placed in the middle of the book, before the liturgical year²⁶ and after the Ordo Missæ, or in the appendix. Some of these rites are not inserted as ceremonies strictly speaking, but only as useful collections of pertinent prayers. The number of Ordos inserted into the liturgical year is smaller than in the Gelasiana:

(1) BETWEEN THE ORDER OF MASS AND THE LITURGICAL YEAR

- (a) ordination of bishop, priest and deacon

(2) INSERTED INTO THE LITURGICAL YEAR

- (a) consecration of oils: Maundy Thursday
- (b) ultimate rites of catechumenate, Baptism, Confirmation: Holy Saturday

(3) IN THE APPENDIX

- (a) dedication of churches
- (b) Matrimony
- (c) Penance (only a collection of prayers)
- (d) clinical Baptism
- (e) blessing of water
- (f) institution of popes

simpler blessings of sacramental character which may, of course, also be used by the bishop. For a comprehensive edition of the threefold blessings, see MOELLER: *Corpus benedictionum pontificalium*.

²⁴ Unless otherwise noted, by the term 'ordinations' I mean the administration of all the traditional seven ranks of Holy Orders.

²⁵ Ordeals were liturgical functions whereby litigants demanded a divine sign in order to determine the truth of their case. Typical ordeals were, for example, trials by fire, by boiling or cold water, and the so-called trial by bread and cheese (corsned).

²⁶ In the SGr the liturgical year is one single cycle, not divided into a temporal and a sanctoral part.

*The so-called Supplementum Anianense*²⁷ by St Benedict of Aniane, attached to the SGr, was meant to supplement the SGr with texts taken from the Gelasiana. From the Carolingian period on, this supplemented version of the SGr was copied and spread over Europe. The SAn, in an appendix to the Eucharistic ceremonies, contain the following episcopal Ordos:

- (1) AFTER THE SERIES OF VOTIVE MASSES
 - (a) tonsure
 - (b) consecration of virgins
 - (c) consecration of altar, baptismal font, liturgical utensils, vestments
 - (d) reconciliation of penitents
 - (e) exodiastic rites
 - (f) exorcism
- (2) AFTER THE SERIES OF PREFACES
 - (a) episcopal blessings
 - (b) minor orders

The *Ordines Romani*

The Sacramentaries, as representative sacerdotal books, either did not contain any rubrics or included precious little. The Ordos left out of the Sacramentaries and the ceremonial instructions were codified in the separate, auxiliary volumes of the OR. In the extant manuscripts these Ordos are never given in isolation but grouped together in collections. In relation to our topic, the following deserve to be mentioned:²⁸

- (1) Baptism: 11 (see also the Ordos of Lent and Holy Week)
- (2) Holy Orders: 34, 35, 35A, 35B, 36, 39
- (3) Papal ordination: 40A, 40B
- (4) Funeral: 49
- (5) Coronation of an emperor: 45, 46, 47, 48
- (6) Consecration of a church and altar: 41, 42, 43
- (7) Liturgical year:
 - (a) In its entirety: 50 (see also certain passages of sections 15 and 16)
 - (b) Lent: 22, 28
 - (c) Holy Week: 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 30A, 30B, 31, 32, 33
 - (d) Blessing of the paschal candle: 25
 - (e) Eastertide: 30A, 30B, 31, 32
 - (f) Ember days: 37A, 37B, 38
 - (g) Candlemas: 20
 - (h) Greater Litanies: 21

²⁷ Earlier authors attributed the Supplementum to Alcuin. This is contained in the Deshusses-edition of the SGr.

²⁸ A useful summary and concordance of the topics, age and provenance of the different parts of the OR is published in VOGEL: *op. cit.* 191–197.

Supplementary material: non-episcopal Ordos in the Pontifical

As we have already seen, both the Sacramentaries and the Collections of the OR include specifically episcopal, as well as “simple” priestly ceremonies. This tendency can be observed all throughout the Middle Ages. The separation of specifically episcopal ceremonies is a rather late phenomenon which we cannot encounter before the 13th century, and it remains sporadic even afterwards. Since this fact is of paramount importance in the medieval history of Pontificals, and neglecting it would seriously disturb scholarly discourse on the genre, we have to ask the question: how did these non-episcopal Ordos end up in the Pontificals? Or in a different formulation: may we call those books Pontificals that contain non-episcopal ceremonies?

We may answer the first question positively. In these collections the specifically episcopal Ordos are always mixed with the same non-episcopal Ordos: with the Ordos of the later Ritual and Processional, as well as with detailed rubrical texts which subsequently became characteristic features of Ordinals, Customaries and Ceremonials. These topics are inseparable for the medieval reception: the concept holding together the different kinds of Ordos does, in fact, exist.

To the second question a practical answer may be given. Since Andrieu’s editions, the genre, to which the above-mentioned concept gave birth, is usually called Pontifical, based on a Roman terminology predominant since the 12th century.²⁹ The only universal characteristic of these sources is that they entitle their chapters with the word ‘Ordo’ and with a more specific identification of the subject. It must be admitted, however, that the term ‘Pontifical’ is not simply a concession to scientific consensus.

We must keep it in mind that in the early Church, especially in Italy, the function of absolution and sanctification was proper to the bishop and his cathedral, and only later in the modern age was it extended to the parish church and the parochial office. The ordinary celebrant of the Sacraments, Sacramentals and benedictions is the bishop, and the ordinary place for their administration is the cathedral. The priest (presbyter) is delegated by the bishop, if necessary. Wherever the ecclesiastical structure is “dense”, that is, every town has its own bishop, the cathedral fulfils the function of the parish church. This explains why the ceremonies of Baptism, Matrimony and Funerals were originally considered episcopal Ordos. The processions which used to involve the entire community also belonged to the liturgical life of cathedrals, and so, even though they do not belong to the bishop’s privileges, it is reasonable to include them in Pontificals.

Less spiritual factors also supported the combination of these Ordos: the need for categorisation and practical considerations. In addition to the Mass and the Divine Office, as the most frequent and most characteristic liturgical acts, there was a need for another “miscellaneous” category which includes all the rites outside of the Mass and Office or in connection with them. For a long time the content of Pontificals

²⁹ PR12 15–16.

was identical to this “miscellaneous” category. On the practical level, the Pontifical is actually a kind of “vademeccum”, a natural carrier of all sorts of mobile ceremonies, and we have to remember that whatever later ends up in the Ritual or Processional, needs wider space, moves outside of the church, or at least of the sanctuary.

Primitive Pontificals

The so-called primitive Pontificals from before the first millennium, edited by Rasmussen, arrange such *Ordos* of a “miscellaneous” category into a sequence.³⁰ They have departed from the Sacramentaries and the liturgical texts are interspersed with rubrics but there is no real logic in which *Ordos* are selected and in exactly what order they are included. They seem rather like accidental collections of independent *Ordos*. These are smaller, lighter, easily transportable manuscripts. They are considered books more on account of the bulk of their content; the various *libelli* are fit into a set in order to make the manuscript more economical. On the level of liturgical content, often we would need more of these Primitive Pontificals to form a comprehensive idea of the episcopal *Ordos* of a given liturgical use.

The *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*

The PRG is the first known attempt, independent of the Sacramentaries, to arrange the above-mentioned “miscellaneous” material in a systematic fashion. This encyclopædic need made itself felt on three levels: (1) The redactors of the PRG collected all of the known and accepted ceremonies that were independent of, or only externally connected to, the Mass and the Divine Office. (2) Their liturgical interest went beyond practicality: it resulted in a massive undertaking of collection and preservation. The ritual material of the PRG extends far beyond what any given use may actually put into practice. Although there were certain uses that followed a particular *Ordo* of the PRG very faithfully,³¹ the PRG never ended up becoming the proper liturgical book of any of the medieval uses. It was treated as a standard collection or raw resource material. This is confirmed by the fact that many copies were found in European dioceses whose uses were significantly different from each other.³² (3) The third “symptom” of the encyclopædic inclination is the sequence of the *Ordos* in-

³⁰ Rasmussen published excerpts of eight pre-1000 Pontificals which are different from the OR and the PRG: Albi, Ms. 20 (akvitán, Albi/Aurillac?, 10th century); Saint Petersburg, Ms. Q. v. I, no 35 (Sens, around the year 900); Leyden, BPL 111:2 (Beauvais, 9–10th century); London, Ms. Addit. 57.337 (Anglo-Saxon, Canterbury/Winchester?, around the year 1000); Paris, Ms. Lat. 943 (Anglo-Saxon, Sherborne?, 960–1001); Paris, Ms. Lat. 1217 (Moissac/Cahors?, 9–11th century); Reims, Ms. 340 (Reims, 10–11th century); Vatican City, Cod. Lat. 7701 (Italy, 10th century).

³¹ This is a lasting feature mostly of Bavarian sources, that is, in the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg.

³² Instead of an exhaustive study of numerous codices and fragments, I now rely only on the provenance of sources I personally used or works included in the critical edition of the PRG (cf. PRG I. XIII.): Monte-Cassino, Rome (2), Bamberg, Eichstätt, Lucca, Pistoia, Paris, Vendôme, Vienna, London, Wolfenbüttel, Budapest, Metz, Cologne, Soissons.

cluded in the PRG. This is the first source where the deliberate categorisation of “miscellaneous” Ordos is noticeable. It may be illustrated as follows:

- (1) THE DIFFERENT RANKS OF HOLY ORDERS
 - (a) tonsure
 - (b) minor orders
 - (c) major orders
- (2) THE CONSECRATION/BLESSING OF OTHER PERSONS
 - (a) women: virgin, abbess, deaconess, widow
 - (b) men: abbot, religious
- (3) THE DEDICATION OF CHURCHES
 - (a) blessing of vestments and liturgical utensils
 - (b) consecration of altars
 - (c) reconciliation of desecrated churches
 - (d) dedication of baptisteries
 - (e) consecration of cemeteries
- (4) THE INSTITUTION/CORONATION OF SECULAR RULERS
 - (a) bishop
 - (b) pope
 - (c) king
 - (d) emperor
 - (e) queen
- (5) RITES FOR ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT
 - (a) synod
 - (b) excommunication
 - (c) reconciliation of excommunicates
- (6) THE ORDER AND EXPOSITION OF THE RITES OF MASS AND PROCESSIONS
- (7) THE EXTRAORDINARY CEREMONIES OF THE LITURGICAL YEAR, INCLUDING:
 - (a) public and private rites of penance: Ash Wednesday, Maundy Thursday
 - (b) rites of catechumenate: during Lent and Holy Week
 - (c) Baptism, Confirmation: Holy Saturday
 - (c) other ceremonies not tied but somehow connected to particular times of the year
- (8) BAPTISM
 - (a) blessings of water
 - (b) clinical Baptism
 - (c) reception of pagans among the catechumens
 - (d) exorcism
 - (e) reconciliation of heretics
 - (f) apotropaic/prophylactic rites³³

³³ These rites were meant to avert bodily or spiritual harm and procure favourable effects. Such

(9) EXODIASTIC RITES

- (a) Confession
- (b) visitation of the sick
- (c) Extreme Unction and the absolution of the moribund
- (d) funeral rites

(10) THE RITES OF COMMUNAL/RELIGIOUS LIFE

(11) BLESSINGS AND BENEDICTIONS

- (a) agrarian sacramentals
- (b) blessing of places and locations
- (c) blessing of fruits and food
- (d) blessing of various objects
- (e) blessings for soldiers

(12) ORDEALS

(13) MATRIMONY, BIRTH, BIRTH BED

- (a) Matrimony
- (b) prayers for birth and in case of infertility

There were no other Pontificals of such monumental proportions ever produced. We must see the PRG as the apex of a convergent process whose goal was the assembly of all the Ordos into a more complete and systematic collection. Its redaction may have been inspired by the cultural situation of the Otto-period when the Church wanted to produce something analogous, if not equivalent, to the supplemented edition of the SGr in the Carolingian age. The PRG must have been a fund of text and structural pattern for the Pontificals after the 10th century, but the process becomes divergent from this time on: the new goal was to divest this enormous book of anything that was not necessary.

Reduction and the development of new genres

Sometimes the manuscripts of the PRG leave out certain Ordos or a particular part of these Ordos. The Roman Pontificals are all leaner volumes than the PRG, but the content of the PR12 and the PR13, despite the reduced content, is akin to the PRG. Although they follow a different logic (at times even in comparison with each other), they do not fall short of the PRG as regards systematic organisation:

- (1) Holy Orders (from tonsure to presbyterate)
- (2) Consecration/blessing of other persons (emperor, abbot, abbess, religious, virgin, widow)
- (3) Dedications (corner stone, church, altar, bells, utensils, vestments), reconciliation
- (4) Blessings of food (only in PR13, PR12, at sections 5 and 10)
- (5) Extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year (reduced in PR13), including: Baptism, Confirmation
- (6) Institution/coronation of secular rulers (only in PR12, PR13, at sections 1–2)

were prayers and blessings before and after traveling, in case of poisoning and illness, etc.

- (7) Synod
- (8) Penance (only in PR13)
- (9) Matrimony (only in PR12)
- (10) Blessings (only in PR12)
- (11) Exodiastic rites
- (12) Catechumenate, litanies (only in PR13, in appendix)

Abbreviation and simplification always result in some loss. The abbreviated Pontifical well-matched the austere tastes of the Papal Curia but ill-suited the transalpine atmosphere. They would not have renounced some of the omitted parts easily, and so another possibility was proposed: the material should be preserved but reorganised into new liturgical genres. That is how the liturgical content of Pontificals were included partly in Missals, Breviaries, Ordinals or other sorts of normative texts. The process is similar to how the abundant liturgical material of the Gelasiana, especially of the SGF, was transferred to “pure” Mass Sacramentaries and Pontificals.

The changes in using different books did not occur at the same time everywhere and in the same way but the tendency is clearly recognisable: remove everything from the Pontifical that is not specifically episcopal, and create new genres for the material thus extracted. In the 10th century the Pontifical is still a well-organised encyclopædia of ceremonies in the “miscellaneous” category, but in time it was gradually transformed into the personal liturgical book of the bishop. Its content was not lost, it was only transferred into other genres.

The classic Pontifical

This process is recognised and completed by the PGD. Durandus methodically removes from the Pontifical the material of the new genres, already wide-spread during his time, which is rather remarkable if we consider that the association of a particular liturgical content with the corresponding liturgical genre is still inconsistent and incomplete in the 16th century. Just because a rite is included in a new genre, it does not necessarily disappear from the old. The parts omitted are the Sacraments and Sacramentals that a simple priest may administer and the extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year, unless they can only be celebrated by the bishop, such as the expulsion and reconciliation of penitents and the consecration of oils on Maundy Thursday. As a talented organiser, Durandus arranges the material of this “purged” Pontifical into three books:³⁴

- (1) Consecration of persons
- (2) Blessing of objects
- (3) Various ecclesiastical functions:
 - (a) specifically episcopal rites of the liturgical year

³⁴ PGD 326–331.: “Sane liber iste tres continet partes. In prima de personarum benedictionibus, ordinationibus et consecrationibus agitur ... In secunda parte de consecrationibus et benedictionibus aliarum tam sacrarum, quam profanarum rerum agitur ... In tertia parte de quibusdam ecclesiasticis officii agitur”

- (b) rites of ecclesiastical government (synod, degradations, excommunication, visitations, etc.)
- (c) solemn pontifical Mass and the bishop's participation at Mass celebrated by another³⁵
- (d) appendix

This structure was probably inspired by the classical organisation of the material into *personae-res-actiones* in Canon law, based on the tradition of Roman law.³⁶ As it is commonly known, the PGD became perpetuated in the form of the PR, and this led to the general modern arrangement of including the Sacraments and Sacramentals administered by a priest in the Ritual, while incorporating the extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year into the Missal. From this time on, the entire ritual material of the Roman liturgy is included in the mutually exclusive yet co-dependent set of books: the Breviary, Missal, Pontifical and Ritual.³⁷

Summary

Whatever has been said about the history of the genre and thus the changes in the content of the Pontifical is summarised as follows:

- (1) Libellus: description of certain individual Ordos
- (2) Collection of Ordos: non-systematic collection of some (smaller or greater number of) Ordos
 - (a) in Sacramentaries
 - (b) in the collections of the OR
 - (c) in primitive Pontificals
- (3) Encyclopaedia: systematic collection of ceremonies outside of the Mass and Divine Office (PRG)
- (4) Abbreviated Encyclopaedia: simplification of the same ceremonies but according to the same concept (PR12 and PR13)
- (5) The bishop's liturgical book: by taking the Ritual and the Processional out (PGD and PR)

I consider it important to emphasise these for two reasons: (1) It is misleading to interpret the content and structure of a medieval Pontifical in light of the PGD. We must make our judgment about a codex by first examining the actual units of content and their sequence. Thus it will become clear if it is a Primitive Pontifical, an accidental and loose assembly of Ordos, a comprehensive collection like the PRG or just an abbreviation thereof, or perhaps, a volume pointing towards the PGD in that it omits the not strictly speaking episcopal Ordos. (2) The liturgical content of Pontificals extends beyond those Ordos that are preserved for bishops. The Sacraments, Sacramentals, blessings, processions and extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year

³⁵ The *Præparatio ad missam* and the *Ordo missæ* is present in many Pontificals even before the PGD. In this respect, the medieval Pontifical is an antecedent of the *Canon episcopalis*, the modern booklet which contains the ordinary parts of the pontifical high mass.

³⁶ More particularly, the chapter division in the Institutions of Gaius (2nd century) which is preserved until the 20th century in codices of canon law.

³⁷ In the order of publication: *Breviarium Romanum*, *Missale Romanum*, *Pontificale Romanum* and *Rituale Romanum*. Facsimile editions: SODI—TRIACCA: *Breviarium Romanum*; SODI—TRIACCA: *Missale Romanum*; SODI—ARCAS: *Rituale Romanum*.

originally belong to the Pontifical, thus, following their history, we must extend our scholarly interests to these genres that in time became independent from Pontificals. Conclusions about the genre also broaden the problematic of liturgical content. In what follows, the term ‘episcopal Ordo’ will be used in this wider sense.

THE EXTANT PONTIFICALS OF HUNGARIAN ORIGIN

When in the following I write about Hungary and its liturgy, what I have in mind is medieval Hungary, including all the regions and territories of the Hungarian Kingdom; in terms of ecclesiastical governance: the archiepiscopal provinces of Esztergom and Kalocsa. Today entire regions of this medieval kingdom belong to neighbouring countries, such as Croatia, Slovakia, Romania, Ukraine, Serbia and Austria. The valuable documents of Hungary’s liturgical past are rightfully considered the proper inheritance of Croatia and Slovakia, countries that are still predominantly Catholic. Specifically, as regards Pontificals, the majority of extant manuscripts are the property of the Zagreb archcathedral. Consequently, I must make it clear in the beginning that medieval Hungary was not a homogenous nation-state in the modern sense, but a political and cultural entity, a home to various ethnic groups and languages: Hungarian, Croatian, Slovak and many others. Hungary’s dioceses used a remarkably uniform liturgy, and when – for the sake of brevity and simplicity – I use the description Hungarian or Strigonian (Esztergom) for the liturgy, I do not mean to suggest that – based on a modern sense of nationality – it was in any way more “Magyar” than Croatian or Slovak.

At this time, we know of four extant Pontificals of Hungarian provenance which represent the local ritual variant.³⁸ The other five manuscript Pontificals used in Hungary are copies of the PGD, among which three were actually written in Hungary. From this fact we may conclude that Zagreb at the latest by the first half of the 14th century, while Esztergom by the second half of the 15th century abandoned the use of its proper Pontifical, and decided to adopt the PGD.

Although these adopted Pontificals also show some proper characteristics, in the centre of their interest we find the representative sources of the 12-14th century. In the following, after a codicological description (provenance and format), I shall write about the history of their research, their age, origin, and liturgical content, taking due care to place them in the context of Hungarian Pontifical Ordos. The purpose of this

³⁸ In addition to these four sources, we are aware of two other Pontificals in Hungary but they belong to foreign Uses. The codex at the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár in Budapest (Clmæ. 330) is from the Benedictine Monastery of Biburg (Bavaria, Diocese of Regensburg) from the time of Abbot John (1178–1199), cf. KAY: *Pontificalia* 123 (p. 23) and RADÓ: *Libri liturgici* 142 (pp. 439–446). The other manuscript at the Archiepiscopal Library of Esztergom (Ms. I. 214) was the property of Giovanni Battista Pinelli, archbishop of Cosenza (near Napoli) between 1491 and 1495, cf. KAY: *op. cit.* 228 (p. 44) and RADÓ: *op. cit.* *145 (p. 462).

introduction is to shed light on the proper context of the H, hence the description of the relevant codices is from second hand sources without touching upon debated questions.³⁹ Independent conclusions will only be drawn at the very end, and concerning only the context itself.

The Esztergom Benedictional⁴⁰

The so-called Esztergom Benedictional (from now on simply BS=Benedictionale Strigoniense) is a manuscript (MR 89) in the custody of the Knjižnica Metropolitana in Zagreb. Dimensions: 156×221 mm, today altogether 114 folios, one sheet between folios 64 and 65 is lost. It is written in South-German Carolingian minuscule but it also contains Gothic supplementation. Its notation is in a peculiar version of German neums but there are also some later, 14th-century notations by several different hands. Until folio 33 the initials are decorated with elaborate drawings. Its binding was originally missing but it was recently restored.

Several important works have been published about the codex, mostly by the same authors who had earned due credit in the study of the H as well. Without wanting to give a full list, I would like to highlight the pioneering work of Germain Morin, the article written of Dragutin Kniewald, and the monographic works of József Török and Janka Szendrei.⁴¹ Its critical edition is being prepared for publication as the fourth volume of the present series by Attila Józsa and myself.

The BS is probably our oldest extant liturgical book,⁴² the experts place its time of composition some time between 1075 and 1093. The basis for the terminus post quem is that one of the churches mentioned in the Ordinations is most likely the Abbey of Garamszentbenedek which was established in 1075. The foundation for the terminus ante quem is that the codex does not contain those Hungarian saints who were canonised in 1083 (Andrew and Benedict, Stephen, Emeric, Gerard), although their public cult was officially decreed by the Synod of Szabolcs in 1092. Already in the Middle Ages the manuscript was transferred to Zagreb,⁴³ and it seems reasonable

³⁹ From among the catalogues we cite the one most known internationally (Kay) and the most complete ones from the perspective of the Hungarian Use (Radó and Szendrei). The description provided here is based on the most comprehensive and reliable summary, indicating all the sources. The prospectus of content is my own.

⁴⁰ Catalogues: KAY: *Pontificalia* 1242 (p. 236); SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* C 60 (p. 65). Description: SZENDREI: *A „mos patria”* pp. 47–48, with appendices, based on research done in 2012 at Zagreb.

⁴¹ MORIN: *Manuscrits liturgiques hongrois* 60–63; KNIEWALD: *Esztergomi Benedictionale*; TÖRÖK: *Az Esztergomi Benedictionale*; SZENDREI: *A „mos patria”* 47–54.

⁴² In this context several other manuscripts were discussed earlier (cf. RADÓ: *De originibus liturgie Romanae in Hungaria*), which has caused some confusion among those who do not speak Hungarian. The manuscripts mentioned by Radó have since been proven to be either of later or of non-Hungarian origin.

⁴³ The 14th-century catalogue of the Cathedral Library was published by TKALČIĆ: *Dva inventara*.

to suppose that new “imported” books were only needed around and after the canonical erection of the episcopal see (1094).

Almost every single expert agrees on the Esztergom-provenance of the manuscript. Their reasoning is based on the fact that the titles of the churches presenting candidates for Ordinations reflect the ecclesiastical structure of the Esztergom diocese during that period: Adalbert (Esztergom), Blessed Virgin Mary (Székesfehérvár), Peter (Óbuda), Hippolytus (Zobor), Benedict (Garamszentbenedek), Margaret (Dömös?). Soon after its composition the book was brought to Zagreb where, based on the corrections, modifications and supplements, it was in use at least until the 14th century.

The major part of the volume is made up by an ample Benedictional, after which the BS was named. In addition to Sundays, the Temporale gives blessings also for Wednesdays and Fridays, two for each day. The various sections of the Sanctorale are inserted into the Temporale, followed by sections of the Commune and Votive material. The rest of the Ordos (for greater clarity, including the Benedictional as well) are as follows:

- (1) Benedictional(1^r–81^r)
- (2) Confirmation: *Oratio simul et benedictio pontificis ad confirmandos pueros* (81^v–82^v)
- (3) Ordinations: *Ordo qualiter in Romana ecclesia ecclesiastici eligendi sunt et consecrandi* (83^r–97^v)
- (4) Dedication: *Ordo ad dedicandam ecclesiam* (98^r–114^r)

On the last folio of the codex (114.) there is an alternative Ordo of Confirmation, followed by the bishop’s vesting prayers and the beginning of the Order of Mass written by two different hands.

The section of the Benedictional is the earliest witness to a tradition which is only known from two other 14th-century Saxon sources (Magdeburg and Braunschweig).⁴⁴ The order of Confirmation is completely identical to that of the H. The closest relative of the Ordinations and Dedication is a 13th-century Pontifical of Zagreb of which more will be said later. The same manuscript also contains an extract Benedictional whose material is partly derived from the BS. The connection of the BS to another Hungarian source for the Ordos mentioned is less direct. This Pontifical, perhaps from Veszprém, will also be discussed later.

From these connections two important conclusions follow. (1) The Uses of East Saxony and its marches may have played a role in the composition of the Hungarian Use. It is unlikely that German dioceses would have adopted a Hungarian liturgy in the 14th century. We do know, however, that in the 10th-century Ottonian Empire the archiepiscopal see of Magdeburg was established specifically for the purpose of conducting “Eastern” missions. (2) Before the adoption of the PGD, all of the Za-

⁴⁴ Based on MOELLER: *Corpus benedictionum pontificalium*, their affinity has been proven by TÖRÖK: *Az Esztergomi Benedictionale*. From among these two Benedictionals, the Magdeburg, Domgymnasium Ms. 154. was destroyed in Berlin during World War II, but its text is known, thanks to LÜDTKE: *Bischöfliche Benediktionen aus Magdeburg und Braunschweig*. The 13-14th-century copy from Braunschweig is now preserved in the Landes-Hauptarchiv of Wolfenbüttel under call number Ms. VII. B 313. As to both, see KAY: *Pontificalia* 439 (p. 87) and 1237 (p. 235).

greb Pontificals are authentic representatives of the archaic Esztergom Use. This is true both of the imported books and the manuscripts produced specifically in and for Zagreb, since the parallels with the BS bear witness to a solid tradition which must have existed in Esztergom already before the foundation of the diocese of Zagreb.

The Chartvirgus-Pontifical (H=Hartwick), being the subject of the present work, is either of the same age as the BS, or a bit later. Its detailed description and analysis is the task of the chapters to come.

The Zagreb Pontifical⁴⁵

The reason I find it appropriate to call the next manuscript simply *the Zagreb Pontifical* (from now on PZ=Pontificale Zagrabiense) among other Pontificals from Zagreb is that the other Pontificals of the cathedral were either not produced in Zagreb or they are already copies of the PGD. The PZ is at the Knjižnica Metropolitana in Zagreb under call number MR 124. Dimensions: 204×275 mm, 84 folios, most probably complete, although the text written on the last page ends abruptly. It was written in early Gothic letters with slight Carolingian features, principally by two hands, later modified and supplemented by many others. There is no notation, except for a single antiphon, notated later and in a sketchy fashion.⁴⁶ It is bound in two wooden tablets tied together by two leather straps.

The codex has not been studied much, it was first described by Dragutin Kniewald in his catalogue of the liturgical manuscripts of Zagreb, and I was the first one to demonstrate its central significance for Hungarian liturgical history.⁴⁷ At the same time, this is the only Hungarian Pontifical which has both a critical and a facsimile edition, published by Ivan Šaško in 2005.⁴⁸

Palaeographically, it is dated to the beginning of the 13th century but it does not contain any data that would help its exact dating. Since medieval times it has been in the possession of the Zagreb archcathedral. Based on the invocation of St Hadrian in its text for the litany, Kniewald proposed that it was copied from an exemplar manuscript of the Abbey of St Hadrian in Zalavár, but this remains a hypothesis without

⁴⁵ Neither the Kay-Catalogue, nor the Hungarian liturgical inventaria know anything about this manuscript.

⁴⁶ The antiphon *Cor mundum* at the beginning of the reconciliation of penitents was added later with sketchy musical notation (in the Divine Office it is the first Lauds-antiphon for the First Sunday of Lent). The melodic variant, insofar as it can be determined, is that of the Esztergom Use; cf. PZ 58^v and DOBSZAY — SZENDREI: *MMMÆ V. Antiphonen* 1199 (Vol. I, p. 96). The notation is identical to the Zagreb-variant of the Hungarian musical notation (thanks to Gábrriel Szoliva OFM for the palaeographical analysis).

⁴⁷ KNIEWALD: *Zagrebački liturگیjski kodeksi* 5–6; FÖLDVÁRY: *Egy hiányzó láncszem*.

⁴⁸ ŠAŠKO: *Zagrebački-pontifikal*.

any real foundation. It seems more probable that it was produced directly for the Zagreb cathedral.⁴⁹

In the beginning of the volume we find a table of incipits and formulas connected with the dedication of churches. The actual Pontifical contains the following Ordos:

- (1) Synod: *Incipit ordo diei primi in synodo episcoporum* (3^{r-v})
- (2) Excommunication: *Excommunicatio perpere agentium* (3^{v-4^r})
- (3) Absolution: *Absolutio excommunicatorum* (4^{r-v})
- (4) Blessing of abbots: *Incipit ordo qualiter abbas vel abbatissa consecrari debet* (4^{v-6^v})
- (5) Laying of foundation stones: *Incipit ordo ubi ædificanda est ecclesia* (6^{v-7^r})
- (6) Consecration of cemeteries: *Consecratio cimiterii* (7^{r-8^r})
- (7) Re-consecration of altars: *In reconciliatione violatæ altaris* (8^{r-v})
- (8) Palm Sunday: *Ordo in Ramispalmarum qualiter processio agatur* (9^{r-13^v})
- (9) Maundy Thursday, blessing of oils: *Ordo in Cena Domini* (13^{v-20^v})
- (10) Maundy Thursday, washing of the feet (Mandatum): *Ordo ad mandatum faciendum* (20^{v-21^r})
- (11) Good Friday: *Ordo in Parasceve* (21^{r-22^r})
- (12) Holy Saturday: *Benedictio ignis in Sabbato Sancto* (22^{r-v})
- (13) Blessing of bells: *Ad signum ecclesiæ benedicendum* (22^{v-24^v})
- (14) Ordinations: *Hic incipit ordo ad ordines clericorum celebrandos* (24^{v-33^v})
- (15) Dedication of churches and altars: *Ordo ad ecclesiam dedicandam* (33^{r-51^v})
- (16) Re-dedication of churches: *Reconciliatio violatæ ecclesiæ* (52^{r-53^v})
- (17) Consecration of reliquaries: *Præfatio consecrationis capsarum* (53^{v-55^r})
- (18) Maundy Thursday, reconciliation of penitents: *Reconciliatio pœnitentium in Cena Domini* (55^{r-61^v})
- (19) Preparation for Mass: *Oratio dum dominus pontifex præparat se ad missam* (62^{r-70^v})
- (20) Order of Mass: *Paratus presbyter intrat ad altare dicens* (71^{r-80^v})
- (21) Benedictional (81^{r-84^v})
- (22) Mass of dedication: *Missa in Dedicatione ecclesiæ* (84^v)

The PZ is a descendant of the BS and the H. The Ordos contained in these two antecedents are united in a single collection, at times reordering or abbreviating them. Its structure is not very well-balanced: the Ordos in connection with the liturgical year and the dedication is not given continuously. It contains some supplements: Ordos and rubrics which are not to be found either in the BS or the H. These are often related to the liturgy of the most famous Hungarian Sacramentary, the so-called Pray-Codex, or of the Veszprém Pontifical (of which more will be said later). Wherever the Veszprém Pontifical and the BS differ from each other, the PZ confirms the variants of the BS. The PZ contains titles and rubrics which are not in the H, even though the scribes left space for them in the H but, for some reason, never filled them in with red ink.

From all this we may conclude that the BS and the H represent one liturgical Use, and their users considered them as related books within the same genre. The PZ is already a precursor of the modern Pontifical in the sense that it abbreviates the Benedictional and leaves out those Ordos which are thematically more related to the Pro-

⁴⁹ This is proven both by liturgical and philological arguments of which we shall speak later.

cessional and the Ritual.⁵⁰ Because of the PZ's extra material it seems reasonable to suppose that the BS or the H were not single copies. The Esztergom Use of the 11th century was transmitted to Zagreb also by other sources,⁵¹ otherwise the PZ could not contain Ordos and rubrics which are not present in its antecedents. These three codices belong together and they confirm each other's contents. Even if we were to encounter any data in collision with them, it cannot be doubted that they represent the typical version of the Esztergom Use and the early customs of the Zagreb cathedral.

The Veszprém Pontifical⁵²

The so-called Veszprém Pontifical (from now on PV=Pontificale Vespreniense) is in the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár in Budapest under call number Clmæ 317. Dimensions: 228×325 mm, 141 folios, complete. It is written with 13-14th-century textual Gothic letters, and it was supplemented in the second half of the 15th century by the same hand in cursive. On the margins we see further notes written by several different hands. The principal part of the Pontifical is abruptly discontinued on folio 97, the rest of which is left blank. Then the text is taken up by the same hand where it was left off, beginning a new section which goes on until folio 132. The rest of the codex is written by a different hand. It is notated all the way until the end with staves, the notation is typically Hungarian, a bit archaic compared to the age of the main text. The notation is written by several hands, all from the 14th century, from the appendix on (folio 133-) in quadrate style. The codex is decorated by finely detailed initial letters and fringes in blue and red. The binding is leather, fortified by wooden tablets in the front and the back.

The first bibliographical descriptions of the PV are from the second part of the 19th century; the names of Emma Bartoniek, Kilián Szigeti, Polikárp Radó and Janka Szendrei are worthy of special mention.⁵³ In the last few years the PV has been studied by Ágnes Szaszovszky whose doctoral thesis is focused on this source, with special attention to the Ordo of dedication. She is preparing the VP's critical edition with my help to be published as the fifth volume of the present series.

⁵⁰ The reduction in the number of blessings may have been caused by the fact that the bishop did not celebrate solemnly every day, and so these solemn blessings were used only on special feast days. The elimination of processional rites is indicated by the omission of Candlemas, the Easter Sunday procession, and Rogations. The Palm Sunday procession is an exception in this regard, but the liturgy of the Holy Week is of a different, transitional character.

⁵¹ According to TKALČIĆ: *Dva inventara* 136., and *op. cit.* 2nd footnote: in the 15th century five Pontificals or Benedictionals were in the possession of the Zagreb Cathedral, not counting the H, which the catalogue mistakenly registered as a Missal.

⁵² Catalogues: KAY: *Pontificalia* 122 (p. 23); RADÓ: *Libri liturgici* 143 (pp. 446–458); SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* C 29 (p. 62). Description: SZASZOVSKY: *A Veszprémi pontifikále templomszentelési ordója*, chapter 1.

⁵³ BARTONIEK: *Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár 317. sz. középkori kódexéről*; SZIGETI: *Mesko veszprémi püspök (1334–44) Pontificalja*; RADÓ: *op. cit.* SZENDREI: *A Veszprémi Pontificale*.

The manuscript does not contain any concrete historical information but relying on palaeographical data, the experts date it to the first half of the 14th century. Based on its earlier places of custody, supplementation and litanies, its Hungarian provenance cannot be doubted. It may be reasonably attributed either to the cathedral of Esztergom or that of Veszprém.

Its Esztergom provenance is supported by the concession of an indulgence copied into the book later, written by the same scribe who corrected the book and wrote its table of content. The Pontifical also has the ceremony of the king's coronation which in Hungary was the privilege of Esztergom, but there are no marginal notes attached to the coronation rite which seems to indicate that it was never actually used in practice. Another problem is posed by the fact that the PV's liturgical order considerably differs from the tradition represented unanimously both by the early manuscripts (BS, H, PZ) and by the post-PV Esztergom sources.

It seems to support its Veszprém provenance that in the Ordo of episcopal consecration the candidate is proposed to the archbishop of Esztergom by the Diocese of Veszprém with the following decree: "Beatissimo N. archiepiscopo Strigoniensi clerus et populus ecclesiae Vespremiensis totius devotionis famulatum." It is rather frequent in medieval books that the proper names to be used in practice are not left blank in the text but are substituted by fictitious examples. We have already seen this not only at the priestly ordination of the BS but also with several baptismal Ordos.⁵⁴ For this reason the text quoted above is not decisive in and of itself. At the same time, the litany does not mention the name of St Adalbert, the principal patron of the archdiocese of Esztergom; instead, it lists the names of the patrons of Veszprém, Sts Michael the Archangel and George, and other saints of local significance. In my opinion the names mentioned in the litany are suitable for identifying a wider region but they are unreliable on the level of individual dioceses. Therefore, we are forced to conclude that as to the question of exact provenance we do not have a final answer yet. The manuscript was certainly used within the ecclesiastical province of Esztergom, and we have no reason to reject definitively the by-now traditional title: "Veszprém Pontifical".

The PV is not a Pontifical in the classical sense. In its first section (1–10) only Ordos reserved exclusively to the bishop are contained in a systematic order. The exodistic content and the Order of Mass in the second section (11–17) is in line with the customs of the late Middle Ages, while the third section (18) is obviously supplementary. The Ordos are as follows:

- (1) Baptism and Confirmation: *Ordo ad catechizandum infantes* (1^r–10^r)
- (2) Ordinations (including that of a bishop): *Benedictio ad clericum faciendum* (10^r–31^r)
- (3) Consecration (foundation stone, cemetery, church, altar): *Ordo ad consecrandam ecclesiam* (36^v–67^r)

⁵⁴ For example, the baptismal formula of PR12 245 has the following names inserted: John, Peter and Mary. In the matrimonial formula of the 16th-century *Agendarius* 53–75, the betrothed couple are represented by the names: John and Catherine.

- (4) Liturgical utensils (including bells): *Benedictio vestimentorum sacerdotalium seu leviticarum* (67^v–74^r)
- (5) Re-dedication of churches: *Reconciliatio violata ecclesie* (74^r–75^v)
- (6) Blessing of abbots and abbesses: *Ordo ad abbatem faciendum* (75^v–80^r)
- (7) Consecration of virgins: *Consecratio sacra virginis* (80^r–84^v)
- (8) Synod: *De sancto synodo ordo Romanus qualiter concilium agatur* (84^v–88^v)
- (9) Coronation of kings and queens: *Ordo ad benedicendum regem* (88^v–96^v)
- (10) Sequence for the dedication of churches: *Quam dilecta* (97^r–v)
- (11) Exodiastic rites: *Ordo minorum fratrum ... ad visitandum infirmum* (99^r–110^r)
- (12) Seven penitential psalms (110^r–114^r)
- (13) Fifteen gradual psalms (114^r–117^v)
- (14) Preparation for Mass (117^v–124^v)
- (15) Benedictional (125^r–131^v)
- (16) Blessing of swords: *Benedictio ensis* (131^v–132^r)
- (17) Solemn blessing for the dedication of churches (132^v)
- (18) Consecration of altars: *Incipit ordo ad consecrationem altaris* (133^r–140^v)

The PV is an enigmatic, isolated source. Its liturgical content does not square with either the above-mentioned archaic Hungarian tradition or the PGD. Although its composition is logical and almost complete, the origin of its *Ordos* is not homogeneous. In order to know more, we have to analyse each *Ordo* individually so that they can be placed in their proper context. So far, the partial results are the following:

Even in terms of the titles, the series of exodiastic rites is Franciscan-Curial in origin. At the baptismal *Ordo*, the rubric referring to the Holy Saturday ceremonies mentions 12 prophecies, a Curial custom which is without precedent in Hungary before 1490.⁵⁵ The *Ordo* of dedication is a true rarity in Europe.⁵⁶ The blessing of bells and the re-dedication of churches are essentially identical to what we see in the PZ. The consecration of cemeteries is very similar but the blessing of abbots is considerably different. The *Ordo* of Synods follows the PR12, the coronation follows the PRG, while the Benedictional is identical to that of the SAn. It is interesting, however, that wherever it differs from the SAn, it stands in parallel to the Benedictional of the PZ.⁵⁷ The notation is Hungarian but in a peculiar version which is also what may be said of its melodic variants.

It will be the task of further studies to determine why the PV is divergent from the other Hungarian sources. At this point, two theories seem plausible. If the PV is not from Esztergom but from Veszprém or from another suffragan diocese, the different liturgical order may represent a different ritual Use. It is not impossible that an epis-

⁵⁵ From the 1490-edition of the Esztergom Missal, the sources are unanimous in prescribing 12 prophecies for the Easter Vigil, cf. DÉRI: *Missale Strigoniense* XXX. footnote no. 133. In earlier standard sources we find four (like in the SGr), in archaic or peripheral sources five prophecies (as the PRG), cf. KOVÁCS: *A nagyszombati próféciákról*.

⁵⁶ This conclusion is drawn by SZASZOVSKY: *A Veszprémi pontifikále templomszentelési ordója*, based on a systematic comparison of almost 40 parallel *Ordos*. Another useful reference: KOZACHEK: *The Repertory of Chants for Dedicating Churches*.

⁵⁷ The blessing for the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (September 8) is crucial because it is not in the SAn but it is identical in the PZ and the VP.

copal see may have wished to express its independence from Esztergom precisely by compiling a representative version of its proper Pontifical.⁵⁸ If, however, the PV is indeed from Esztergom, or at least an authentic witness to the Esztergom Use of its age, it bears witness to an intermediate stage of development: a period when the Hungarian church, under foreign influence, revised its pontifical rites but had not yet adopted the PGD. Since the PV was used for a long time, even in the 15th century, personally I prefer the first hypothesis.

The Durandus-Pontificals Used in the Hungarian Kingdom

The later Hungarian Pontificals are without exception copies of the PGD. In Zagreb, from the 14th century, in other Hungarian cathedrals, from the 15th century, the adoption of the PGD is an accomplished fact. These are important primarily from the perspective of fine arts and as sources of melodic variants. The liturgy contained in them is international in character, hence irrelevant for our present study. They signal with their bare existence that the strictly-speaking Hungarian episcopal Ordos (whose international counterparts form part of the PGD) did not survive until the end of the Middle Ages. The PGD manuscripts used in Hungarian dioceses, and their bishop owners are the following:⁵⁹

- (1) Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 37 (Pope John XXII, Avignon, 1316–1334 [?])
- (2) Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 163 (James of Placentia, Zagreb, 1343–1346)
- (3) Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 25 (Nicholas Babonić, Zagreb, 1350–1356)
- (4) Esztergom, Library of the Archcathedral Mss. 26 (John Filipecz/Pruisz, Várad, 1477–1490)
- (5) Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ottob. Lat. 501 (John Vitéz, Veszprém, 1489–1498)

Jakab Placentiai was transferred from Avignon to the see of Zagreb. According to Kniewald the Pontifical of MR 163 was written at Avignon in 1339,⁶⁰ and perhaps it was Bishop Jakab himself who brought the *Pontificale Romanum* of MR 37 to the cathedral of Zagreb where it was used for a long time.⁶¹ It is impossible to determine if

⁵⁸ It should put us on our guard that those Hungarian cathedrals whose late medieval liturgy we know (Pécs, Eger and Zagreb), do not vary to such extent from Esztergom, even though they consciously cultivated their relative independence. The first printed editions of the relevant sources: *Missale secundum morem alme ecclesie Quinquecclesiensis*; *OA*; *Missale secundum chorum et rubricam almi episcopatus Zagrabiensis ecclesie*.

⁵⁹ For more information on Hungarian bishops, see GAMS: *Series episcoporum* I. 387. (Zagreb), 386. (Veszprém), 385. (Várad).

⁶⁰ KNIEWALD: *Esztergomi Benedictionale* 230.

⁶¹ According to KNIEWALD: *Zagrebački liturgijski kodeksi* 6. it was originally a papal copy. I have not studied the source personally but it is worthwhile mentioning that according to the full title of the Filipecz-Pontifical, the Papal Curia changed from the PR13 to the PGD under the pontificate of Pope John XXII: “Incipit Pontificale secundum novum ordinem sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, compositum per sanctissimum patrem dominum Ioannem papam XXII.” Such a title does not necessarily mean that the book was copied specifically for the pope. Nonetheless, the information is still valuable because the quoted monographs about liturgical sources (Vogel, Palazzo) only state that the Papal Curia took the

the changes to the Pontifical began with the arrival of the Bishop Jakab from Avignon, or they had already been part of the liturgical redaction at Zagreb which is usually attributed to one of his predecessors, Ágoston Gazotti (1303–1323).⁶² The other three Pontificals can properly be called Hungarian, even in terms of their composition.

Other Related Sources

In our study of the Pontifical's liturgical content our attention cannot be restricted to Pontificals as a genre. The PZ and the PV have demonstrated that the evolvement of the classical Pontifical had already been an accomplished fact before the adoption of the PGD. This means that in archaic Pontificals the individual layers of content were transmitted differently. Such were the extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year, the material later collected in Rituals, hence those Sacraments and sacramentals that could be administered by simple priests. These remained a part of the Hungarian Use, and survived the abandonment of our own Pontifical. The line of division between different genres was not clearly defined anyway: we can see quite a few episcopal Ordos preserved in Sacramentaries. Therefore, in studying Hungarian Pontificals we have to be mindful of some other liturgical genres as well.

The Codex Pray

One of our most important liturgical books with the very first Hungarian text to be preserved in writing, the so-called Codex Pray (from now on P=Pray) is in the custody of the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár in Budapest with call number MNy. 1.⁶³ Although its principal text is a 12th-century monastic Sacramentary, most likely from Boldva in North-East Hungary,⁶⁴ among its sources we find Pontifical Ordos from Esztergom. Its close philological relationship with the H is most obvious when we examine these episcopal Ordos: Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the Sacred Triduum, the Easter liturgical play and procession. In addition to these, it contains exodiastic rites,

PR13 to Avignon, although the first printed edition of the Papal Pontifical of 1485 reproduces the PGD. We have no further information regarding the time and initiator of the change.

⁶² Ágoston was a Dalmatian Dominican, an alumnus of the University of Paris, who left Zagreb for Avignon during the pontificate of John XXII. Even though he was a truly international character, contrary to the common misperception, he did not introduce the Dominican liturgy in Zagreb. The Use of Zagreb preserved its fundamentally Strigonian (Esztergom) character even after the 14th century, but its highly centralised, more detailed sources are more unified than those of Esztergom.

⁶³ The P has been for some time the most often studied Hungarian liturgical manuscript but it still has not been published critically. KAY: *Pontificalia* 124 (p. 23); RADÓ: *Libri liturgici* 2 (pp. 40–76); SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* C 19 (p. 61). Description: SZENDREI: *A „mos patriae”* 144–209.

⁶⁴ The hypothesis of its origin from Vác (also argued by Radó) is advanced by MEZEY: *A Pray-kódex keletkezése*, and in German by MEZEY: *Probleme der Entstehungsgeschichte des Pray-Kodex*. This idea has since been rebutted several times.

matrimonial ceremonies, the consecration of cemeteries, the rite of laying foundation stones, and the Ordo of a Pontifical Mass with very detailed preparations.

The Notated Esztergom Missal and Breviary, supplementary sources

A representative notated Missal of the Esztergom Archcathedral (from now on MNS=Missale Notatum Strigoniense) is preserved in Pozsony (Bratislava) at the Archiv Mesta under call numbers EC. Lad. 3 & EL. 18. The experts date this manuscript and its several fragments to some time before 1341.⁶⁵ Its philological connections with the H are even closer than it was the case with the P. In addition to the Ordos mentioned earlier, it also contains such specifically episcopal Ordos as the expulsion of the penitents on Ash Wednesday and their reconciliation on Maundy Thursday,⁶⁶ as well as the blessing of oils. It is a very important source for the rites of Baptism and wedding ceremonies. Every single Hungarian Missal of the 15-16th century is dependent upon this source, although they usually abbreviate it considerably.⁶⁷

As regards the Divine Office, the MNS's counterpart is a 13th century notated Esztergom Breviary (from now on BNS=Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense), which is preserved under call number DE. I 7 in Prague at the Strahovská Knihovna, the library of the Praemonstratensian (Norbertine) Monastery of Strahov.⁶⁸ With early Pontificals it shares the description of the Offices of the Sacred Triduum and the Baptismal Vespers of Easter. The 15-16th-century Hungarian Breviaries are just as dependent upon this manuscript as the Missals were upon the MNS.⁶⁹

Besides the BNS, the most valuable document of the Hungarian Office is the so-called Codex Albensis (from now on CA) preserved under call number 211 at the Universitätsbibliothek in Graz (Austria). This is a 12th-century notated Antiphonal, most likely from the South-East region of Transylvania (in the ecclesiastical province of Kalocsa).⁷⁰ It contains the Ordo of the Easter play, parallel to that of the H. The same Ordo may also be found in the so-called Futaki-Gradual.⁷¹

⁶⁵ Facsimile: SZENDREI — RIBARIČ: *Missale Notatum Strigoniense*.

⁶⁶ The Ordo of the reconciliation of penitents on Maundy Thursday is found in the fragment of Fasc. 322. Nr. 10. at the Literárny Archív Spolku Svätého Vojtecha in Nagyszombat (Trnava, Slovakia). It was identified by Zsuzsa Czagány. According to footnote no. 28 of DANKÓ: *Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariae* 577. this fragment was still an integral part of the codex at the end of the 19th century.

⁶⁷ The Esztergom Missal was published in several printed editions between 1480 and 1524. For a critical edition, see DÉRI: *Missale Strigoniense*.

⁶⁸ Facsimile: SZENDREI: *Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense*.

⁶⁹ The Esztergom Breviary was published in several printed editions between 1480 and 1558. A critical edition is planned in the future as part of the present series.

⁷⁰ Facsimile: FALVY—MEZEY: *Codex Albensis*.

⁷¹ Call number: İstanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi 2429. Perhaps it is originally from Buda, usually dated to 1463.

The Ordinals

The third relevant group of sources is that of the Ordinals. Of these a detailed description has been provided in the previous volume of the present series.⁷² These are important for the extraordinary *Ordos* of the liturgical year, especially that of the Holy Week. The Ordinals do not have a direct philological relationship with the Pontificals but their ceremonies often provide us with very elucidative parallels. The Esztergom Ordinal from the end of the 15th century (from now on OS=Ordinarius Strigoniensis)⁷³ fills the gaps in terms of the Easter procession and Great Vespers, while the Eger Ordinal⁷⁴ (from now on OA=Ordinarius Agriensis) provides supplementary material and information about the reconciliation of penitents. Since these – like the other Ordinals – are rather late sources, they help to determine the timeframe of the *Ordos*, that is, until when were those ceremonies, about which the archaic Pontificals inform us, considered integral parts of the Hungarian liturgy.

The Rituals

Finally we must make mention of the Hungarian predecessors to the Ritual. For a long time, the most important source for the *Ordos* in connection with the content of the Ritual was the P and the MNS. We do not know of any real Rituals from before the time of the printing press. From that time on, however, several editions were published with the titles: *Baptismale* or *Obsequiale Strigoniense*. These contained, in addition to the Sacraments and sacramentals, a number of processions and a description of the Holy Week. The last, unchanged edition, the so-called *Ordo et ritus*, was published in 1560. The liturgical changes of the 16-17th century had the least influence on this genre, hence the 11th-century *Ordos*, first and foremost the Baptismal *Ordo*, were preserved without discontinuity all the way until the beginning of the 20th century.⁷⁵

Pauline sources

At last, we must mention the pre-1600 sources of the Pauline Hermits (*Ordo Sancti Pauli Primi Eremitæ*), the only Hungarian medieval monastic foundation. In the 13th century the Paulines adopted the Esztergom Use as their proper monastic liturgy, consequently the Pauline books preserved an archaic version of the Esztergom Use even in later periods.⁷⁶ Naturally, there were minor modifications, either because the Order's liturgical identity demanded some peculiarities, or because a monastery was

⁷² FÖLDVÁRY: *Ordinarius Strigoniensis* 21–26.

⁷³ In addition to what is included in the bibliography, we know of another edition from 1514. For its critical edition, see: DOBSZAY: *Liber Ordinarius Agriensis*.

⁷⁴ In addition to what is included in the bibliography, we know of five other editions until 1520. For its critical edition, see: FÖLDVÁRY: *Ordinarius Strigoniensis*.

⁷⁵ The last 1907-edition of the *Rituale Strigoniense* is basically identical to the editio princeps. This continuity was disrupted by the publication of a reform Ritual in 1961, called *Collectio Rituum*.

⁷⁶ As to the Pauline liturgy, see: TÖRÖK: *A magyar pálosrend liturgiájának forrásai*.

not in position to realize the liturgy in its full cathedral form. Here we are not dealing with strictly-speaking pontifical *Ordos* because the Paulines had neither bishops, nor abbots. Nonetheless, the extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year in Pauline Missals are informative parallels,⁷⁷ and the 15th-century Pauline Cantuale of Cześćochowa⁷⁸ is one of the most important Hungarian sources for exodiastic rites.

THE CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE CHARTVIRGUS PONTIFICAL

Subsequently, I will describe the H according to the same principles I applied to the other Pontificals, but in greater detail. This description will not simply duplicate the data of the available catalogues and research done so far;⁷⁹ I intend to share the results of my own on-site examination of September, 2012. The codicological and palaeographical analysis is based on the work of Edit Madas. In the chapter on musical notation I will give a summary of Janka Szendrei's detailed analysis.⁸⁰

Bibliographical Data

Provenance

The H is manuscript MR 165 at the Knjižnica Metropolitana or Metropolitanska Knjižnica (Archepiscopal Library) in Zagreb. The library's material is basically in the custody of the Hrvatski Državni Arhiv (Croatian National Archives) but it is actually the property of the Zagrebačka Nadbiskupija (Zagreb Archdiocese).⁸¹ The latest scholarly literature⁸² is, in fact, wrong in citing the codex as the property of the Na-

⁷⁷ A representative manuscript of the Pauline Missal is found in the Stiftsbibliothek of Göttweig (Cod. 107). All the printed sources follow this manuscript.

⁷⁸ The manuscript is preserved in the Library of the Pauline Monastery of Cześćochowa (583. R. I. 215).

⁷⁹ Catalogues in chronological order: KNIEWALD: *Zagrebački liturgijski kodeksi* 14; KNIEWALD: *Illuminacija i notacija zagrebačkih liturgijskih rukopisa* No. 5; RADÓ: *A magyar középkor kótás kéziratái* No. 268; TELLER: *Monumenti di musica sacra nell' Ungheria medievale* 483; TELLER: *Magyarország középkori hangjelzett kódexei* 31; SZIGETI: *Denkmäler des gregorianischen Chorals aus dem ungarischen Mittelalter* 133., 135., 150; SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* C 64 (p. 66); DEMOVIĆ: *Spomenici glazbene kulture u Hrvatskoj od. 10. do 12. stoljeća* 55–91; CSAPODI—CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI: *Bibliotheca Hungarica* II. 2947; KAY: *Pontificalia* 1243 (p. 236).

⁸⁰ Both Edit Madas and Janka Szendrei have read and approved the relevant chapters. I want to thank them for their cooperation.

⁸¹ For a long time the director of the library has been Rev. Vladimir Magić, and the property rights belong to the archbishop of Zagreb. The designated research room of the library is room 15 on the ground floor of the archive.

⁸² For instance, KAY: *op. cit.* (with misspellings) and SOMOGYI: *A Hartvik-agenda és a kánonjog* 119. In my earlier writings I have also often referred to the University Library as its place of custody.

cionalna Sveučilišna Biblioteka (National University Library). The basis for such a claim could be the fact that the Archiepiscopal Library was nationalised during Communism, and its material was integrated into the University Library. After the fall of Communism, however, this material was given back to the Catholic Church, and so the reference to the University Library as its place of custody is now outdated.

Size, state of preservation, usage, volume

The manuscript folios are 227×295 mm in size but the 65th folio, which was added later, is 222×290 mm. The layout (írástükör?) is in one column, 155×223 mm in size. On each page 22 lines were prepared by blind ruling (vak vonalazás?), traces of the punctorium are still detectable.

The material of the folios is thick parchment with holes in several places. Page 1^r has become dark brown, the entire first sheet (ívfüzet?) is faded and stained. In the beginning of the codex the edge of the pages is often ragged, these were amended during a recent restoration. Pages 112^v (the back side of the 7th sheet) and 120^v (the last page of the codex) are also darkened and faded. The entire last sheet is quite worn. Based on these abrasions we may suppose that at one time the codex was unbound and several sheets were used separately before the 14th century, when the Cathedral's inventory describes the codex exactly as it is today:

Item, unum aliud missale antiquissimum deletum in prima pagina, et in fine prime pagine secundi folii finit "in viam gencium", et in fine libri "sit semper tecum".⁸³

This is also the earliest information about the fact that the manuscript was owned by the cathedral. Its use in Zagreb as early as the 13th century is indirectly attested by the observations that the text of the PZ is in direct relationship with it,⁸⁴ and that "hand" 3C (see later) uses specifically Zagreb terminology in revising the Ordo of Candlemas.⁸⁵ At places the scribbling on the top of the pages are cut off,⁸⁶ thus it seems that the bookblock was trimmed some time in the 13th century or later. It seems certain that after the 14th century the manuscript never left Zagreb, even temporarily. Around 1990 it was professionally restored at the Croatian National Library.

It is 120 folios in volume. The folios have been numbered with a pencil in modern Arabic numerals in the top right corner of the recto pages. The verso pages are sig-

⁸³ Published in TKALČIĆ: *Dva inventara* 131.

⁸⁴ Beyond the identical liturgical order of the parallel Ordos, the relationship can also be demonstrated on a microphilological level. Several of the strange textual variants in the H can also be found in the PZ, e.g. "Re integra" instead of "Redintegra", cf. H 46^v and PZ 58^r. Further examples can be seen in the critical apparatus of the present edition.

⁸⁵ It is a typical characteristic of the books from Zagreb that they use the term 'chorarius' instead of the 'chorator/choralis' customary in Esztergom. Generally, the text of the revised rubrics is very close to what we find in the *Missale secundum chororum et rubricam almi episcopatus Zagradiensis ecclesie* (150^r–154^r).

⁸⁶ According to the classification below, this pertains to "hands" 4A and 4B, both from the 12-13th century.

nalled in the bottom left corner, adding the letter *b* to the Arabic numbers. The co-dex contains 15 sheets (signatures), most of which is quaternio:

$$2IV^{1-16}+(IV+1)^{17-25}+IV^{26-33}+III^{34-39}+3IV^{40-63}+(IV+1)^{64-72}+5IV^{73-112}+IV^{113-120}$$

Folio 19 (at the end of the reconciliation of excommunicates and the last page of the part describing the rites of ecclesiastical discipline) is glued into the 3rd sheet but its text is continuous. In the 9th sheet, folio 65 (blessing of the balm, and its mixture at the blessing of chrism on Maundy Thursday) is a later addition, its content is supplementary to the principal text, but it does not fit continuously in between pages 64 and 65. After folio 112 (between the end of the liturgical year and the beginning of exodiastic rites) one or two sheets are missing. The text does not end on the last page, hence at least one sheet must be missing from the end of the manuscript (logically the funeral rites would be next in order). Based on the liturgical content other lacunæ may be supposed but these cannot be confirmed with any codicological data, hence these must be attributed to its own textual tradition and not to any mutilation of the manuscript.

A narrow stripe has been cut off from the edge of certain pages, only to be reinserted perpendicularly into an incision made somewhat deeper into the page.⁸⁷ The function of these tabs was probably to mark certain pages or to make turning the pages easier. Most of them are made at texts that the H placed in the context of the liturgical cycle but could be used outside of the given Ordo, as well.⁸⁸ A few of the tabs might serve the purpose of dividing the text, signalling the following folios or sections:

- 44 Beginning of the Maundy Thursday Ordos
- 53 General blessing of oils (in the context of Maundy Thursday but also for other occasions)
- 62 General confession and absolution (in the context of Maundy Thursday but also for other occasions)
- 81 General blessing of incense (in the context of Holy Saturday but also for other occasions)
- 90 Blessing of baptismal water, Baptism (in the context of Holy Saturday but also for other occasions)
- 103 Blessing of water (in the context of Easter but also for other occasions), Easter Procession
- 104 Blessing of foods (in the context of Easter)
- 106 Rubrics for Eastertide, Invention of the Holy Cross
- 108 Litanies (votive material after Rogations)
- 116 Absolutions (in an exodiastic context)
- 119 Anointing (in an exodiastic context)

⁸⁷ As to these tabs, see the photographs on page ??? of the appendix.

⁸⁸ For more about these, see the following chapter about the liturgical content and structure of the book.

Typeface, later side-notes by different hands

The principal text is written in Carolingian minuscule from the late 11th century,⁸⁹ by three different hands, indicated (below) by Roman numbers. The major part of the codex was written by the first hand. A contemporaneous second hand continued the copying from pages 40^r–42^r (at the second half of the Palm Sunday Ordo and the beginning of the Maundy Thursday Ordo). Another contemporaneous third hand wrote the later inserted folio 65.

The manuscript was later corrected or supplemented by the scribbles of several different hands. In describing these later additions, I am trying to focus on perspicuity, therefore, I attribute all the modifications of similar character to the same hand, if the style of writing admits it. Theoretically, the possibility cannot be excluded that many more “hands” left their mark on the text but their eventual identification would not really contribute to a better understanding of the codex. I am only giving here a concise summary of the page numbers bearing the marks of individual hands, it will be the task of the critical apparatus to provide information about the details. The categorization and identification with Arabic numbers of the different hands is done according to the intention with which these sriptors modified the principal text. Within the same categories I identified the individual hands with Latin capital letters according to their order in time or significance.⁹⁰

(1) The first category is that of the corrector. To this category belong a single 12th-century “hand” who corrected the entire codex (5^v–116^v), and who was especially active in correcting the Maundy Thursday sermons. It seems certain that most of the carefully done rasurae also belong to him. He obviously tried to copy the hand responsible for the principal text, but due to the rasurae and the unavailability of space, he often had to deform the letters. For this reason it is rather difficult to date his activity; furthermore, we cannot preclude the possibility that other hands were also involved in the manuscript’s correction. Perhaps the rubrication of the exodiastic Ordos (113^r–120^v) is also done by the first hand, who is identified by his more elongated letters and red ink with blueish highlights. The same sort of ink also appears in the rubrication of previous Ordos.

(2) The second category is that of the sriptor responsible for text supplementation. To this category belong a single 12th-century “hand” who provided the missing texts of the Good Friday Ordo on a blank surface or after erasing the previous text (74^r–79^v).

⁸⁹ VESZPRÉMY: *A 12. századi magyar kódexírás alakulása* (226–227) dates it to the turn of the 12th century, or the latest to the first decade of the 12th century. Among the musical notations (more easily datable than the palaeography) we find notations that date back to the last decade of the 11th century or earlier. See the chapter on musical notation below. These, of course, cannot be earlier than the main text. According to the opinion of Edit Madas (voiced personally to me), its dating to the 11th century is also supported by the orthography of the codex.

⁹⁰ For more information on the “hands” see the photographs on page ??? of the appendix.

(3) The third category is that of the scribes who complemented the codex. At least five hands of different eras belong to this category, who complemented or modified the principal text with several additional items. Hand 3A is the annotator of Luke's genealogy at the blessing of water on Epiphany, some time from the first decades of the 12th century. He wrote the title of the genealogy with notation on the top of 22^r. Hand 3B is the annotator of the Epiphany Play, also some time from the first decades or the end of the 12th century. He copied the complementary parts of the play in Leonine hexameter to the bottom of pages 28^v and 29^r. Hand 3C is 13th-century cursive. He revised the Ordo of Candlemas with rubrics on the margins, by restructuring the items and cancelling out entire sentences from the text (30^r–32^v). Hand 3D is also 13th-century cursive but somewhat different from 3B. He supplemented the procession against war with an oration on the margin of page 112^r. Hand 3E is 13th-century textual. He complemented the baptismal Ordo on the margins of pages 85^r and 88^r. Identical with it or very similar is the hand which supplemented the unfinished formula of the Anointing of the Sick on the last page (bottom of 120^v). To the bottom of page 39^v (from where the writing of the principal text changes for a few pages) a "modern" hand added the note "(hic nihil deest)". I do not include this annotation among the list of medieval "hands".

(4) The fourth category is that of the scribblers. The notes of three different hands belong to this category. Hand 4A is rather early, perhaps from the 12th century. With sketchy capital letters he wrote a few sentences from the principal text, or other texts that do not fit into the context of the codex, on the top of pages 18^r, 20^r and 40^r. Hand 4B decorated the top of pages 15^r and 91^v with small but rather refined 13th-century Gothic letters. His additions are of a liturgical nature (Hail Mary, the beginning of Psalm 109), but they do not have anything to do with the principal text. The age of Hand 4C is quite uncertain. On the top corner of page 86^v he wrote one single, hardly legible word.

The following table should assist the reader in more easily comprehending the contributions of the different hands:

PRIMARY "HANDS" (end of the 11th century)

1st hand (scribe of the entire manuscript)

2nd hand (scribe's assistant, at the end of the Palm Sunday Ordo: 40^r–42^r)

3rd hand (author of the insert for the blessing of the balm: 65^{r-v})

SECONDARY "HANDS"

1st hand (12th century, the corrector of the entire manuscript)

2nd hand (12th century, the author of the supplement for the Good Friday Ordo: 74^r–79^v)

3rd hand (authors of the supplements)

3A hand (12th century, the annotator of Luke's genealogy: 22^r)

3B hand (12th century, the annotator of the Epiphany-play: 28^v–29^r)

3C hand (13th century, oblique, reviser of the Candlemas Ordo: 30^r–32^v)

3D hand (13th century, oblique, author of the supplement for the procession against war: 112^r)

3E hand (13th century, author of the supplement for the Baptismal Ordo and the Anointing of the Sick [?]: 85^r–88^r, 120^v)

4th hand (scribblers)

4A hand (12th century, in capitals: 18^r, 20^r, 40^r)

4B hand (13th century, in fine Gothic: 15^r, 91^v)

4C hand (uncertain and faded: 86^v)

Layout, Orthography, Grammar

The layout of the H is rather simple; the reader is aided by the usual graphic means characteristic of liturgical books.⁹¹ The liturgical texts to be read or recited (e.g. orations, readings) are written with normal-sized black letters, in smaller black letters the melodic items (e.g. antiphons, hymns), with normal-sized red letters the rubrics. There is some inconsistency in the use of black or red ink, for instance, whenever in a rubrical context the incipits are not separated by the use of black ink, or when the generic character (whether they are to be recited or sung) of certain items (e.g. psalms, versicles) is not made clear by changing the size of the letters. The items or their subsections (e.g. strophes, verses) usually begin with a red initial letter, while in prosaic texts each paragraph begins with an embedded initial, the height of two lines. At the beginning of the liturgical year a space of three lines is left blank for an embedded initial, and the first word following is written with capital letters. The titles are written with red ink, usually in the top right corner of the column, where the last line of the previous item left some space blank. At times, this blank space is left empty. This proves that originally several lines were left out for rubrication which was done afterwards, once the principal text was complete.

The orthography and interpunctuation of the codex corresponds to the customs of the era; the details may be checked and systematically studied at the end of this volume, in the orthographic apparatus.⁹² The differences in comparison with normative modern Latin orthography could be classified in four categories: general medieval characteristics, vulgar features, archaic features and spelling specific to the H.

(1) I consider as general medieval characteristics those features that are dominant in Hungarian liturgical books until the age of the printing press.⁹³ These are the following: the writing of the *ti*+vowel (betűkapcsolatok) according to pronunciation as *ci*+vowel (e.g. *amicicia*, *exicialis*, *devocio*, *consorcium*, *diucius*, *peciit*); leaving out the initial or intervocal *h* and the *h* in diphthongs (e.g. *ebdomada*, *omelia*, *catecizo*, *betleem*, *proibeo*), or the superabundant use of the *h* (e.g. *habundo*, *heliseus*, *chorusco*, *lintheum*, *coherceo*); the (mono- or diphthongising) spelling of certain related consonants (e.g. *loquutus*, *secuntur*, *michi*, *nichil*, *langor*, *ungentum*, *fantasmaticis*), or its al-

⁹¹ For further information, see also the chapter on the orthography and layout of the present edition.

⁹² For the orthographic apparatus, see page ???.

⁹³ As to the normative orthography, interpunctuation and layout of medieval liturgical books, see: FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 292–308; for the linguistic background, see especially: STOTZ: *Handbuch der lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters* III.

ternative spelling (*karitas*); the insertion of a *p* in the middle of the *mn* consonant pair (*sollempnis*, *dampno*, *tempno*, *columpna*); leaving out the etymological *s* after the prefix *ex* (e.g. *exilium*, *expecto*); in words of Greek origin the *y* is often changed to an *i* (pl. *elemosina*, *martir*, *misticus*), or the opposite happens in “exotic” words (e.g. *cayphas*, *homousyon*, *synai*, *ydolum*).

(2) These features are characteristic of vulgar, neo-Latin phonetics: uncertainty as regards the doubling of consonants (e.g. *amississe*, *immitari*, at the same time *grabato*, *pecaminum*); the (zöngésedése) of the *t* (e.g. *credendum*, *roscide*) and the softening of the liquidae (*fraglans/flaglans*); a shift of certain vowels in terms of vowel harmony (e.g. *esayas*, *letania*, *incolomitati*, *benivolus*, *valitudo*). Some of these vulgar characteristics became part of the conventional medieval spelling (e.g. *capud*, *quatinus*, *iocunditas*). This is the reason why this group has common features with the above-mentioned category.

(3) The archaic features are those that were considered rarities already in the 12th century. These are primarily the following: the use of the *ę*, at times the equivalent *aę*, *ae/æ* or *oe/œ*. The H uses the letter *e* partly etymologically correctly, partly in accordance with the customs of the time with the same words (e.g. *cęleber*, *cęterus*, *ęcclesia*, *ętiam*, *piętas*, *prophęta*). Its preference for the *ę/æ* is sometimes excessive (e.g. the *ę* as a verbal prefix, the *ę* ending of adverbs and vocatives, *acętum*, *męus*, *quisquę*, *sęd*). These spellings could reasonably be viewed as more mannered than archaic, thus they overlap with the next category.

(4) The major part of the orthographic features of the H can be traced back to a kind of pedantic, hypercorrect attitude. To this category belong some of the extravagant uses of *ę/æ*. The most outstanding features are the ones that are applied consistently: the use of the *ti*+vowel (betűkapcsolat), instead of *ci*+vowel always in the same words (e.g. *fidutia*, *faties*, *fatio* and its derivatives, *iuditium*); the dissimilative spelling of verbal prefixes (e.g. *adprehendo*, *conlaudo*, *inbecillis*, *obprobrium*); attaching prepositions to the nouns following (e.g. *aseculo*, *abastris*, *adopus*, *cumseruo*, *decęlis*, *esilice*, *inbrachio*, *obcausam*), which is used at times also with other parts of speech (e.g. *quamors*, *sinescitis*, *daveniam*); the etymological separation of compound words (e.g. *ad aperire*, *multi formis*, *quotiens cumque*).

In the H numbers are written out in letters or indicated by Roman numerals, sometimes adding the ordinal indicators as well (*II*, *III*, *iiii*, *III^{or}*, *V^{ia}*, *VII*, *XII*, *lx^{mo}*). Greek words are treated agrammatically, e.g. for Good Friday always the accusative *parasceven* is used as an indeclinable form, thmesis is applied to the term *homousios* (e.g. *de homine usion*, *homo et usios*), and the text of the Trisagion is given as follows: *agyos otheos agyos hyschiros agyos athanatos eley sonimas*. The spelling of proper names (three magi, Luke’s genealogy) is uneven, but it has no special characteristics in comparison with general medieval customs. It is worthy of note that on the pages written by Hands 2 and 3 the tendencies in spelling change a little. As to Hand 2, the hypercorrect *ti*+vowel forms disappear, and instead of the usual *benedicchio* we see *benediction*. On the page written by Hand 3 we find *perfectione* and *faciat* instead of the usual *perfeccione* and *fatiat*.

The linguistic quality of the text is rather balanced but not of a very high order. Most likely the scribe had no real comprehension of what he was copying but the original he used could not have been a corrupt text. The corrector, that is Hand 1, did a very good job wherever he earnestly checked the text. There remained very few mistakes, and these are usually to be found in the less carefully formulated rubrics. On the level of individual words a few agrammatical separations (*e.g. imp etusque, a barida*) draw our attention. In lengthy and syntactically more complex euchological texts we often encounter grammatical mistakes or inconsistencies but they are not very large in number; in this regard the H far surpasses the PV.

Musical Notation

The H is the first document for the development of the Hungarian musical notation. The H has been discussed from this aspect by Janka Szendrei who meticulously described and limned the complete set of signs and symbols for each type of notation. She also properly dated them and placed them in their European context. Subsequently I will summarize her results.⁹⁴

The neums of the Chartvirgus Pontifical and the Hungarian notations

The neums were written into the text by the later users of the codex with some inconsistency. As a result, not all of the texts written with smaller letters and specifically intended for later notation actually have musical notes above them. Furthermore, there are texts written in normal-sized letters which were not meant to be notated originally, yet music was later added to them. Each of the sections were notated by different hands and in different styles of neum-writing. Most of them used a particular version of the so-called German notation, proper Hungarian features are observed especially at the the processional hymn of Holy Saturday (*Inventor rutilo*) and Luke's genealogy. The later developments of the Hungarian notation are foreshadowed by the Palm Sunday chants and the Exultet. The melodic versions – insofar as it is possible to surmise from the adiastematic notation – are all identical to the later representative sources of the Esztergom Use with stave notation.⁹⁵ The facsimile of the notated items and the corresponding melodies can be studied in the appendices.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ SZENDREI: *Középkori hangjegyírások Magyarországon ???*; SZENDREI: *A „mos patria”* 90–103. At the appropriate places, she refers to most of the authors cited below.

⁹⁵ The only exception could be the antiphon *Ante diem festum from the washing of the feet on Maundy Thursday, as it is found on page 70ⁱ* of the H. The text is somewhat different than the one we encounter in later Hungarian sources: it has particular variations in the word order, and the famous, so-called “caput melisma” is placed on the syllable ‘ca’, instead of the usual ‘put’. The notation, however, which cannot be much later in origin, reminds us of the well-known melody: the word ‘dixit’ has no neums, and the melisma is placed on the syllable ‘put’.

⁹⁶ For the notation and the facsimile, see p.??? of the appendix.

Before we proceed to present the different types of musical notation we find in the H, we must briefly discuss the question of the so-called Hungarian notation.⁹⁷ The notation of our first notated codex, the BS cannot yet be distinguished from the German notations of the same period. In this manuscript and in other early Hungarian sources what we see is the adoption of German, especially South-German traditions. This is also confirmed by the earlier musical additions of the H. In this regard the only special feature is when we can identify elements which are not from South-Germany but from the Rhineland.

Our last neumatic sources are from the 12th century. In these we already find a specifically Hungarian version of German neum-writing. The kind of notation used in the H for the *Inventor rutili*, the *Palm Sunday chants* and the *Exultet* already foreshadows this proper Hungarian system.

In fact, the Hungarian churches began to use stave notation rather early in comparison to their Germanic surroundings. They developed a special, uniform, easily identifiable version of the diastematic system which survived until the 18th century as a reliable marker for liturgical books of Hungarian origin. This energetic, cursive system is called Hungarian or Esztergom notation. It is based on German, Metz-Laon, and Italian elements which were completely assimilated and developed into a uniform, homogenous system. Its direction of writing is left to right in ascending and vertical in descending notes; it prefers long, complex neums. The notation used in the H for Luke's genealogy is already a transitional form pointing towards the Esztergom notation.

Notators

In the next paragraphs I will give a conspectus and evaluation of the work done by the notators based on Szendrei's analysis.⁹⁸ For a more in-depth study an exhaustive description and analysis of every single neum would be necessary, but it is not the task of this present edition. The notators are numbered according to the sequence of the manuscript's pages. The type, quality and age of their notes are summarised in the following and in a separate table. The forms of individual neums are demonstrated by the facsimile pages and tables provided in the appendices.⁹⁹

(1) The first notator wrote in the musical notes of Luke's genealogy on page 22^{r-v}, in the blessing of the water (following a byzantine custom). This Hand is identical to Hand 3A, the one that also wrote the genealogy's title on the top of page 22^r. The notation can be dated to the first decades of the 12th century. Although the sequence

⁹⁷ For a monographic summary of the topic, see: SZENDREI: *Középkori hangjegyírások Magyarországon*.

⁹⁸ Before her, from the perspective of musical palaeography, the H was analysed by HUDOVSKÝ: *Neumatski rukopis Agenda pontificalis MR 165*.

⁹⁹ The table on page ??? of the appendix was prepared by Gábrriel Szoliva OFM based on the original and with the help of Szendrei's stylised sketches.

of names in the genealogy is incorrect,¹⁰⁰ the notator took this faulty text as the basis for his notation, applying to it the melody also known from a later Hungarian tradition.¹⁰¹

The text is written by normal-sized letters which means that originally it was not meant to be notated. Thus the notator had to use the very narrow space available for notes. Due to the insufficiency of space, at first glance the notation seems to be written with neums characteristic of German manuscripts, but it is diastematic in character and so it would normally require a larger space. The set of signs it uses does not conform to any known, clear type; it is an organic system of neums characterised by a well-practiced technique, using German neums (*clivis*, *porrectus*, *quilisma*, *virga* and *punctum as syllabic signs*) and neums from Metz¹⁰² (*climacus*-types, *cephalicus*, the deformation of Germanic notes). In the neums we find a clear indication of individual notes; the notator tried to provide an easily readable musical notation. The direction of writing is not German (that would progress in a narrow, horizontal strip), in ascending it goes to the right, in descending it is vertical (although it is not always consistent due to the lack of available space).¹⁰³

In conclusion we can say that this kind of notation uses a mixed, experimental set of signs. It is unparalleled, transitory, and without permanence.¹⁰⁴ As a result of a later transformation, this eventually became what is now known as Esztergom notation, assimilating German notation, neums of Metz and an Italian scandicus. In the genealogy's notation we still see some German neums which were later changed, but the new direction of writing is already in place, and a characteristic form, the vertical climacus is introduced. Consequently, the genealogy's notation is a transitional form between Hungarian neum-writing and the Esztergom notation.

(2) The second notator added musical notes to the role of the magi in the Epiphany Play on pages 28^v–29^v. The other parts of the Play are left unnotated even though the text is written with small letters, leaving enough room for notation. This notator is the same as Hand 3B, responsible for the textual supplementation of the Play, at the bottom of pages 28^v–29^f. It is possible that he had to sing the part of one of the magi at the Play's performance. The quick-handed, sketchy notation can be dated to the first decades of the 12th century. Some of the signs are used in different

¹⁰⁰ The confused order of names as a result of mistakes in copying was recognised by László Dobszay; see below, in the chapter on the blessings of water. In the present edition I follow the original but I indicate the proper order by the inserted numbering.

¹⁰¹ RAJECZKY: *Magyarország zenetörténete* I. 293–294. (Notation and description, with a list of sources in Szendrei's chapter entitled "Lekció-tónusok".)

¹⁰² As to the characteristics of the notation of Metz, see: HOURLIER: *Le domaine de la notation messine*.

¹⁰³ For the characteristic directions of the palaeography, see the first appendix of CORBIN: *Palaeographie der Musik I. 3. Die Neumen*.

¹⁰⁴ According to Szendrei's observation (made personally to me), one can see contact neums of similar elements in Northern Italy, in sources from the area of Como.

versions. From among the German neums the Metz-Laon-type cephalicus (shaped like the number 9) stands out.

(3) The third notator supplied musical notes to the items of the Palm Sunday procession: the antiphons *Fulgentibus palmis*, *Occurrunt turbæ*, and *Cum appropinquaret*; the hymn *Gloria laus*; and the antiphons *Pueri Hebræorum vestimenta*, *Scriptum est enim* and *Hosanna filio David*. All of this notation is found on pages 41^{r-v} written by Hand 2. The earlier items of the same Ordo written in small letters by Hand 1 (the antiphons *Collegerunt responzorium*, *Ante sex dies*, and *Cum audisset*) are left unnotated. According to Szendrei, this notation can be dated to the turn of the 12th century with corrections made in the 12-13th centuries. Based on the typical brownish tones of the ink, it cannot be ruled out that the notes were actually added by Hand 2. This is made all the more likely by the fact that the neums on these pages fit more perfectly than anywhere else to the empty space left specifically for musical notation. Since on page 42^v the writing is continued by hand 1, we cannot consider Hand 2 to be later. If the neums were indeed written by him, it means that the notation is contemporaneous with the text itself.

The notation is of good quality, uniform, written by a firm and well-trained hand. The direction of writing and the set of signs used are German; not even those neums that are written in several versions diverge from this norm. The vertical lines designating the place of notes within the neums (“proto-kottafejek”) and the addition of a crotchet (kampó) to the *cephalicus* points towards a 12-century Gothic-style Hungarian notation, like that of the CA.

(4) The fourth notator added notes to the hymn *O Redemptor sume carmen* within the Maundy Thursday Chrism Mass and to the hymn *Tellus ac athra iubilent after the Mandatum ceremony (washing of the feet)* on pages 55^r and 73^r respectively. The notation – similarly to the earlier Hands – can be dated to the end of the 11th century, making it basically contemporaneous with the codex itself. The notation is refined, with long, energetic (szárakkal?) and its direction is German. Its characteristic neum is the *pes*, substantially different from its typical Hungarian forms: instead of the dominant South-German round shape, what we see here is the flag-like *pes à ergot* known from German Rhineland sources. Due to its longer (szára?) the form of the epiphonus is also different from the South-German standards.

(5) The fifth notator is responsible for providing the musical notation for the items of the Mandatum (washing of the feet) on Maundy Thursday: altogether 20 items on pages 69^v–71^r, beginning with the antiphon *Ante diem festum*. The notation can be dated to the end of the 11th century, perhaps to a time just a little before the last decade, and its nicely written, in the German-type direction, using a rich, well-defined set of signs.

(6) The sixth notator added musical notes to the items of the Good Friday Ordo on pages 75^{r-v} and 77^v: the improperia beginning with *Popule meus*, the antiphons *Ecce lignum Crucis* and *Dum fabricator mundi*, and the processional hymn *Laudes omnipotens*. Its simple and sketchy notation can be dated to the end of the 11th century. Its set of signs is definitely South-German but less uniform and differentiated

than it was the case with the previous, more consistent Hands. Its characteristic feature is that the loops (*hurkai*) of the *quilisma* are not written horizontally (which is what we see in German notation and in the style of the other notators of the codex) but with a decisive upward stroke in a typical Italian fashion.

(7) The seventh notator wrote out the notes on page 81^{r-v} for the hymn *Inventor rutili* sung at the blessing of the fire on Holy Saturday. This page, containing all the text and notation with the exception of a single line, is rather faded, hence at times the melody can only be deciphered with great difficulty. The notation can be dated to the beginning of the 12th century; it is well-written, uniform notation with a German-type direction (as obvious from the writing of the *climacus*). Its typical neums are the *pes* shaped like the number 3, the *virgy* shaped like the number 1, and the *clivis* formed by two parallel (*karból*).

These consistently used, characteristic neums may be found in other notated codices of Hungarian origin, as well. This type of *pes* is typical to the BS, while these forms of the *virga* and the *clivis* are seen in the CA. The notation of the BS is South-German in type, its set of signs is often compared to the notation of St. Gallen from the later period. The same type of notation also influenced some North-Eastern regions (East-Saxony and the marches). The notation we see in the CA bears witness to the total appropriation and further independent development of the German tradition in a less heavy-handed direction, quite different from the contemporaneous German trends.¹⁰⁵ The notation of the *Inventor rutili* in the H represents a transition between the two; as if an imprint of the progress from the 11th century German notation to its own stages of independent development.

(8) The eighth notator provided notation for the *Exultet*, the blessing of the Easter candle on pages 82^v–84^r. The notation can be dated to the beginning of the 12th century. The text was written in normal-sized letters, and there is no room left for neums in between the lines. Hence the notation is written in a sporadic and cramped fashion but – given the circumstances – it is rather well-kempt and uniform. Its direction and set of signs is of a Germanic kind. The way that the *pes* and the *virga* are connected is typical to South-Germany, and we also see (as was the case with the sixth notator of the Good Friday Ordo) the special *quilisma* with the upward loops. The notator of the *Exultet* displays the same tendencies as the third notator (of the Palm Sunday procession), converging towards the CA.

(9) The ninth notator placed neums over some parts of the principal oration at the blessing of baptismal water on Holy Saturday: *Vere dignum ... qui invisibili potentia prex*, on pages 90^r–92^r. The neums appear at the end of the sentences, that is, wherever the concluding formula of the preface tone is to be applied to the text. The blessing of the baptismal water, similarly to the *Exultet*, was written in normal-sized letters, thus the notation is sketchy and cramped. Szendrei did not pay any attention to it, so we will not provide further analysis either.

¹⁰⁵ As to the notation of the BS and the CA, see: SZENDREI: *Középkori hangjegyzírások Magyarországon* ???, and ???; SZENDREI: *A „mos patria” kialakulása* 51–54, and 138–142.

(10) The tenth notator added musical notes to the Gloria-trope (*Sacerdos Dei excelsi*) for the Easter Sunday Mass and over the following intonation of the Gloria in excelsis Deo on page 104^f. The notation can be dated to the beginning of the 12th century. Its flexible forms are very close to those of the sixth notator (of the Good Friday Ordo) but its sketchy, less ruly lines remind us of the second notator (of the Epiphany Play). Its set of signs is quite heterogenous, some of the neums are written in several different ways. The 1-shaped virgas dominate, just like with the seventh notator. With regard to a strangely formulated pes, the possibility of a mediterranean or Western (perhaps Normann) origin was brought up¹⁰⁶, but this hypothesis has to be rejected on account of the typically German signs, direction of writing, and the formulation of the other pes. Here, too, we encounter the characteristic quilisma with energetic upward loops (in this case only two in number) which is a very unusual occurrence among German neums, but it was used in the H already by the sixth and eighth notators (there with three loops).

The following table should facilitate the recapitulation of the the most important data about the notators of the H:

- 1st notator (Luke's genealogy): diastematic mixed notation, refined, first decades of the 12th century
- 2nd notator (mystery play for Epiphany): German neums, sketchy, first decades of the 12th century
- 3rd notator (Palm Sunday): German (Hungarian?) neums, refined, turn of the 12th century
- 4th notator (hymns for Maundy Thursday): German (Rhineland?) neums, refined, end of the 11th century
- 5th notator (Maundy Thursday washing of the feet): German neums, refined, before the last decade of the 11th century
- 6th notator (Good Friday): German (South German) neums, simple, end of the 11th century
- 7th notator (*Inventor rutili*): German (Hungarian?) neums, refined, beginning of the 12th century
- 8th notator (Exsultet): German (Hungarian?) neums, refined, beginning of the 12th century
- 9th notator (blessing of baptismal water): German neums, sketchy, (?)
- 10th notator (*Sacerdos Dei excelsi*): German neums, sketchy, beginning of the 12th century

Summary

The ten different kinds of notation we identified in the H means that the manuscript was notated by ten different hands who markedly differ from each other from various perspectives. The most fundamental difference is between the diastematic mixed notation (of first notator) and the German neum-writing (of all the others). There are also significant differences between the German-style notations, and it proves that the notators of the same codex acquired their musical education from various scriptoria of different traditions. All of them use German notation but in certain cases we see individual South-German (sixth notator) and Rhineland types (fourth notator) as

¹⁰⁶ HUDOVSKÝ: *Neumatski rukopis Agenda pontificalis MR 165 104*. Its Norman origin is a recurrent but very much overrated topic in the history of studying the H. See the chapter below on the date and origin of the H.

well. Another distinguishing feature is that the musical notes were not added at once, but on different occasions within a 30-40 year-long period. The training and preparation of the notators were certainly not on the same level. This leads us to conclude that in the first decades of the use of the H, there was a lively musical culture in Hungary taping into much wider regional influences and still in transition. In this musical culture we can also detect certain elements of the later independent development which advanced in two directions.

The first is the development of a specifically Hungarian neum-writing whose representative witness is the CA. This notation was eventually abandoned. Its predecessor is the handiwork of the seventh notator, although the set of signs and style of the third and eighth notators also point to this direction. The second is the development of the Esztergom stave notation. Its antecedent is the diastematic notation of the first notator. This transitional phenomenon from the beginning of the 12th century proves that these two directions were pursued in Hungary in the same period, parallel to each other. Both were characteristic and viable but the Hungarian Use eventually chose the one which was still an exemption in the time of the H's production.

Decoration, Binding

The H is a good-quality, large, nicely written but not representative codex. Unlike the smaller and more refined BS, it does not contain ornamental elements or decorative drawings on the margins or initials.

Its binding is original: in-between two dark-brown wooden tablets without leather covers, bound by leather straps. Size: 295×230×75 mm. Upon restoration it received a new, dark-brown leather spine on two double raised bands and new headcaps. In the beginning and the end double endsheets were added but it does not have paste-down endpapers. On the first wooden tablet, outside, in the left upper corner there is a printed label with the following text in red colour: *Metropolitanska Knjižnica Provostolnog Kaptola Zagrebačkog (u Pohrani kr. sveuč. Knjižnice) MR 165* (the part "R 165" is written by hand in black ink).

THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH

In this chapter I will review all the questions which were proposed and – in most cases – answered by those scholars who have so far studied the H. My goal is to point out in which areas they have achieved enduring results and which questions have remained unresolved. I also wish to direct attention to those theories regarding the H which are commonly known but are actually in need of correction. In order to do this, it is indispensable to make available more widely the results of the most signifi-

cant studies published so far only in Hungarian and Croatian.¹⁰⁷ Since these studies are basically inaccessible to the international community of scholars, some of the obsolete notions are only repeated time and again because they have been published in French, Latin, German or English.

Although I will more or less follow a chronological order, my summary is not intended to be a merely mechanical recapitulation of all the relevant publications. I would like to identify the personal interests, methodological background and preconceptions that influenced each scholar in his or her approach. From among the fairly abundant literature on the subject I will highlight the most reliable and inventive authors. In the meantime, I propose to present in an organised, logical fashion all of the theories and opinions upon which I will rely later on, or with which I aim to dialogue. Here I will only touch upon those studies that treat the H as a whole, and somewhat later – in a chapter about the actual liturgical content – I will analyse each of the *Ordos* individually.

Franjo Fancev

Insofar as I know the real significance of the codex was first realised by Franjo Fancev (1882–1943), a Croatian literary historian and philologist who published his findings in several articles written in 1925.¹⁰⁸ He did not study the manuscript methodically, his attention was focused on the liturgical plays described in the H. He thought the codex was written originally in Zagreb, and he meant to support this opinion by topographical data.

Germain Morin

The first real pioneering work was published in 1926 by Germain Morin (born: Léopold Frédéric Morin, 1861–1946,) a Benedictine monk from Maredsous, liturgist and patrologist.¹⁰⁹ Morin discussed the H in correlation with the other two 11th-century manuscripts in Zagreb, the BS and the St Margaret Sacramentary (MR 126). The study of these three codices remained closely intertwined, and so it is with reason that they have been given the nickname: “the Zagreb three”.

Morin provided a very accurate codicological description, while remained uncertain as to the actual genre: he considered the manuscript to be a mixture of a Pontifical, an Ordinal and a Ritual. He based this opinion probably on the fact that the first part (containing rites related to ecclesiastical discipline) is specifically episcopal; the

¹⁰⁷ Since I do not speak Croatian, I had to rest content with secondary information about these articles. If this in any way seems to belittle the results of Croatian scholarship, I must make it clear right away that I had no such intention. I need to thank Fr. Ervin Gellért Kovács, a Norbertine priest, for helping me with the Croatian language and its orthography.

¹⁰⁸ FANCEV: *Liturgijsko-obredne igre*; FANCEV: *O najstarijem bogoslužju*

¹⁰⁹ MORIN: *Manuscrits liturgiques hongrois*, he speaks of the H in the first part (54–60).

second part (describing the extraordinary rites of the liturgical cycle) is heavily rubricated, and the last part (about exodiastioc rites) remains within the competence of regular priests. This genre-definition is needlessly complex. Morin's study was conducted before the publication of Andrieu's works, and so it is natural that he tried to apply modern genre-types to the H. Unfortunately, his definition kept being repeated even in a period when all the proper information about the structure and content of medieval Pontificals was readily available.

In the central part of his study, Morin describes the content of the H, about which he makes some observations that attest to his impressive liturgical understanding and knowledge of the sources, yet – by his own admission – without a comprehensive design, as if “brainstorming”. His ideas can be divided into two categories. First, he highlighted the characteristic features of the H, and tried to put them in an important and relevant perspective. I will later return to a discussion of these insights. Secondly, he formulated some general thoughts in relation to the manuscript and the beginnings of the Hungarian liturgy. As to the codex itself, Morin was the first one to argue that the bishop Chartvirgus mentioned in the Exultet is none other than Arduin, the bishop of Győr. Based on this assumption, he applies the titles of churches in the H to the topography of the medieval city of Győr.¹¹⁰ With regard to the origin of the rites described in the codex, he mentions certain Normann and Byzantine influences, as well as elements from the Danube Valley and Monte Cassino. Among these, he clearly prefers the Normann affiliation which – in his opinion – is also confirmed by the Sanctoral parts of the other two sources of the so-called “Zagreb three” (Morin was actually born in Caen, Normandy). In line with this approach, Morin also connects the origin of the Hungarian liturgy not only to Normandy but also to other Northern regions, such as Flandria and Brabant (today Belgium, where incidentally Morin's Abbey, Maredsous is located).

According to Morin's original intention, these propositions were only meant to engender further study and scholarly discussion. Instead, in virtue of his authority and frequent references, these theories acquired an authority he had never intended to bestow. Nonetheless, it is Morin's enduring merit and legacy that he placed the study of the H in the context of Hungarian liturgical history; he identified some of its original sources however far they are from each other geographically; and he drew attention both to the significance of the manuscript and to the independent characteristics of its *Ordos*. He insisted that the manuscript be published, for instance, as part of the Henry Bradshaw Society series. I consider it an honour that after 90 years I am in position to fulfil his wish.

¹¹⁰ I will treat of the so-called Hartwick-theory (including all the bibliographical references) in the next chapter.

Dragutin Kniewald

In Hungary and Croatia Dragutin Kniewald (1889–1979), Croatian Catholic priest and liturgical historian is the most quoted expert on the “Zagreb three”.¹¹¹ As the “father” of the 20th-century liturgical renewal, he was very well connected, his studies on the subject were translated into Hungarian by Flóris Kühár OSB. He was so well-known in Hungary that his forename (Charles) was often changed in publications to its German (Karl) or Hungarian (Károly) version. He made a microfilm copy of the codex for the Hungarian National Museum which has now been used for over half a century by Hungarian scholars (including myself).

It was through his activity that Morin’s theories became more widely known. Kniewald’s merit was more in communicating ideas than in formulating them: his work stays within the framework of Morin’s results; at best he details or clarifies them. Accordingly, it is in this context that he discussed the hypotheses of the manuscript’s possible origin from Győr or from North-Eastern France. His argument in support of Győr is based on topographic considerations and the monastic presence suggested by the rubrics. With this thesis he intended to refute the opinion of those Croatian colleagues – often motivated by overzealous national pride – who insisted that the H was originally written in Zagreb.¹¹² In Kniewald’s opinion the volumes of the “Zagreb three” came from Hungary; they were brought to Zagreb by bishop Duh (Czech by birth, most likely a Benedictine monk) when the diocese was established in 1094.

Kniewald supports the hypothesis of the manuscript’s origin from North-Eastern France (for him it always means Normandy, the Western part of what once was Austrasia) more categorically than Morin, but his arguments are based on the same parallels. Kniewald’s article, however, was published during World War II when the supposed French origins of the Hungarian-Croatian liturgy was not a purely scientific question anymore. The other (more likely) possibility was to trace the book’s origins to Germany, but exactly at the time of Kniewald’s publication on the subject Germany invaded Yugoslavia and turned Croatia into a puppet state. It was with the campaign in the Balkans that Hungary entered the war as an ally of the Third Reich. In these circumstances the acknowledgment of German cultural influence in the Middle Ages¹¹³ would have been tantamount to legitimizing the *Drang nach Osten*,

¹¹¹ KNEWALD: *Hartwick győri püspök Agenda Pontificalis-a; a Szent Margit-szakramentáriumról*: KNEWALD: *A Habóti kódex*; a BS-ről: KNEWALD: *Esztergomi Benedictionale*

¹¹² Kniewald rebuts the writings of the above-mentioned Fancev (of whom he otherwise has a positive opinion), but especially SAKAČ (*Krapina, Kijev, Ararat 145–146*) whom he judges to be incompetent. The Jesuit Sakač, who later became the rector of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, was an ideologue of the non-Slavic (Iranian) origin of the Croats.

¹¹³ Here he argues against VALJAVEC: *Der deutsche Kultureinfluss im nahen Südosten 444.*, whose well-founded reaction to Kniewald was that he overemphasized the French “connection” to the detriment of the discernible German elements. Valjavec, who was partly Hungarian, got heavily involved in Nazi cultural politics but his scientific credits were never questioned.

while preferring the French “option” was a subtle gesture of resistance. It is rather descriptive of the delicate situation that Kniewald felt compelled to corroborate his scientific impartiality by emphasizing his German blood on his father’s side.

As regards identifying the genre of the H, Kniewald did not follow Morin. He was the one who introduced the term ‘Agenda’ or ‘Agenda pontificalis’, but in the illustrated appendix to his article he simply talks of the source as the “Győr Pontifical”.

Kniewald’s enduring contribution was that he compared the liturgical content and textual variations of the H with other later sources from Zagreb and Esztergom, and thus he brought attention to their close liturgical and philological connections. He was very familiar with all the available Croatian sources and contemporary Hungarian liturgical scholarship. He was in position to study the H not only as regards its possible – and necessarily less certain – origin but also from the more rewarding perspective of its “afterlife”. In doing that he always remained immune to the kind of unproductive and ideologically driven approach that is bent on pitting Croatian and Hungarian medieval sources against each other.

Géza Karsai

Not all of the pertinent studies endeavoured to treat H as a whole. Some of the authors approached the manuscript with a rather specific interest. The favourite of non-liturgical scholars has clearly been the Epiphany Play, the so-called “*Tractus stellæ*” which was seen as the first document of Hungarian and Croatian drama or theatrical art.¹¹⁴ This is also what elicited Fancev’s interest, although its first monographic analysis was published by Géza Karsai (born: Ferenc Kurzweil, 1905–1981), a Benedictine monk of Pannonhalma, teacher of Hungarian and German, scholar of folk religion, drama history and Medieval studies.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Its keen reception is demonstrated by the fact that in the Kalazantinum (Theological College of the Piarist Fathers in Budapest) the Play was performed on Christmas Day of 1941, “adding stylish and up-to-date Gregorian melodies to it”, cf. DARVASY: *Középkori Stella-játék*. The director was György Bulányi SchP who was later well-known both for his courageous resistance against Communist Church politics and his objectionable theological opinions. Karsai’s text was set to music by Kilián Szigeti SchP who “reconstructed” the music based on a parallel melody from Rouen. On a Schola Hungarica record released in 1985 (*Epiphany — Gregorian Chants from Hungary*, Hungaroton SLPD 12559) the whole Play was recorded using essentially the text and structure of the H and the melody of the so-called *Livre de Jeux de Fleury* (Fleury Playbook: Orléans, Bibliothèque de la Ville Ms. 201.) which is dated to some time around the year 1200. With the help of the Schola Hungarica it was filmed by the Hungarian Television for the first episode of the series *Ars Musica — Pictures from the History of Hungarian Music*. The episode entitled “Gregorian chants from the Age of the Árpád-dynasty” was introduced by the music historian, Benjamin Rajeczky OCist. It is downloadable from the video archives of the Hungarian Television (<http://videotar.mtv.hu>). This version of the Epiphany Play is still regularly on the repertoire of many choirs in Hungary.

¹¹⁵ KARSAI: *Középkori vízkereszti játékok*. There is a summary in German at the end of the book (310–312).

In evaluating Karsai's work we must separate what was written about the Epiphany Play and the H in general. As regards the H, Karsai did not do any research on his own but simply adopted Morin's ideas slightly improved by Kniewald about the manuscript's origin from Győr and the French roots of the liturgy described therein. Karsai, influenced by an all-pervading Benedictine bias, goes somewhat further. Based on the sporadic monastic references that Kniewald also identified,¹¹⁶ Karsai asserts that the H must have been produced in the abbatial scriptorium of Mount St Martin (today Pannonhalma, Karsai's own monastery).¹¹⁷ In his opinion, the Epiphany Play was first produced in French Abbeys from where – naturally with Benedictine mediation – it was spread to all the other regions of Europe.

With regard to the presentation on the Epiphany Play, Karsai's book is one of the most thorough and original works ever published about the H. He discusses the *Tractus stelle not in and of itself but by comparing it to every other Epiphany Play still extant. He is very well aware of all the contemporary textual editions and theoretical literature*,¹¹⁸ but he refrains from setting up a typological and genealogical system. He realized that not enough Plays survived for a representative reconstruction of the tangled web of significant influences. On the other hand, any attempt at a reconstruction would be thwarted by the fact that each of the Plays was a single creation of concrete authors. Karsai declares that there is no history of development to these Epiphany Plays: the simpler and more intricate dramatic representations do not correspond to earlier and later productions, while a given church used the same version of the Play all throughout its history. A similarly important finding is that we can only make sense of the liturgical drama's archaic structure if we understand that it is, in fact, a series of liturgical stations and processions. This observation is perfectly justified in light of the analysis of other Ordos.

The bulk of Karsai's work is philological in nature. Instead of creating a system, he organised the lines of each known Play in alphabetical order. With the help of this method it became possible to prove objectively when, where, and in what context the

¹¹⁶ They refer to some, in and of themselves insignificant lexical elements, such as the sparse occurrence of the words 'prior' and 'frater'. Most of these are found in the exodiastic Ordos which may very well be of monastic origin. In any case, the two sections that feature "mos monachorum" (20^f) and "domus monasticarum" (84^f) make mention of these as things that differ from the customs of the H or of the cathedral it represents.

¹¹⁷ Karsai planned to write a study on the origin of the H, cf. KARSAI: *op. cit.* 207., but insofar as I know it was never completed.

¹¹⁸ Among these, the most important at that time was: YOUNG: *The Drama of the Medieval Church*. As to the rest, see the chapter on research history: KARSAI: *op. cit.* 55–60. and the bibliography: 304–309. In connection with Young's edition, see MEZEY: *Adalékok a középkori dráma történetéhez* 104–105., It is about the Easter Play (*Visitatio sepulcri*) which very similar in the H and the P. According to YOUNG: *op. cit.* 246–247 the item "*Venite et videte locum*" is characteristic to a special group of Easter Plays. This line is also in the two Hungarian translations, in a 12th-century codex from the Abbey of Remiremont in Lotharingia, and in the Regularis Concordia, a uniformising Customary of English monasticism from before the Normann invasion. Based on the sporadic evidence available, Mezey, similarly to his colleagues, supposes a North French influence here.

individual textual elements were in use. Then using a dramatic arrangement and going from the less elaborate to the more intricate, he published the Latin text of the Plays with short but informative introductions. Understandably, he discusses the *Tractus stellæ* of the H in greater detail, providing a reconstruction of dramatic movements and including an appendix with musical notation. Karsai determined that the Hungarian Play's text is not specific but its structure and rubrical material are unique. He also explores the more specific parallels of the marginal supplementary notes and identifies the lines that have no parallels anywhere else.

Thus Karsai was the first one to make a successful effort at producing a methodical analysis of one of the *Ordos* in the H which also takes into account the entire available European source material. It is regrettable that Karsai's work had little direct influence on Hungarian literary history and his results became known mostly through a volume *Régi magyar drámai emlékek* [Old Hungarian Dramatic Documents], edited by Tibor Kardos,¹¹⁹ Unfortunately, Kardos quotes from Karsai inaccurately and only superficially, without due mention of his real results, while treating Karsai's unfounded theory about the origin of the H from Pannonhalma as a well-established fact.

Nausica Morandi

The topic has recently been studied semiotically and from the perspective of music and drama history by a young Italian doctoral student, Nausica Morandi. Her doctoral dissertation is about the Epiphany Plays.¹²⁰ She analysed altogether 49 sources (more than Karsai), hence she provides us with a more complete picture about the geographical and historical prevalence of the liturgical drama. According to Morandi the Play of the HS is the Easternmost and one of the earliest Epiphany Plays.

Her conclusions are not radically new, and had she been able to overcome the linguistic barrier, Karsai's book could have been very helpful in her research. She specifically treated the subject of the H in a conference.¹²¹ In her paper she touches upon the Leonine hexameters added to the margins, and she confirms Karsai's conclusion: some of the lines in the H have parallels in Freising and Bilsen, but other variants and sections are entirely unique. Morandi's contribution is that in her comparison she also involved the neums used to record the melody. She also analyses the Hungarian Play dramatically, stating that it is truly unique: it has neither an antecedent, nor a descendent; it cannot be placed into any summary category. The Play of the H is remotely related musically, textually, and dramatically to contemporary German li-

¹¹⁹ KARDOS: *Régi magyar drámai emlékek* I. 39–46., notes: 59–60., text and musical notation (the melodic variant of Rouen) with notes: 241–256. The author's earlier related publications: KARDOS: *Koraközépkori magyarországi misztérium a betlehemi 'Csillag-ról'*; KARDOS: *Középkori kultúra, középkori költészet* 37–40.

¹²⁰ She defended her thesis in April of 2011, at the Department of Visual Arts and Music History at the University of Padova with the title: *L'Officium Stellæ, studio delle fonti liturgico musicali*. Its publication is to be expected some time in the first half of 2013.

¹²¹ MORANDI: *The Hungarian Officium stellæ*

turgical dramas, as well as to later, 12-13th-century Normann sources which – according to Morandi – were influenced by their German counterparts. Unfortunately, neither conclusions are built on rock solid foundations: the hypothesis of German origin is based on the posterior, 12th-century supplements of “Hand 3B”, whereas the only basis for a Normann connection is the dramatic role of an angel and the ample rubrical material.

Polikárp Radó

The biblical scholar, liturgist, and book historian Polikárp Radó (born: János Radó, 1899–1974), who compiled a catalogue of liturgical manuscripts in Hungary,¹²² was also a Benedictine monk at the Abbey of Pannonhalma. His liturgical manual written in Latin and entitled *Enchiridion Liturgicum* made him internationally known.¹²³ Radó was not a scholar of the H but, following Kniewald’s opinions and based on the earliest Hungarian sources, he created a grandiose vision about the origins of the mediaeval Hungarian liturgy.¹²⁴ Kniewald in an article also published in 1959 and in Latin summarizes Radó’s opinions as hard facts.¹²⁵ Since until now this is the only summary available in Latin (a world language of liturgical scholars) about the origins of the Hungarian liturgy¹²⁶, foreign scholarly literature still quotes and references it,¹²⁷ even though its conception, source material, methodology and conclusions are doubtful. This is the reason I feel compelled to treat of it in greater detail.

Radó’s conception is based on the fact that Hungary’s first Christian king, St Stephen tried to avert excessive German influence over his kingdom, for which reason he cultivated intensive Italian and French diplomatic connections. In Radó’s opinion the same orientation was manifested in creating a specifically Hungarian version of the Roman liturgy. This seemed like a tenable hypothesis only until the earliest pertinent sources were considered to be manuscripts from the 12-13th century: namely the P and an even later notated Missal.¹²⁸ The efforts of Morin and Kniewald,

¹²² RADÓ: *Libri liturgici*. Its first edition with the material of Hungarian libraries was published in 1947, while its second edition also including the material from the libraries of some neighbouring countries came out in 1973.

¹²³ RADÓ: *Enchiridion liturgicum*

¹²⁴ RADÓ: *De originibus liturgiæ Romanæ in Hungaria sæculi XI*. The same work was published in Hungarian two years before: *A magyar liturgia eredete a XI. században*

¹²⁵ KNIEWALD: *Officium et missa de Conceptione et Nativitate B. M. V. secundum consuetudinem veterem Zagrabiensem* 4.

¹²⁶ There is a more recent work on the topic which could offer more up-to-date information, but it is rather sketchy: DOBSZAY: *Az esztergomi rítus* 19–21. Although it has been translated into English, it is yet to be published.

¹²⁷ Even the most recent and well-known OCC 373. Also KAY: *Pontificalia* 1243 (page 236).

¹²⁸ Güssing/Németújvár, Klosterbibliothek der Franziskaner Cod. 1/43. The codex is from the first half of the 13th century. Today most are of the opinion that it is from Zagreb, but it is actually a parochial and not a cathedral copy. Its value as a source for the typical Hungarian (hence Zagreb) Use is limited.

however, extended the source material, including also 11-12th-century codices in their research. Hence Radó worked with seven manuscripts, including the “Zagreb three” and the P, as the earliest sources of the Hungarian liturgy. The Hungarian pertinence of the other sources was proved by Kniewald. In order to define the origin of these seven sources, Radó applied a method based on the Sanctorale, that is, he “localised” the liturgical Use by examining the the origin and cult of the “favourite” saints locally celebrated or perhaps included in litanies. His comparison of the Mass Ordo and system of pericopes is informative but less well-thought-out; and some of Radó’s ideas were uncritically adopted from other, earlier authors, provided they could be quoted to support his hypothesis.

He thought that Hungary’s earliest liturgical book was the so-called Szelepcsényi Codex.¹²⁹ In this Gospel Book we find all the characteristics of the Hungarian Sanctorale but the propers of Hungarian saints are not yet present. Although Radó is convinced that the book was written in Hungary, he supposes that it was based on a Frankish Benedictine prototype. The Temporale begins with Easter which – in his opinion – is a typically Old Gallican feature, while he thinks that the system of pericopes points towards Süstern, Utrecht, and Trier.¹³⁰ He also argues that based on its Sanctorale the other Evangelistarium, the so-called Oláh Codex is from Liège (Lüt-tich).¹³¹ Amongst the “Zagreb three”, the St Margaret Sacramentary already contains the popers of the first Hungarian saints. Here St Audoenus is mentioned as “beatis-simus pater noster”, and he was the archbishop of Rouen (641–684) and the founder of the Abbey of Fontanelle. From the H, Radó highlights the Plays for Epiphany and Easter which – turning one of Morin’s careful suggestions into a decisive argument – he considers as originating from Rouen, indeed, from archbishop John of Avranches himself. Based simply on the fact that it has a Benedictional, he claims that the BS has a specifically Gallican character. The so-called Rado Bible¹³² is not a liturgical book but it contains drawings and references to periscopes, and Kniewald identifies both as typical French features. Finally, in the P the cults of Sts Vaast (Vedastus) and

¹²⁹ The codex is kept in the Nitra/Nyitra cathedral chapter’s library without a call number. The theory about its antiquity and origin – now generally rejected – is proposed in RADÓ: *Le plus ancien livre liturgique de Hongrie*; in Hungarian: *Magyarország legrégebb liturgikus könyve*

¹³⁰ In this respect, Radó relies on BEISSEL: *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches* (1907).

¹³¹ In the Library of the Esztergom Archcathedral: Mss. III. 180. As of today, the determination of its origin and age seems to be correct but the codex was only brought to Hungary after a 16th century purchase. SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* 20–21 (note 65) refers to the the opinion of a scholar from Esztergom, Zoltán Kovách which was verbally communicated at a 1973 symposium of the Book History Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Science. Szendrei is quoted by TÖRÖK: *11–12. századi liturgikus kódexeink tipológiája* 68.

¹³² Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod. 1190. (“Rado-Bibel”, see the online catalogue of the library: <http://aleph.onb.ac.at>). The codex was written in Northern France some time between 834 and 866, well before the Hungarian conquest of the Carpathian Basin (896). Its attribution to Rado, the abbot of St Vaast in Arras (790–808) is unfounded. Only KNIEWALD: *Zagrebački liturgijski kodeksi* 2–3 suggested it had any connection with Hungarian liturgical history.

Amand suggest a connection with Utrecht and Maastricht. Following Jungmann, Radó asserts that the Mass Ordo of the P belongs to a group often named after the diocese of Séez in Normandy, although lately the term “Rheinischer Messordo” is preferred.¹³³

Relying upon these data, Radó locates the Hungarian liturgy’s source region somewhere in Normandy, Flanders and Lotharingia. His next question is how this Northern French and “Belgian” tradition could have made its way to 11th-century Hungary. Since we cannot find the cult of St Maiolus and All Souls Day in early sources, he rules out any connection with Cluny. He proposes that the “mediator” was Richard (1004–1046), the abbot of St Vanne (Vitonus) near Verdun.¹³⁴ Richard visited King St Stephen twice, first in the entourage of Emperor Henry II, and later with the crusaders sent by Richard II, Duke of Normandy and led by William, count of Angoulême. Bishop St Gerard, the most important ecclesiastical figure of Hungary’s foundation as a Christian state quotes Abbot Richard in one of his works. In Radó’s opinion, he was familiar even with the Byzantine traditions which is why we can identify certain Greek elements in the early Hungarian liturgy.

The Abbey of St Vanne near Verdun was the head of a Benedictine congregation comprising more than twenty monasteries. The congregation was independent of Cluny, was even in rivalry with it. Later they sympathized with Gorze Abbey but remained uncommitted. It is not proven but certainly possible that the Abbey of St Vaast in Arras also belonged to this congregation.¹³⁵ It is well documented that it was Richard who founded the Monastery of St Lawrence in Liège. The Monastery of St Vandrille in Fontanelle was originally built by St Audoenus in the 7th century but it was destroyed by the Vikings. In the first half of the 11th century, it was restored by the Dukes of Normandy, Gerard I (who once travelled even to Hungary) and Richard II. This monastery did not belong to the above-mentioned congregation, although the Chronicon written by Richard of Verdun mentions it as such. Nevertheless, it was clearly under the influence of the reforms introduced by Gorze Abbey. Based on these considerations, Radó was of the opinion that each of the seven “cardinal” sources he listed could be placed within the framework of Abbot Richard and the Congregation of Verdun.

Even though Radó’s reasoning is obviously speculative and lacks real solid foundations, I must revise them detail by detail. As to his concept, he clearly prefers the French and Italian to the German “connection”. It is true that in 11th-century Hungarian politics independence from the Holy Roman Empire was an important consideration which was deliberately fortified with close diplomatic and cultural relations with other European regions. Nonetheless, this somewhat unfriendly attitude towards

¹³³ JUNGSMANN: *Missarum sollemnia* I. 122. note 5 (third edition).

¹³⁴ The idea is not new, it was originally brought up in MORIN: *Manuscrits liturgiques hongrois* 56, note 5.

¹³⁵ To facilitate the comparison, see BROU: *The Monastic Ordinale of St. Vedast’s Abbey Arras*

Germans cannot be projected back to the time of Hungary's foundation as a state.¹³⁶ At that time, that is, during the reign of Emperor Otto III and Pope Sylvester II, what we see is a renewed sense of collaboration between the church and the state, and the Holy Roman Empire did not impede the creation of independent Kingdoms, such as Hungary and Poland, nor did it hamper the erection of independent ecclesiastical structures in these new states. At King St Stephen's royal court there were many German nobles and clerics in attendance, especially due to his marriage to Bd Giselle, Duchess of Bavaria. The distinctly German-type palaeography and the partly Germanic character of the liturgical content in our earliest manuscripts is in complete harmony with these historical data.

In my estimation Radó's preference for a non German origin is derived from a problem of self-identity quite typical to Hungarian Catholicism. During the Reformation – for various historical reasons – the major part of Hungary became Protestant. This tendency was later overturned in the era of Catholic Restoration, forcefully supported by the “heavy hand” of the Habsburg rulers. In fact, a large part of the the Catholic population was made up of “Swabians”¹³⁷ who were settled in those regions of Hungary that had become almost completely unpopulated during the Turkish invasion. For these reasons, Catholicism was often associated with loyalty to the Habsburg Dynasty or with German ethnicity, while Protestantism became almost like a national creed. Naturally, Catholics could not completely dissociate themselves from the independence movements and the growing sensibilities of national identity, hence they were forced into an apologetic attitude of “no to Habsburgs, yes to Catholicism”. Given that the birth of the Hungarian nation state in the 19-20th century tapped heavily into this anti-Habsburg view of history, even Catholic self-identity absorbed a kind of anti-German attitude.

The source material that Radó used was not, in fact, any bigger than what had already been known to Morin when his article got published in 1926. The three sources whose importance Kniewald underlined were greatly overrated by Radó. As to the Szelepcsényi Codex, modern scholarship has proved that it is from the middle of the 12th century, and so it cannot be considered the oldest Hungarian liturgical book. It is generally accepted that the Oláh Codex is from Liège and can be dated to the end of the 12th century, but it was not produced either in or for Hungary. From the perspective of musical palaeography it is a typical example of the Liège-Aachen notation. The information we can gather from the Evangelistaria is insufficient for making general conclusions about the entirety of the liturgical Use. It is especially true of the 9th-century Rado Bible which is too early for any conclusive argument based on periscopes and ornamentation. Moreover, the monography on pericope sys-

¹³⁶ For further information on the political and cultural background of the period, see GYÖRFFY: *István király és műve* 137–147.

¹³⁷ In common Hungarian parlance the words “német” (German) or “sváb” (Swabian) are used to describe the Catholic, German-speaking minority of Austrian origin.

tems that Radó used was published in 1907, and so it cannot be considered the last definitive word on the subject.¹³⁸

What remains is the “Zagreb three” and the P. The French character of the Sanctore in the Zagreb manuscripts is something Morin had already discovered. A complete evaluation of the Hungarian Calendars and Sanctorals or their comparison to parallel European sources would be a monumental work whose proper context is not the analytic study of Pontificals. This topic will be discussed in the future volumes of this series treating of the Mass and the Divine Office. It cannot be denied that certain Gall (French) saints are regularly featured in Hungarian Sanctorals and a few Gall, especially Normann elements became part of the Esztergom Use.¹³⁹ It is not obvious, however, exactly what conclusions may be drawn from these facts. The region Radó delineated corresponds to the very heart of the Frankish Empire, that is, to Austrasia. This region played a most important role in the Frankish adaptation of the Roman rite, and it is from here that the rite spread to the entire continent. Taking this into consideration, it is not really surprising that the Roman Sanctore should have made its way to Hungary through the mediation and expansion of an Austrasian Sanctore.

The argumentation conducted independently from the Sanctore is even less convincing. Morin only proposes a relation between the Plays of the H and Rouen because the Patrologia Latina series happens to contain an Epiphany Play from Rouen among the appendices to the works of liturgical exegesis by John of Avranches.¹⁴⁰ Even less could be said of the Easter Play. After the collective edition of medieval liturgical dramas and some familiarity with Karsai’s work, it would have been easy to conclude that the Epiphany Play of the H is not any closer to its counterpart from Rouen than it is to any other Play of a simpler structure, equally wide-spread in German and Gall regions.

As regards the BS: the episcopal blessing is, in fact, a Gallican-Visigoth genre but in the 11th century it has already spread to Italy¹⁴¹, thus its use in Hungary does not

¹³⁸ For a summary analysis and tables, see CHAVASSE: *Les lectionnaires romains de la messe*. For a list of the most important 20th-century sources: *ibid.* I. 12–14. The true understanding of the material is hampered by the fact that scholars still insist on approaching the earliest sources from a genealogical perspective, instead of trying to create a synchronic typology.

¹³⁹ CZAGÁNY: *Magyar-normann zenei kapcsolatok a középkorban?* CZAGÁNY: *Magyar-normann zenei kapcsolatok a középkorban II.* (The latter is a new, updated version of the first study that appeared 20 years previously. It also contains a summary in German.)

¹⁴⁰ JOANNES ROTOMAGENSIS ARCHIEPISCOPUS: *Liber de ecclesiasticis officiis* 43B. This text also mentions the Epiphany play but the text and melody in columns 135–140 of the volume are generally taken from the liturgical books of the Rouen cathedral. These excerpts are included only as an illustration and with the qualification “incertus” among the works of the archbishop of Rouen (1069–1079), originally born in Bajoux. This is yet another proof that Kniewald and Radó uncritically adopt and develop Morin’s ideas.

¹⁴¹ The collection of threefold benedictions is an organic part of the Franko-Roman liturgy since the SAn, that is, the 9th century. According to the OCC (a commentary on the fifth Ordo), from the 10th century they were used also in Northern Italy. For a summary on the use, history and scholarly lit-

necessarily suppose any direct French influence. It is precisely the Benedictinal of the BS whose “relatives” have already been identified in Magdeburg and in the suffragan Braunschweig, which happened to be the very centre from which the German church’s Eastern mission originated during the time when the Christian state of Hungary was established.

In relation to the Mass Ordo of the P, I must emphasise that the Hungarian mediæval Use does not have a very specific and uniform Mass Ordo, while on the level of the Sanctorale and Temporale there are plenty of proper Hungarian characteristics. Within the Hungarian tradition, the Mass Ordo of the P is actually a rather peculiar and voluble phenomenon. The topic necessitates further study which we plan to complete when the Hungarian Sacramentaries and Missals will be published. However, it is already certain that the origin of the Mass Ordo in the P will not be entirely identifiable with the origin of the Hungarian liturgy.

On the level of methodology, the study results of the last decades have already proven that identifying the origin of liturgical sources based primarily on the Sanctorale is unreliable.¹⁴² The Sanctorale is the most variable and accidental component of a liturgical Use. It is much more informative and trustworthy to analyse liturgical Ordos by the structure of their ceremonies, choice and sequence of textual and musical items. Studying the Sanctorale is only productive antecedently, in pinpointing the overall region of origin, or subsequently, in determining the sub-regions of the regions thus identified. Furthermore, even if a Sanctorale is representative of a particular Use, it does not mean that its preference for certain saints bears any relation to where any given saint actually lived, worked or enjoyed special veneration. These correlations are often very complex and indirect.

From this it seems clear that Radó’s audacious attempt to determine the origins of the Hungarian liturgy was more obstructive than helpful for further developments about the question. Nonetheless, it would be unfair to give a purely negative evaluation to Radó’s efforts. Although his methodology and conclusions are faulty, I think he recognised two important aspects correctly. The first one is that the liturgy of the Hungarian church is a uniform composition which has to be seen in connection with the political and cultural ambitions of the 11th century. Secondly, the laying of the foundations of the Hungarian Use must be attributed to a highly qualified, leading European intellectual and his school or intellectual “workshop”.

Zoran Hudovský and Miho Demović

The works of two Croatian scholars must be mentioned among the antecedents or parallels of the most important musicological publications about the H. The first pa-

erature of the genre, see JÓZSA: *Benedictio pontificalis sollemnis*.

¹⁴² For an excellent methodological study on this topic, see DOBSZAY: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europæ. A Preliminary Report* 7–27., in Hungarian *ibid.* 373–393. As to the significance of the Temporal, see especially section 10/3 (pages 17. and 379).

laeographical analysis was published by Zoran Hudovský (1930–2004), a Croatian composer and music historian.¹⁴³ He was the first one to bring attention to the above-mentioned Western European relatives of the manuscript's musical notation; a conclusion he probably reached relying on the theories of Kniewald and Radó. Later a priest and musicologist by the name of Miho Demović (1934–), director of the Cathedral Choir of Zagreb, studied the subject in relation to other pre-13th-century documents of Croatian music history.¹⁴⁴ In trying to determine the origins of the Croatian liturgy, his leans towards the ecclesiastical culture of the Dalmatian coastline.

Janka Szendrei

One of the major figures in the second generation of scholars who have studied the H is Janka Szendrei (1938–) musicologist, choir director, an expert on Hungarian folk music, mediaeval church music, and Gregorian palaeography. Until now her research has proved to be of the greatest importance in studying and analysing the source basis of the Hungarian liturgy.

In 1981 Szendrei published a catalogue of notated sources from the Hungarian Middle Ages.¹⁴⁵ Since almost without exception the notated sources are liturgical books, and because almost every liturgical book contains some musical notation, this catalogue is practically the most complete collection of Hungarian liturgical books. Although her descriptions are somewhat sketchier than those of Radó, her selection is far more representative. She included libraries that Radó never studied, first of all: Zagreb. In addition to manuscripts, she also studied incunabula and early printed books. Then she was not interested primarily in Hungarian provenance but rather in sources of Hungarian origin. In determining a book's origin she was assisted by her veritable palaeographical and liturgical knowledge. Therefore, if her work had not been limited by the disciplinary framework of musicology, that is, if she had also studied unnotated sources, we would have no reason to speak of lacunae in her catalogue.

Her collection contains an inventory, very useful indices, and even an introductory treatise which is far more than a foreword. It is actually a summary of mediaeval Hungarian liturgical history in light of the available sources that is characterised by a fortunate constellation of intuition and accuracy. In terms of the genre and origin of the H, Szendrei accepts the opinion of Morin and Kniewald but ignores Radó's theories. She does not treat of the liturgical content but highlights the "pastoral concern" of the H which – in her opinion – is demonstrated by the liturgical Plays and the lengthy homiletic schemes. The primary merit of the catalogue and its introduction is that Szendrei correctly determines the historical context of the H. She described the "Zagreb three" as the most representative sources for the beginnings of Hungarian li-

¹⁴³ HUDOVSKÝ: *Neumatski rukopis Agenda pontificalis MR 165*

¹⁴⁴ DEMOVIĆ: *Spomenici glazbene kulture u Hrvatskoj od. 10. do 12. stoljeća*

¹⁴⁵ SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai*. A summary in German: *ibid.* 189–192.

turgical history, and emphasised their continuity with subsequent developments. This sensitivity was greatly nourished by the fact that in the 1970's and 1980's Szendrei had a major role in Hungarian efforts to engender a renewal of liturgical life and church music, and more particularly in the so-called schola-movement. She and her intellectual milieu has often and with great commitment drawn upon the liturgical heritage of mediaeval Hungary not only academically, but also artistically and in parochial pastoral practice.¹⁴⁶

Her particular contributions were in the area of notated chant material and its palaeography. These results were not published in a detailed fashion as part of the catalogue's introduction but in a later monography whose first part is dedicated to the history of Hungarian chant notation, while its second is about the kinds of German neum-writing that were used in medieval Hungary.¹⁴⁷ The scientific study of musical notation was a methodological novelty that greatly contributed to a more certain determination of age and origin, and it also helped to acquire a clearer understanding of the often complicated relationships between various sources. Palaeography actually provides pointers beyond its scope of competence, insofar as by looking at the development of musical notation one can make inferences regarding orientation, style, institutional background, and search for a proper identity within the Hungarian church.

More than twenty years later Szendrei published her summary work about the earliest nine notated sources of the Hungarian mediaeval liturgy.¹⁴⁸ She describes each source from a primarily musical and liturgical perspective but in a more versatile and elaborate fashion than ever before. In the closing chapter she delineates her vision of the liturgical and musical history of the Hungarian Middle Ages. She treats of the H in the third place among the sources but in a more detailed manner than earlier. Until today, this chapter has been the most important publication within the scholarly literature about the H. Szendrei first provides a bibliographical description, then engages the question of origin. She gives a complete analysis of the musical content, including not only properly notated pieces but also those liturgical texts that were written with smaller letters, obviously so that at some point music could be added to them. By doing this, Szendrei ventures into questions that pass over the limitations of a purely musicological interest, and typically concern liturgical arrangement. The only area where Szendrei's work remains wanting is that she does not deal with

¹⁴⁶ On the artistic level this is proven by the internationally renowned records of the Schola Hungarica, while pastorally it is manifested by the publications of the St Augustine Movement for Liturgical Renewal and the Hungarian Church Music Society, as well as by the liturgical life of many parishes based on these achievements. The troped Gloria of Holy Saturday, "Ó fölséges Isten papja" is based directly and solely on the H. It is included in the modern Hungarian church hymnal = *Éneklő Egyház* 834 (page 1440). This is the "Sacerdos Dei excelsi" at the principal Mass on Easter Sunday (H 104^t).

¹⁴⁷ SZENDREI: *Középkori hangjegyzések Magyarországon*. A summary in German: 187–192. The author's significant results in musical palaeography are accessible in German and English in *Studia Musicologica* XXVII–XXX (1985–1988).

¹⁴⁸ SZENDREI: *A „mos patria” kialakulása*

exodiastic rites and *Ordos* of ecclesiastical discipline (at the beginning and in the end of the book), and in her analysis of the liturgical content she does not pay sufficient attention to the euchological and rubrical material. Practically, this means that she handles the manuscript not as a Pontifical but simply as a collection of extraordinary *Ordos* for the liturgical year (basically, as something analogous to Missals and Breviaries). That being the case, her conclusions are always relevant. The concluding subsection describes and analyses the different kinds of musical notation.

The whole of Szendrei's book can be rather informative about the H, not only the chapter specifically dedicated to it. Almost every single source treated therein has some kind of connection with the H; among them especially the other two members of the "Zagreb three", and then the BS, CA, P, BNS and MNS. I have already underlined the significance of the last chapter: here we find the summary of all the relevant results (the work of a lifetime), presented in a way that manages to avoid both unfounded speculation and unimaginative scientific aridity.

Since I have already written about her subsection on musical notation, and her opinion about the book's origin and individual *Ordos* will be treated later, here I will only mention a few details that are generally characteristic of Szendrei's approach. In examining the question of origin, she remains within the methodological framework of her predecessors, that is, her conclusions are also based on the person of bishop Chartvirgus and the titles of the churches mentioned. She is generally very cautious when it comes to historical hypotheses. Nonetheless, she is the first one who – based on a careful comparison of notation, melodic variants and ceremonial details – declares with certainty that the H is consistent in featuring variants that are characteristic of the fully developed Hungarian Use, and may not be found in their entirety anywhere else in Europe. The only remaining problem is that we know nothing about the liturgical conditions of the era prior to the H: the use and influence of the H in Hungary is unquestionable but its Hungarian origin is not. Theoretically, the H might very well be representative of a foreign Use which became formative only later as regards Hungarian liturgical practices.

In searching for parallels of the liturgical material, Szendrei does not insist on a single pattern. Hence she follows Morin's approach who thought it was possible that the H had drawn upon Normann and Byzantine examples, sources from Monte Cassino and the Danube Valley. Szendrei's conclusions are more solid than those of Morin, because she was able to work with a wider source material; important editions and data bases had been made available in the meantime. This change in approach certainly allowed her to identify those regions from where the liturgical content of the H originates. It is even more important that the liturgical *Ordo* of the H is not simply an adoption of a specific foreign Use, but the creative compilation of several, at times far-distant models. As opposed to the French preferences of Kniewald and Radó, Szendrei – evidently based on musical palaeography – takes for granted the Germanic (or more correctly: Central European) character of the H. With regard to the specific details, she highlights the non-South German, mostly Rhineland connections, and she is most pleased when North Italian influences manifest themselves.

Even in other writings, she is sensibly sympathetic with this source territory of the Hungarian liturgy.¹⁴⁹ Yet her conclusion is not that the Hungarian Use is more Italian than German or French, but that the H is the first document of a Use which draws upon a wide European pool of influences, creating a unified synthesis out of a very heterogenous source material.

In connection with Szendrei's work, we must make mention of two other authors who were her close collaborators, and although they are not counted among those who closely and specifically studied the H, their propositions openly dialogued with Szendrei's conclusions. The first one is József Török, who placed the H within the context and typology of liturgical books, the second is László Dobszay who formulated a very articulate theory about the time and circumstances of the Hungarian liturgy's origins.

József Török

The early Hungarian liturgical books, including the H, were analysed from a typological perspective in a 1986-conference paper by József Török (1946–), a priest, theologian and church historian.¹⁵⁰ The important contribution of this study was that the earlier codicological approach considered the available sources individually, in separation from each other, while from the perspective of music history their relationship with non-musical sources was not given sufficient attention. Török was the first one who placed the earliest Hungarian manuscripts in the context of Ordos, Sacramentaries, and Pontificals. In doing this, he was motivated both by his francophile cultural sensibilities and by the suggestions of his master, László Mezey, a highly influential scholar of mediaeval Latin, literary and cultural history.

As opposed to his predecessors, Török emphasised the South German influences which is certainly a positive development in comparison with the prior overemphasis on the French "connection". Nevertheless, it escapes his attention that the geographically and historically more obvious South German elements (from the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg and Bavaria) are actually less dominant in the Hungarian liturgy than the influence of Swabia, Frankonia and Saxony. In order to correct Radó's construction, Török points out that the source value of the Oláh and Szelepcsényi Codices are highly questionable. Much to his credit, Török makes use of the early Hungarian book indices and the results of studying book fragments.

In Török's opinion, the H is a transitional type of book; archaic in nature in comparison with the PRG. According to him, the points of departure in this regard are the Ordos or Agendas. These are norm-texts containing some liturgical material as well. Such would be the Ordo referenced by the Synod of Esztergom around 1100.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ SZENDREI: *Latabitur deserta*

¹⁵⁰ TÖRÖK: *XI–XII. századi liturgikus kódexeink tipológiája*

¹⁵¹ LÉDERER: *Szöveggyűjtemény Magyarország történetének tanulmányozásához* I. 61., 64. In my opinion, the "libellus" mentioned here is most likely the *Micrologus* by Bernold of Constance whose

These Ordos would then be developed in three directions: with the addition of liturgical texts in the direction of Pontificals or Rituals, whereas by amplifying the rubrical material, in the direction of Ordinaries. Although at times he calls the BS an abbreviated Pontifical, and the H a proper Pontifical, in reality he considers the H to be a liturgical norm-text which – in virtue of including liturgical texts *in extenso* – points to a later and fuller development of Pontificals and Rituals. Although in the following I feel compelled to argue with the latter opinion, Török’s contribution to the study of the H is significant, because he was the first one to bring up the question of genre and typology, and for the first time he included in the discourse the editions of Andrieu and Vogel, especially the PRG.

László Dobszay

As Szendrei’s closest colleague for decades, László Dobszay (1935–2011), liturgical historian, musicologist and choir director was a truly epoch-marking, multi-faceted and suggestive figure of 20th-century liturgical science. He always remained sceptical about the Hungarian origin of the H,¹⁵² which is probably due to the fact that the H has little relevance to Dobszay’s main area of expertise, that is, the Divine Office, and wherever there is an overlap, the correspondence between the H and the Hungarian Use is not convincing. At the same time, it was precisely his study about the repertory of the antiphons and responsories in the Divine Office that led him to certain conclusions which are entirely verified by the analysis of the H.

In his programmatic study of 1988,¹⁵³ and in a popular work summarising his earlier results¹⁵⁴ Dobszay examined the unity and differentiated nature of the Hungarian Use in comparison with the Central European and even wider context. He recognised that the characteristic, proper features of the Hungarian Divine Office are found in the entire territory of the mediaeval kingdom; a fact – I might add – that identifies Hungary as the largest liturgical region in the whole of Europe. This region, however, is divided into subregions which share all the dominant elements of the common Hungarian tradition but allow for certain structured local solutions. This seems unique in comparison with other regions of the continent.

Although Dobszay clearly admits that only retrospective conclusions can be drawn from our Office-sources, he attributes this phenomenon to the way the Hungarian ecclesiastical structure was created. It was the result of a heavily centralised and rather rapid process, not the outcome of a slow, spontaneous expansion in a “democratic”

use is particularly manifest in the Hungarian church under the influence of the Gregorian movement, or more specifically in the P and the BNS, cf. FÖLDVÁRY: *A liturgiamaғыарáаат nyomai a XIV. század előtti Magyarországón* 89–96.

¹⁵² I base this statement on his verbal communications and his written examiner’s evaluation of my doctoral dissertation.

¹⁵³ DOBSZAY: *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europae. A Preliminary Report*

¹⁵⁴ DOBSZAY: *A középkori magyar liturgia István-kori elemei?*

contest of independent ecclesiastical centres. Since the rule of King St Stephen was followed by a chaotic period of disintegration and the eventual consolidation was based on restoring a well-established tradition and discipline, Dobszay is convinced that the fundamental structure of the Hungarian Use was a product of the age of St Stephen. In the time of establishing Hungary as a Christian state, the principal characteristics of the Hungarian Use were created and spread as emblematic features. All the subsequent variations were introduced to nuance this foundational heritage, and every later attempt to uniformise drew upon this common treasury.

Dobszay and Szendrei worked together on researching, studying, analysing, editing, and making available (sometimes even in daily liturgical practice) these Hungarian sources. As to the formative period of the Hungarian Use, Szendrei, who perhaps had a more intimate knowledge of the concrete sources and was very much influenced by her experience in musical palaeography, emphasised the heterogeneous background of the 11-12th-century liturgical life in Hungary. She is of the opinion that we have to presuppose a colourful, international environment whose elements were gradually amalgamated by the Hungarian church, and the uniform features were only fully developed later, as a result of a 13-14th century redaction. Dobszay, who was very sensitive to structures, a systematic intellect and active “artificer” of liturgical rites, admitted the possibility and significance of subsequent codifications, but he saw liturgical rites as artifacts that were fashioned and put into practice by creative minds. He was convinced that this project was fulfilled at the very beginnings of the Hungarian church. In my estimation both of these propositions are true, and I will attempt to create a synthesis when I analyse the liturgical repertory and structure of the H.

Herbert Schneider

The authors whose studies were conducted contemporaneously with Szendrei, did not speak of the H as a whole; instead they continued the line of investigation Karsai began by singling out one Ordo or one component for analysis. Among them one of the foremost is Herbert Schneider (1945–), German mediaeval historian, the renowned editor of synodal Ordos.¹⁵⁵ For Schneider the H is just one Ordo among many, so he mostly relies on Radó, his bibliography is random, and his textual edition has some minor flaws. At the same time, the synodal Ordo is the only one besides the Epiphany Play about whose European context we can formulate a conclusive judgement, since Schneider strove to include in his research every single extant Ordo from the period before the widespread use of the PGD and the Decretum Gratiani.

Schneider assigns the number 10 to the Ordo of the H. In his typology, those Ordos are numbered that he considers to be independent compositions, or that contaminate and supplement Ordos which were originally independent from each other.

¹⁵⁵ OCC 64–65 (analysis), 373–385 (text). For my detailed study based on synodal Ordos, see FÖLDVÁRY: *A zsinattartás rendje a Hartvik-agendában*.

The ordo of the H belongs to the latter category. He finds its antecedents in two Ordos: 5A which is only extant in one manuscript from Monte Cassino, the Pontifical of Pope Victor III (1057–1086), once Desiderius, the Abbot of Monte Cassino. The other is Ordo 9 of 9-10th-century sources from Rheims.¹⁵⁶ This latter Ordo is only related to the H by virtue of a single but well-identifiable group of items. This group is from the second half of the 9th century and it is known from a collection of canonical regulations in 309 chapters.¹⁵⁷ Thus the H inserts these elements of Ordo 9 into the framework of Ordo 5A. Its proper features are that the entire set of the items is rearranged into a new, well-thought-out structure, and it complements the aforementioned sources with a few other chant items.

Theoretically, this comprehensive edition of synodal Ordos provides a typology but its approach is genealogical which has both positive and negative results. The positive result is that the Ordos are arranged into a logical order, going from simpler to more complex forms, and so it is easily recognisable when their various elements entered into the process of handing them down from generation to generation, and what their direct or indirect antecedents were. The negative aspect is that it focuses more on the handing down of individual elements and their reception than on independent creations. By doing this, it gives the impression that the development of these Ordos is a straightforward historical progression in which the Ordos are continually crossed and supplemented, and consequently, their typology is primarily diachronic and not synchronic. This is why Schneider sees no reason to continue his research on synodal Ordos after the 12th century, although the adoption of the PGD dates to a later period, and it was not complete until the end of the 16th century.

This much is certain, however, that the relatives of the synodal Ordo in the H – thanks to the comprehensive study of all the available sources – did not come up in a haphazard fashion. Based on this study, we can make very important and entirely reliable conclusions regarding the source regions of the H, the measure of independence in its composition, and its relationship to other churches in Central Europe. These conclusions, of course, cannot be extended with complete validity to all the other Ordos of the H, nonetheless they are highly informative. This is my brief summary of the results:

(1) The relationship of the H to Monte Cassino seems certain, although not exclusive. Morin has already identified these connections at least in the case of two Ordos, and among his conclusions these seem to be the most authentic ones. Perhaps some of the Italian elements Szendrei indicated can also be explained by this relationship. Ordo 5A was very widespread in Italy and it stands very close to the H in time; it is also part of a very representative Pontifical, that is, it was handed down on a truly liturgical line of descent. At the same time, it can be proved philologically that Ordo 5A used to have other copies as well, because certain 12-century Ordos take 5A as

¹⁵⁶ Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ms. Barberini Lat. 631.

¹⁵⁷ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France Lat. 4278.

their basis but with several variants which cannot be deduced from the Codex of Abbot Desiderius.

(2) The connection with Rheims is more problematic. The items of Ordo 9 can be easily identified in the H, but they are supplementary, not of great importance in Rheims either, distant in time, and were not passed on in a liturgical but in a canonical line of descent. This fact may raise our attention to Northern France as a potential source region but it necessitates further confirmation.¹⁵⁸ Some of the elements of Ordo 9 are actually present in an early 11th-century Ordo from Freising (number 20). Although the common elements do not include the items shared by Ordo 9 and the H (which are not to be found in Ordo 20), the connection demonstrates that the lost relatives of the “Rheims” Ordo may have been circulated in Central Europe. In any case, the Epiphany Play certainly had some common elements with the Ordo from Freising.

(3) The third informative conclusion is that the H does not contain the dominant Ordos of the Carolingian era (7. és 14.) which, by means of the PRG’s popularity, were also wide-spread in Central Europe. This means that the orientation of the H goes beyond the immediate geographical “neighbourhood” and makes use of the material of far distant regions. There can be little doubt that this is indicative of a deliberate attempt to be original and independent. The originality of the H is so strong that in the material Schneider covered there is not a single parallel or close relative to be found. For the sake of comparison: Schneider’s edition is based on approximately 300 manuscripts which are categorized into 43 different types.

(4) The independence of the H is not exhausted by the fact that it relies on material from regions that are not contiguous with Hungary and are distant even from each other. The Ordos used as sources are not followed slavishly, nor are they simply placed one after the other; they are completely disassembled and out of the separate elements a new composition is created attesting to a very definite sense of taste. It has unique textual variants and also lengthier items which cannot be found in any of the extant sources. This means that potentially any European liturgical tradition might be counted among the sources, and in analysing its Ordos, the structure of the rites is more decisive than its selection of items.

Szilvia Somogyi

In connection with the synodal Ordo or in general with the disciplinary Ordos of the H, we must make mention of a recent article written by a doctoral student, a young historian, Szilvia Somogyi¹⁵⁹ who, by studying the canonical erudition of the early mediaeval period, became interested in the H. Somogyi carefully compared the sources and literature of canonical history with the content of the H, and she concluded that our present knowledge of 11-13th-century Hungarian synods and judi-

¹⁵⁸ For further analysis: CHEVALIER: *Sacramentaire et martyrologe de l'Abbaye Saint-Remy*

¹⁵⁹ SOMOGYI: *A Hartvik-agenda és a kánonjog*

cial practice is not contradicted by anything in the liturgical content of the H. It is very relevant to the question of origin that the Ordo of the H presupposes a provincial synod presided over by an archbishop, which clearly contradicts the hypothesis of its origin from Győr because this city was a suffragan of Esztergom, and the only other archbishopric in Hungary was that of Kalocsa.¹⁶⁰ This, in and of itself, is not absolutely decisive since liturgical books are not functional in every possible detail, but if this fact is supported by other data, it may be a very important argument.

Somogyi's merit is that she included the Ordos of the H in her extensive research, and she was the first one to make use of Schneider's results. Her most important conclusion is that the Ordos of synods, excommunications and reconciliations in the H presuppose familiarity with, and the use of, Burchard's *Decretum*, while the degradation and restitution of presbyteral (priestly) Ordos are not related to Burchard. She published the textual parallels in an appendix. She considers the H informative from the perspective of canon law because until now the acquaintance in Hungary with certain canonical collections, such as the *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* and the *Collectio Pseudo-Isidoriana*, could only be presumed conditionally and from manuscript fragments. Although it is objectively true that several details of the aforementioned Ordos are taken from Burchard, the antecedent sources of the H must have been liturgical texts. Practically, whoever used the H was necessarily familiar with Burchard's texts, but it is not at all certain that they were fully aware of the fact that these sections were adopted from Burchard. For this reason the H itself only proves the knowledge of Burchard's *Decretum* in the environment where the derivatives of Schneider's Ordo 5 were produced.

Edit Madas

The long homiletic schemes of the H were already noticed by Morin and Szendrei, but their detailed analysis was accomplished by Edit Madas (1949–), a mediaeval scholar and literary historian, an outstanding expert on hagiography, homiletics and Hungarian mediaeval book culture.¹⁶¹ Within the context of Hungarian mediaeval homiletic literature, Madas described the homilies of the H as the first known complete sermons.

First she provides a brief but very up-to-date summary of the history of studying the H, including an almost complete bibliography. With regard to dating, Madas formulated her own theory on the basis of palaeography which I have already described as part of the manuscript's description. As to the genre, she repeats Morin's theory, but when it comes to the question of origin, she sides with Kniewald. She

¹⁶⁰ ENGEL Pál—KOSZTA László's article on "Zágráb püspökei" in KRISTÓ—ENGEL—MAKK: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon* 740. Zagreb first belonged to Esztergom, from 1180 to Kalocsa, and then soon again to Esztergom.

¹⁶¹ MADAS: *Középkori prédikációirodalmunk történetéből* 49–81; see also MADAS: *A legkorábbi fennmaradt magyarországi prédikációk*.

does not take a definitive position, but asserts that such well-constructed theories can only be countered by an equally coherent argumentation. She tactfully avoids discussing the theory of French origin while she considers the German “connection” to be probable. Madas methodically confutes one of the statements made by Kilián Szigeti OSB (1913–1981), music historian, choir director and composer, namely, that the Chartvirgus of the H is identical to Hartwick, archbishop of Salzburg (991–1023), who – in Szigeti’s opinion – led a Christian mission to Hungary. Fortunately, this theory, being untenable both chronologically and liturgically, did not exert much influence on scholarly literature; although by way of a poorly written yet rather widely circulated textbook on liturgical history it still misleads many students and interested readers.¹⁶²

In the central part of the chapter on H, Madas discusses the homiletic texts of liturgical books in general terms. She proves that the phenomenon is not uncommon, and then she proceeds to analyse four sermons for Maundy Thursday, primarily from the perspective of the sources and independent compositions or alterations. These texts are organised into parallel columns and translated into Hungarian.

The first Maundy Thursday sermon is made by the bishop to the reconciled penitents. Madas could not find its origin, therefore, she thinks it is possible that the sermon was actually written in Hungary. The second sermon in which the bishop explains the rites of Maundy Thursday is more exciting. It is a compilation unique to the H; we can identify the prototypes used whose texts are molded together with proper transitions. Among the sources we find one of the Maundy Thursday homilies of Beda Venerabilis,¹⁶³ the eucharistic treatise of Pascasius Radbertus (*De corpore et sanguine Domini*),¹⁶⁴ a partial commentary in one of the versions of the SGr,¹⁶⁵ and the *Liber officialis* of Amalarius.¹⁶⁶ More interesting than identifying the sources is the way the redactor of the H handles these texts. The text of Radbertus, for example, is edited not only formally but also as regards its tone, in conformity with the “humane” style of the H, also apparent in other sections. Among the parallels, Madas mentions also a Pontifical from Beauvais, mediated by the AER, but this text is actually the Maundy Thursday sermon of the PRG,¹⁶⁷ and unfortunately, the unawareness of the true significance of the PRG is generally characteristic to the history of studying the H. The third Maundy Thursday sermon is about the faith. Only the rubrics of the PZ make it clear that the Holy Communion of the faithful on Maundy

¹⁶² SZIGETI: *A magyarországi római szertartású liturgia vázlatos története*, in VÁRNAGY: *Liturgika* 528. This book was first published in 1975 as a college manual.

¹⁶³ BEDA VENERABILIS: *Homilia XXV in Cæna Domini*

¹⁶⁴ RADBERTUS: *De corpore et sanguine Domini*

¹⁶⁵ MÉNARD: *Notæ et observationes*. The text quoted by Madas under the title ‘Menardus’ is, in fact, a work from 1641, which was republished in the SGr edition of the Patrologia Latina series (1849). Here the parallel texts are actually from the source text used by Ménard, that is, from one of the versions of the SGr.

¹⁶⁶ HANSSENS: *Amalarii Episcopi Opera Liturgica Omnia II. Liber Officialis* 68., 76–77.

¹⁶⁷ AER Volume IV, chapter 22 (page 111) = PRG II. 82–85.

Thursday was prepared by a communal confession of sins and a profession of faith.¹⁶⁸ Madas does not recognise the context of the sermon; hence she considers this set of Maundy Thursday sermons to be a kind of collection. She could not find parallels to this sermon on faith. Finally, the fourth sermon is what the bishop addresses to his clergy after the Mandatum (washing of the feet) and the concomitant “Lenten” supper. This is wholly identical to the Pseudo-Augustinian sermon.¹⁶⁹

Madas does not include among the liturgical homilies: the episcopal admonitions which were to be delivered during a synod, the homiletic scheme for admonishing the penitents on Ash Wednesday, the two well-known allocutions of the archdeacon at the time of the penitents’ reconciliation, or the remonstrances of the penitential Ordo directed to the confessants. If these had been taken into consideration, it would have become more apparent that allocutions are a rare but real liturgical genre in Pontificals, even though their occurrence is not completely consistent. Nevertheless, what literary history and philology could determine about the four Maundy Thursday sermons on the basis of their parallels, is very compatible with what we have learned about the H so far. We can find adaptations, proper compositions, and creative redactions of foreign examples. The principles of redaction that Madas has managed to identify in terms of the liturgical homilies are the very same as the principles that we can discover in relation to musical notation, the Epiphany Play, or the synodal Ordo.

My Own Earlier Contributions

My attention was drawn to the H in 2004, as I was preparing an edition of the extant Hungarian Ordinals. The immediate reason was Szendrei’s catalogue which – in agreement with Morin – identifies the richly rubricated section of the H at the end of the liturgical cycle as an Ordinal.¹⁷⁰ Although it soon became clear that it is not an Ordinal, I have recognised that in order to understand 15-16th-century Ordinals, one must be familiar with the rubrical material of earlier liturgical books as well.

Beginning with Kniewald, many have realised that there are obvious textual correspondences between the H, the P and the later Esztergom books, but the task of their systematic philological analysis was left to me.¹⁷¹ This is the reason why I compiled a chrestomathy of the rubrics I found in the H, the P, the MNS, the BNS and the first

¹⁶⁸ PZ 17r

¹⁶⁹ MAI: *Novae patrum bibliothecæ tomus primus* 331–332.

¹⁷⁰ MORIN: *Manuscrits liturgiques hongrois* 54: “pontifical, ordinaire, rituel”; SZENDREI: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* C 64 (page 66): “Liber Ordinarius + Pontificale”

¹⁷¹ FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis*, chapter II/3 (pages 199–243) and the third part of the appendix: *Fragmenta Pontificalis antiqui Strigoniensis*. The first reflections on these results: FÖLDVÁRY: *Ligatis natibus* 390–401, and FÖLDVÁRY: *A liturgiamağyarázat nyomai a XIV. század előtti Magyarországon* 94–96 (originally, this is an excerpt from chapter II/2 of my doctoral dissertation). A concise summary of the research and conclusions in English, FÖLDVÁRY: *Unknown Fragments of Ordines in Medieval Hungary*; in Hungarian, FÖLDVÁRY: *Ismeretlen ordótöredékek a középkori Magyarországon*.

printed ceremonial books of Esztergom. I have demonstrated and analysed the parallels and differences. Finally, I checked if these same rubrics can be found in other Hungarian churches or in neighbouring countries. The result was negative. In addition to some interesting partial results, I have reached the conclusion that the rubrical texts of the H are much closer to later Esztergom books than to earlier Zagreb sources, and these related texts, which are not found in Pontificals, contain fragments proper to Pontificals at illogical places. Since the H was taken to Zagreb at a very early date and it remained there, this means that the H is the first witness to a textual tradition which began in Esztergom, it was preserved without damage or loss only there, it already existed in the 11th century, and its original “host” (or prototype) was a Pontifical.

Once I have determined that the H is a real Pontifical, I began to dedicate my attention to its genre, thematic and structure.¹⁷² Trying to place the H within the history of Pontificals, I had to answer the following question: is it an archaic, primitive pontifical, or an elaborate composition proper to its age? Since it can be dated to somewhere between the PRG and the PR12, and the German-Italian orientation of the early Hungarian church is evident, I had to determine if the H draws upon the PRG or it is a prelude to the PR12. The conclusion I reached was that the H was a “modern” composition in the second half of the 11th century, while structurally it followed the PRG rather closely. I noticed some disproportionality to the extent that in the H the liturgical cycle is more emphatic and takes up greater space than the pontifical *Ordos*, and that the most typical pontifical *Ordos* (ordinations and dedication) are missing. In my opinion this can only be explained if we assume that the H is actually the last book of a two- or three-volume Pontifical. The first volume was probably the BS or a manuscript very much like it.

The recognition of the PRG as basic reference was an important step, but in a negative sense. It was in comparison with the PRG that I realised how original the selection of the H really is. It is even more true about the composition of certain *Ordos*, which allows us to appreciate the particular editorial logic, taste and style behind the composition of the H. The characteristic features of the H are well documented in the Esztergom rite all the way until its abandonment in the 17th century but they cannot be found either in foreign churches or in more peripheral Hungarian sources. Consequently, the “workshop” of the H must have been the “workshop” of the entire Esztergom Use. Naturally, my attention turned to identifying the liturgical “raw material” used for each *Ordo* and the principles of redaction applied in composing these *Ordos*. This work has already been accomplished with regard to the *Ordos* of Palm Sunday, excommunication-reconciliation, and synods.¹⁷³

¹⁷² My programmatic study, FÖLDVÁRY: *Középkori pontifikálék Magyarországon*. A summary of the results so far, FÖLDVÁRY: *A Hartvik-agenda és a Német-római pontifikále*

¹⁷³ FÖLDVÁRY: *A Hartvik-agenda kiközösítési és visszafogadási rítusainak szerkezete és eredete*; FÖLDVÁRY: *A zsinattartás rendje a Hartvik-agendában*; FÖLDVÁRY: *A római rítus változatainak kutatása* 19–39., 78.

In the meantime, I have come up with certain partial results in relation to other Ordos, I have developed a technique for describing and analysing these Ordos, almost by accident I have discovered the PZ as an important help in processing the H and the BS,¹⁷⁴ and I began to write an ambitious book about the methodology of studying liturgical Uses.¹⁷⁵ I hope, nay I am convinced, that I am on the right track, but I am profoundly indebted to the previous generations of scholars, especially to the Hungarian school of liturgiology. This school has always looked for life and ideas behind the sources, and never severed its ties with the reality of daily liturgical practice.

DATE AND ORIGIN

In my opinion the H is a copy of one of the volumes (most likely the second) of the representative, 11th-century Pontifical of the Esztergom archcathedral. The structure of the liturgy therein was composed in the first decades of the 11th century, during the reign of King St Stephen. This copy, however, was only made later, in the 1080's or in the beginning of the 1090's, with some imperfections and lacunae in the rubrics and notation, at times abridging the original prototype. Nothing rules out the possibility that this copy was made specifically for the cathedral of the Zagreb diocese, established sometime between 1090 and 1095.¹⁷⁶

I expect that my thesis will be confirmed by the analysis of the entire textual material and liturgical order. In what follows – before the aforementioned analysis – I will summarise and evaluate the historical data gathered and processed by the usual means of codicology and the scholarly literature so far. Due to its publicity, I will discuss in detail the so-called Hartwick-hypothesis, that is, the theory that attributes the H to Arduinus, bishop of Győr.

Date

The H does not contain any data from which we may draw unequivocal historical conclusions about its date of “birth”. Except for the name Chartvirgus – which we shall discuss later – there are no references in it to historical events, persons or institutions, and it does not suggest or suppose any liturgical regulation, feastday or cult of saints that could determine the exact date of origin. In dating the manuscript, therefore, we must rely on the history of its use and palaeographic considerations.

¹⁷⁴ FÖLDVÁRY: *Egy hiányzó láncszem*

¹⁷⁵ FÖLDVÁRY: *A római rítus változatainak kutatása*

¹⁷⁶ As to the founding document, see ROKAY Péter's article on “Zágrábi püspökség” in KRISTÓ—ENGEL—MAKK: *Korai magyar történelmi lexikon* 739–740. Usually the concrete dates: 1092 or 1094 are mentioned. Here and in what follows I will review the results of standard historical studies. Not being a historian, I shall refrain from formulating my own opinion.

As regards the context of its use, the first direct information is the aforementioned 14th-century entry in the inventory at the library of the Zagreb cathedral. Since the codex is described exactly as it is today, it is safe to assume that the period of its intense use was earlier than that. We know that the H was one of the sources for the PZ which dates to the beginning of the 13th century, and “Hand” 3C, in revising the Ordo of Candlemas, attests to the manuscript’s use in Zagreb. Hence the codex was certainly in Zagreb by the beginning of the 13th century. We know even less about the 100 years or so between this time and the date of its origin which can be determined fairly accurately by palaeographical means.

Nevertheless, the H is a member of the “Zagreb three”, and its significance is that all three of the cathedral’s earliest codices contain data – primarily proper and unmistakably referenced patronages – which exclude their origin from Zagreb. There is no real doubt today as to the Esztergom origin of the BS, and the St Margaret Sacramentary is either from the collegiate chapter of Dömös, near Esztergom, or from a Benedictine monastery nearby. The fact that the liturgical books of the Zagreb cathedral were imported from afar cannot be explained unless Zagreb at the time had an insufficiently developed liturgical life and book culture. For this reason, Kniewald’s theory seems credible that well-established Hungarian ecclesiastical centres donated the “Zagreb three” to the newly founded cathedral. The most probable donor, of course, is Esztergom, and the items donated were the liturgical books used by the Esztergom archcathedral and its immediate surroundings, or copies made for the specific purpose of assisting the new foundation in Zagreb. This assumption, at least, is not contradicted by the other two members of the “Zagreb three”.

This is also supported by palaeographical results. Every scholar who has ever studied the codex agrees that the wider time frame of its typeface is the turn of the 12th century. According to Madas, if we compare its orthography with the St Margaret Sacramentary, dated to the beginning of the 12th century, the H seems somewhat older.

Musical palaeography can yield even more exact results, although we must be careful because the several different kinds of notation may not be completely reliable, if we would like to determine their chronology with great accuracy, down to the decade. According to Szendrei, the notation of the Mandatum by notator 5 is the earliest, possibly from the 1080’s. Since the notation is later than the text, the manuscript may be coeval with the BS or even older. This seems to be contradicted by the fact that in Szendrei’s opinion the notation of the Palm Sunday Ordo by notator 3 dates to the turn of the 12th century. The problem is that I believe this notator to be identical to Hand 2 who is also responsible for the text on the corresponding pages, and Hand 2 cannot be later than Hand 1, since Hand 1 takes over the writing from him on the verso of folio 42 (on the very same page!). This means that the writing of Hand 2, and thereby, the musical scores of notator 3 are coeval with the manuscript itself. Taking all these into consideration, my dating of the codex is to the first half of the 1090’s. This also happens to be the time of the establishment of the Zagreb diocese, thus the historical and palaeographical lead to the very same conclusion.

This dating does not exclude the existence of a close relationship between the H and the BS, since the top end for the latter's origin is 1093. It cannot be decided with any certainty which one is actually the oldest Hungarian liturgical book, but it seems likely that they were not taken to Zagreb immediately as the new bishopric was founded. If the St Margaret Sacramentary was, indeed, part of the "package", the donation was probably made some time in the beginning of the 12th century. According to tradition, Duh, the first bishop crossed the Sava river with 32 priests into the territory newly occupied by King St Ladislav. Initially they could not have had many books at their disposal, provision for the needs of the new diocese was probably gradual. Accordingly, the textual corrections and musical notation from the beginning of the 12th century may not have been done in Zagreb.

Origin

Theories about the origin of the H are usually based on two bits of information: (1) the bishop whom the deacon commands to God's protection at the end of the Exultet, is named Chartvirgus, (2) the Ordos presuppose the existence of churches dedicated to Sts Stephen, Mary and Peter. Based on these two data, Morin suggested – with several questionable leaps in logic – the origin of the H from Győr. Subsequently, I will examine these data more closely.

The Hartwick-hypothesis

Before laying out my own opinion, I must discuss the theory that identifies the Chartvirgus of the Exultet with Arduinus, bishop of Győr. This idea, originally suggested by Morin and further developed by Kniewald, became so dominant that today most consider the H to be from Győr. The question is still debated in Hungarian mediaeval studies, almost every scholar of 11-12th-century Hungarian history treats of it. These opinions are best summarised by Madas in her description of the H; I will only highlight the most important elements while paying special attention to the primary sources cited in their support.

We basically know of three people during this period of Hungarian history by the name Hartwick, or some other version of it. Essentially, the Hartwick-hypothesis operates under the supposition that these three people are, in fact, one and the same person. In this respect, the situation is similar to the construction of the medieval figure of St Denys by combining the Areopagite, Pseudo-Dionysius and the martyr of Montmartre...

The first character is Arduinus who was supposedly the bishop of Győr at the turn of the 12th century.¹⁷⁷ What we seem to know of him is that in 1097 King Coloman

¹⁷⁷ Kornél SZOVÁK's article "Győr püspökei" in KRISTÓ—ENGEL—MAKK: *op. cit.* 739–740. Among the bishops of Győr we know by name, Arduinus is the second one who was preceded by Nicolas (†1055) and followed by George, taking office in 1111. Others have different dates, for example: 1095–1005 (TÖRÖK: *A tizenegyedik század magyar egyháztörténete* 203.), 1088–1103 ("Hartvik"

the Learned sent him to Sicily as an envoy to ask for the hand of the daughter of Roger I, a Normann count. The only other mention made of him is in a modern historical study, referring to an unknown source in connection with an ecclesiastical dispute in 1103. The other character is a bishop by the name of Cartvicus,¹⁷⁸ who at King Coloman the Learned's command edited the minor and major legends of King St Stephen (who was canonized in 1083).¹⁷⁹ The exact dating of these legends is a matter of debate: they were written either around 1100 or between 1112 and 1116. For some time, this Cartvicus was also identified with a homonymous bishop of Regensburg or an abbot of Hersfeld, others say he lived in Hungary.¹⁸⁰ Since his work is one of the first products of Hungarian literature, the person and age of the author intrigue both historians and philologists. Finally, the third character is the Chartvirgus mentioned in the Exultet of the H.

Arduinus, Cartvicus and Chartvirgus were all bishops, and their names are closely associated with Hungarian political and intellectual life at the turn of the 12th century. The first one to propose that the first two are the same person was Gyula Pauler in 1883.¹⁸¹ His argumentation rests on two foundations: he presumes that at the turn of the 12th century there was a bishop in Győr by the name Arduinus, and also that Arduinus is a Latin-Italian style softening of the hard-sounding name Hartvigus. He buttresses his argument with the following:

(1) Gottfried Malaterra, a Benedictine chronicler from the 12th century, writes in his work entitled *Historia Sicula* that the Hungarian King Alamannus (Colomannus?) sent envoys to Sicily in order to ask for the hand of Felicia (also: Busilla) in marriage who was the fourth daughter (from the second marriage) of Roger I, a Normann

in *Magyar Katolikus Lexikon* = <http://lexikon.katolikus.hu>, 1097–1110 (GAMS: *Series episcoporum* 373.). The date 1088 is probably a result of confusion with the homonymous abbot of Hersfeld, anti-archbishop of Magdeburg. As to the others, see the referenced data. I have not managed to identify the source of Török's dating.

¹⁷⁸ In other textual variants: Carthvitus or Hartvicus.

¹⁷⁹ The words “Domino suo Colomanno regi precellentissimo” refer to Coloman the Learned, Hungarian king (1095–1116), although another possibility has been suggested in connection to Prince Coloman, King of Galicia (1208–1241). Emma Bartoniek's edition of the legend: SZENTPÉTERY: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* II. 401–440. In the appendix of the 1999-reprint edition there is a summary of the study results and relevant bibliography by Kornél Szovák: II. 772–773.

¹⁸⁰ The reason the bishop of Regensburg has been suggested is that he happened to be a contemporary of King Coloman, we are aware of his “expedition” to Hungary, and we do not know anyone by that name among the Hungarian bishops. This identification is, however, contradicted by the fact that the bishop of Regensburg came to Hungary in the entourage of Emperor Henry V trying to invade Hungary which makes it very unlikely that he would have been commissioned by the Hungarian king. See PAULER: *Ki volt Hartvic püspök?* 803. The name of the abbot of Hersfeld (1072), who for a few months was named anti-archbishop of Magdeburg by Emperor Henry V, came up because of his anti-Gregorian attitude and because some thought he had eventually escaped to Hungary. His authorship can be ruled out, since it has been proven that he dies in 1090. Based on the works of Lajos J. Csóka and József Deér, see KLANICZAY: *Az uralkodók szentsége a középkorban* 307. As to what nationality Cartvicus was, there is no consensus.

¹⁸¹ PAULER: *Ki volt Hartvic püspök?*

count. The gesture was received favourably but the count asked the king to confirm his intentions by sending some men of noble birth to his court. To reassure the king, Count Roger I in turn sent a few of his men to Hungary. King Coloman fulfilled his wishes, and bid a certain Count Thomas and Arduinus to travel to Sicily. Malaterra describes Arduinus as “episcopus Ioviensis (Iauriensis?)”¹⁸²:

Alamannus autem rex Hungarorum, audiens famam Siculorum gloriosi comitis, Rogerii, legatos dirigens, filiam suam in matrimonium concedi expostulat. Ille vero, quamvis honesti viri, qui ad hoc venerant, essent, tamen, illos honeste a se dimittens, de suis etiam, ne fallatur, cum ipsis dirigens, remandat, ut, si executum, quod cœperat, velit, alicuius auctoritatis gradus vel ordinis personas, quibus facilius credatur, ad id confirmandum mittat. Qui anhelus exsequi Arduinum Ioviensem episcopum et Thomam comitem idem expostulatum mittit.¹⁸³

The marriage was eventually contracted, confirming the Normann-Hungarian alliance against Byzantium and Venice. A large Normann delegation was sent to attend the lustrous nuptials. Felicia bore twin boys to Coloman, and one of them became the next king, Stephen II. The queen died in 1104. Thus Malaterra relates true historical events, and we have no reason to doubt its further details but the proper names of the story are often rather inaccurate.

(2) Miklós Schmitth, Jesuit historian in a work published in 1752 about the archbishops of Esztergom refers to a conflict in 1103 between Máté, archbishop of Veszprém and Péter, abbot of Mount St Martin (today Pannonhalma) whose monastery is located in the diocese of Veszprém. Apparently, the argument was peacefully settled by Seraphinus, archbishop of Esztergom, at a meeting that was attended by several other bishops: Ugolinus, archbishop of Kalocsa, Sixtus, bishop of Várad, and Arduinus, bishop of Győr. Schmitth does not make reference to any particular source but it is possible that he was in possession of certain documents that have since been lost to posterity. Here is the relevant passage:

Subinde exortas simultates inter Matthæum episcopum Vespremiensem et Petrum abbatem Sancti Martini de Monte Pannoniæ anno MCIII. amicissime composuit Seraphinus. Disceptationi intererant Ugolinus Colocensis, Sixtus Varadinensis et Arduinus Geuriensis seu Iauriensis episcopi.¹⁸⁴

These two bits of information, which can neither be confirmed nor dismissed, would be cited in support the claim that at least between 1097 and 1103, the bishop of Győr was named Arduinus. There is no other source ever referenced by Pauler or others. What remains is to prove that Arduinus is actually a softened form of the name Hartvigus. Pauler argues as follows:

¹⁸² Iaurinum is the Latin mediaeval name for the city of Győr in Western Hungary.

¹⁸³ MALATERRA: *De acquisitione regni Siciliae*, volume IV, chapter 25 (column 1203). I changed the orthography and interpunctuation of the quoted texts in accordance with my own standards. Pauler's quotations are based on MURATORI: *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* V. 599.

¹⁸⁴ SCHMITTH: *Archi-Episcopi Strigonienses* I. 46. Pauler quotes the second edition of 1758; that is also what I used.

(3) The Chronicles of Thietmar von Merseburg (975–1018) and the related work of the Saxon annalist (Annalista Saxo) between 1148 and 1152 consistently apply the name Hartvigus to Arduinus or Harduinus, margrave of Ivrea,¹⁸⁵ who was a contemporary of Emperors Otto III and Henry II, and – as the rival of the latter – king of Italy. Since Thietmar was a contemporary of Arduinus and a relative of the imperial dynasty, and Annalista Saxo handles his sources rather critically, in Pauler’s judgment their testimony is reliable as regards Hartvigus being the 10–12th-century German version of the italianised Arduinus. Thus if in the period when bishop Cartvicus composed the Legend of St Stephen the bishop of Győr was indeed called Arduinus, and the two names are the same, it is possible that these two bishops are identical.

Pauler’s theory was received favourably until Elemér Varjú’s critique in 1928.¹⁸⁶ Varjú does not deny that the two names could be identical, but he questions the authenticity of the historical data about Arduinus, bishop of Győr, and suggests that the author of the Legend of St Stephen could only be a foreigner.

In support of his opinions, Varjú argues that Malaterra often distorts other names, too. It is not at all certain that Ioviensis should be read Iauriensis; it could just as well be Ianuensis, in reference to Genova (Ianua). This seems to be supported by the fact that in the 14th-century Italian translation of the text we find: “episcopo di Genua Arduyno”. He does admit, however, that the contemporary bishops of Genova (Augurius/Ogger or Aicard/Airald [Richard]) are not better candidates to be identified with Arduinus than any other Hartvigus. It is an express error of Varjú to suppose that Arduinus would have assisted at the “per procura” wedding of King Coloman and Felicia. Malaterra does not mention it, and the diplomatic mission of Arduinus and Count Tamás was only meant to prove the seriousness of the King’s proposal. The wedding was celebrated in Hungary, in the presence of some archbishops and bishops. Among the members of the Normann legation bishop Henry Lescastrensis (Neocastrensis?) is mentioned several times by name.¹⁸⁷ Thus if Hungarian prelates and an important Normann bishop were at the wedding which was not celebrated “pro procura”, it is unreasonable to suppose the assistance of a Genovese bishop.

According to Varjú, the other reference to Arduinus was constructed by Schmitt, based on a bull of Pope Paschal II from 1102, mistakenly dated to 1103.¹⁸⁸ The name of Arduinus was only involved in this falsification because of Malterra’s text.

¹⁸⁵ Pauler’s source: PERTZ: *Annales, chronica et historia ævi Saxonici* 783–844. passim; PERTZ: *Chronica et annales ævi Salici* 647–669. passim. The newer editions of Thietmar and the Saxon annalist: HOLTZMANN: *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon*; NASS: *Die Reichschronik des Annalista Saxo*

¹⁸⁶ VARJÚ: *Legendæ sancti regis Stephani* 95–98.

¹⁸⁷ Neocastrum is the Latin name for the Greek town of Nicastro in Calabria (South Italy). Its first bishop known by name was Henry from 1090. A document from 1116 makes mention of him as an important figure of the Normann administration. See TAKAYAMA: *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily* 46.

¹⁸⁸ JAFFÉ: *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* 4429 (volume I, page 484; Varjú is probably mistaken, cf. 713.) Text and dating: ERDÉLYI: *A Pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek rend története* I. 592–594.

Based on document evidence, Varjú affirms¹⁸⁹ that the bishop of Győr between 1101 and 1118 was named György (George); hence there is no reason to mention any Arduinus in this context, as there was never a bishop of Győr by that name.

Besides the author of the Legend of St Stephen being a foreigner, Varjú argues that Cartvicus does not mention his episcopal see in the introduction which would have been considered improper in a document addressed to the king. In addition to this, Varjú highlights the literary gestures that do not represent Hungarians in the best light and are slightly degrading of the honour of Hungarian kings.¹⁹⁰ In the meantime, Varjú points to the bishops of Magdeburg (Hardwig), Meißen (Hertwig) and Regensburg (Hartwik). Based on indirect political connections, he recommends especially the bishop of Meißen as the potential author of the Legend. Varjú also reflects on Morin's theory: he thinks there is nothing specifically Hungarian about the H, and so under the Chartvirgus mentioned therein is most likely the originally Istrian bishop of Regensburg, due to the Byzantine influences recognised by Morin in the Ordo for the blessing of water (more explicable in Istria than in Győr).

Another cardinal point of the argumentation is the dating of the Legend. Varjú thinks that the Legend must have been written after 1109 because there is a telling detail in it about the death of St Emeric, St Stephen's son. According to the Legend, the soul of the deceased crown prince was immediately taken up to heaven which was miraculously revealed to a Byzantine bishop.¹⁹¹ The author of the Legend of St Emeric says that he heard this story from a canon of Cæsarea when, on the way to the Holy Land, he was in Constantinople with Prince Álmos, King Coloman's brother.¹⁹² This happened either in 1108 or 1109 which supports dating the Legend of Cartvicus to some time between 1110 and 1116 (King Coloman's death). If this, indeed, is when the Legend was written, Arduinus, bishop of Győr could not have been the author.

Varjú's theses – perhaps due to his often heated tones – were not well received by Hungarian historians.¹⁹³ Undeniably, his arguments are not always of the same

¹⁸⁹ According to Varjú (the source is not identified), George, bishop of Győr is first mentioned in the contract between King Coloman and Michiel Vitalis, Doge of Venice (†1102) regarding the integrity of Dalmatian legislation. Varjú dates the contract to 1101, and underlines that also Pauler, the author of the so-called Hartwick-hypothesis dates the event to 1097, that is, to the year when – even according to Malaterra – Arduinus must have been the bishop of Győr. Cf. VARJÚ: *Legenda sancti regis Stephani* 96, note 2.

¹⁹⁰ Such are (1) the so-called “children's tithe” according to which all the vanquished pagan insurgents and their descendants would have had the obligation to give each of their tenth children as slaves to the Benedictine Abbey of Mount St Martin; (2) the reference to the once regular Hungarian raids on Western Europe; and (3) the denial of royal titles to Hungarian rulers before the Christian coronation of King St Stephen (here Cartvicus downgrades the words ‘rex, regalis, imperialis’ in the antecedents of the legend).

¹⁹¹ SZENTPÉTERY: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* II. 428.

¹⁹² *Ibid.* II. 456.

¹⁹³ Emma Bartoniek, who edited and published the legends of King St Stephen in 1938, agreed with Varjú on the dating, see *ibid.* II. 365.

strength, sometimes he is unreasonably distrustful of the sources, and he is clearly wrong as regards the “per procura” celebrated wedding and the lack of Hungarian characteristics in the H. Yet there are two important conclusions we can apply here: Pauler’s Hartwick-hypothesis has several fickle elements, and bishop Hartwick could have been a foreign prelate.

Most recently, Gábor Thoroczkay asserted that the Legend was not written around 1110, but as early as 1100.¹⁹⁴ His own argument is built upon the observation that one can sense anti-Gregorian apologetic overtones in the Legend which was more characteristic to the reign of King Coloman. In this period the papacy tried to claim feudal lordship over Hungary but the author of the Legend – using the ideological tools available at the time and with reference to the (partly fictitious) regulations of King St Stephen – tactfully defended the sovereignty of the king’s secular power. By the end of King Coloman’s reign, the Gregorian ideology became much stronger even in ecclesiastical legislation, and Hungary sought to strengthen its ties with the papacy in order to counter German influence. If this reasoning is correct, chronologically Arduinus and Cartvicus could have been the same. Unfortunately, Thoroczkay quotes Kniewald as an “irrefutable evidence” to prove that Cartvicus/Arduinus was the bishop of Győr at the end of the 11th century.¹⁹⁵ His theory would still work without it, but historians often uncritically adopt the opinion of liturgists, and conversely.

Consequently, today the Hartwick-hypothesis may be summarised in the following positive statements: (1) It is possible that there was a bishop of Győr by the name of Arduinus during the reign of King Coloman the Learned, some time between 1097 and 1102/1103. (2) There is an example of an Italian Aduinus at the turn of the 12th century who was called Hartvigus by German chroniclers. (3) The Cartvicus we know as the author of the Legend of St Stephen was certainly a bishop who was commissioned by Coloman, and the tenor of his work is in harmony with the first years of King Coloman’s reign. Based on these results we cannot exclude the possibility that Arduinus, bishop of Győr and bishop Cartvicus were one and the same person.

We must conclude that the hypothesis remains but a hypothesis. We know very little about the Hungarian bishops of the period in question, the historical references are scarce and not always perfectly reliable. It is hard to explain why Cartvicus calls himself Cartvicus if the other sources record his name as Arduinus. Foreign bishops are not unlikely candidates, we have no idea when the bishop of Győr actually took office, and the dating of the Legend is still uncertain. Even if Arduinus was the bishop of Győr and he is identical to Cartvicus, author of the Legend of St Stephen, it still does not say anything about the Chartvirgus of the H. To rely on the “proofs” of Morin and Kniewald in this regard is tantamount to arguing from a conclusion.

¹⁹⁴ THOROCZKAY: *Megjegyzések a Hartvik-féle Szent István-legenda datálásának kérdéséhez*

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 570. According to Thoroczkay, the first documented mention of George, bishop of Győr is from 1111, cf. GYÖRFFY: *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima* I. 345–346.

Who else could have bishop Chartvirgus been?

Since I do not feel competent to pass judgment on the identity of the three Hartwicks on historical grounds, I will approach the problem from the perspective of philology and liturgical history. At the appropriate place in the Exultet (H 84^r), the name stands in an ablative case, separated by a space, in the form: “chart virgo”. Due to the writing of the letter ‘i’ without the dot on top, Morin thinks that the alternative reading of “chart iurgo” (Chartiurgus?) is also possible. If we only consider the codex and its text, three problems arise in connection to this name:

(1) The first problem is the space in between. In the section on orthography, I have already pointed to certain agrammatical forms in spacing. A major part of these are due to the deliberate etymologising of one of the “originators”, from a more original stratum of the text. A smaller part, on the other hand, is completely unfounded; and these are the mistakes of the actual copier whose knowledge of Latin happened to be weaker: even some primitive grammatical lapses can be ascribed to them. The separation of the bishop’s name belongs to this latter category. In my opinion this is due to the copier mistakenly recognising in the second part of the name the word “virgo” which is frequently used in liturgical texts. He simply did not realise that he was copying a proper name.

(2) The second problem is the context. In the concluding section of the Exultet, the liturgy prays not only for the bishop but also for the pope and the king by name.¹⁹⁶ At both places in the H, we find the word “illo” because according to an older custom of liturgical books the name to be mentioned was referenced not by the letter N (nomen), as it was done later, but by the properly declined form of the pronoun “ille”.¹⁹⁷ Hence the construction of the text lacks proper logic. If it was part of the concept that the proper names of the actual dignitaries at the time be included, why was it not done with the names of the pope and the king? Conversely, if it was not part of the concept, why was the name of the bishop included?¹⁹⁸ Even on a statistical basis it seems more probable (two against one) that including proper names was not part of the original concept. The name “chart virgo” was written into the text by accident which is confirmed by the above mentioned problem of separation. We may assume that the prototype used by the copier did mention names but the original task of the copier was to leave them out. If then – as the mistaken spacing indi-

¹⁹⁶ According to Radó, to mention a king (rex) instead of an emperor (imperator) in the Exultet is a Hungarian characteristic. Unfortunately this is not something I can confirm: we can actually find both words in certain dioceses of the Holy Roman Empire.

¹⁹⁷ The third option was to write actual but duly replaceable proper names, as I have already mentioned above in connection with the BS.

¹⁹⁸ This solution may be explained by the fact that the Pontifical is the personal ritual book of the bishop, whereas it is presupposed that while the bishop is in office, popes and kings may change. However, this attitude would have been considered rather inappropriate for a bishop who is subject both to the popes and the kings.

cates – the copier did not realise that it was a proper name, it is understandable why he copied it regardless of the original concept.

(3) The third problem concerns the subsequent meddling with the text: the notation above the name and the attempt to rub the proper name out. Notator 8 from the beginning of the 12th century provided musical notation for the entire Exultet but in the section above the name “chart” he wrote a neum corresponding to two syllables, while the space above “virgo” was left blank. The neum fits neither to the original three-syllable name, nor the single syllable of “chart”. Thus the notator had either a two-syllable word or any substitutable name in mind. The other “intervention” is easily recognisable: somebody smeared the name with a wet finger tip in a slightly downward motion, from left to right. This was done after the notation, that is, after the beginning of the 12th century, because the smearing extends to a few neums underneath. It is certain that at one time somebody was bothered by the inclusion of the proper name, and even if he did not make an attempt to delete it properly, he was well aware that it was superfluous. At this point I would like to offer yet another consideration. At other sections of the codex we can find a multitude of carefully executed rasurae, this “barbarian” attempt to smear or rub out by hand is unique. I find it very difficult to imagine that any medieval bishop would have treated the name of his predecessor with such disrespect.

In any case, it seems certain that the Latin name corresponds to the name Hartwick which was used in several different forms in the Middle Ages. We do not know of any bishop Chartvirgus from Zagreb or other Hungarian dioceses already in existence at the time. There are three possibilities: (1) we interpret the name of one of the known Hungarian bishops so that it fits the form used in the H; (2) one of the unknown Hungarian bishops was called by that name; (3) somehow the name of a foreign bishop made its way to the manuscript.

When the H was written, the following Hungarian dioceses existed: Esztergom, Veszprém, Kalocsa, Eger, Győr, Erdély, Pécs, Bihar-Várad, Csanád and Vác. The name Chartvirgus can only be connected to Győr or to one of the dioceses where the list of known bishops is incomplete. Győr is a option because it had a bishop at the turn of the 12th century by the name Arduinus, and it is theoretically possible that Harduin/Arduin is a version of the name Hartwick. Among the bishops whom we do not know by name, there are even archbishops of Esztergom. The list has lacunae both around the middle of the 11th century and in the 1080’s and 1090’s.¹⁹⁹ It is not improbable that one of the unknown archbishops was called Hartwick because it was a rather popular name in the region. If the H was indeed produced in the 1090’s, and

¹⁹⁹ Based on Kornél SZOVÁK’s article “Esztergom érsekei” in KRISTÓ—ENGEL—MAKK: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon* 203. There is a possible hiatus between archbishops Benedict and Desiderius (1055–1067), or between Nehemias and Acha (1077–1091/1094) because there is no information about the date of deposition or death of Benedict (who took office in 1055) or who became archbishop after Nehemias’ death in 1077. According to GAMS: *Series episcoporum* 380, there is a possible hiatus from 1046 to 1075 and from 1085 to 1089/1092/1100.

it was sent to Zagreb at the time of the cathedral's foundation or a bit later, then Chartvirgus could have been the bishop of Győr, one of the archbishops of Esztergom around the time, or even the ordinary of another diocese in Hungary. If the two syllables suggested by the notation actually correspond to a particular name, it could very well be either Acha of Esztergom or Duh of Zagreb.

With regard to foreign bishops there is no need to speculate. There were many bishops abroad in 11th and 12th centuries by the name Hartwick, even in dioceses which were not distant from Hungary either geographically or culturally. According to the catalogue of Gams²⁰⁰ chronologically the following possibilities present themselves:

(1) Salzburg	991–1023	Hartwig
(2) Brixen	1028–1039	Hartwig ²⁰¹
(3) Bamberg	1047–1053	Hartwig von Bogen
(4) Magdeburg	1079–1102	Harduicus/Hartwig [von Spanheim] ²⁰²
(5) Verden	1085–1097	Hartwig/Hartwich
(6) Regensburg	1106–1126	Hartwig/Hartwich von Ortenburg ²⁰³
(7) Meißen	1108–1118	Herwig/Hartwig ²⁰⁴
(8) Trieste	1115–	Artvigus

Since the identification of Chartvirgus with a Hungarian bishop is in the very least speculative, it would seem more plausible to see the H as the product of an episcopal or archiepiscopal cathedral in the Holy Roman Empire.²⁰⁵ However, this is excluded both by the manifest textual and liturgical connections of its content to the subsequent Hungarian tradition, and by the lack of such relationship with the Uses of the aforementioned foreign ecclesiastical centres. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that among the sources of the H and other books of the Hungarian Use, the codices of these dioceses abroad were, in fact, present, since the *Ordos* already analysed are obviously results of a process of redaction by means of compilation. In this case, the H is not a slavish copy of a foreign prototype, while it is possible that among the several sources used we may find specific foreign books. If the direct source of the *Exultet* happened to be one of them, and the copier did not realise that the word “chartvirgo” referred to a bishop of another country, it is not so difficult anymore to explain how it made its way into the text, why there is a discrepancy in its subsequent

²⁰⁰ GAMS: *Series episcoporum* 259–321. I will describe the smaller chronological differences later. As to the individual dioceses, a generally up-to-date, accurate list can be found at <http://en.wikipedia.org>

²⁰¹ 1020/1022 are also possible dates for the end of his activity.

²⁰² The “von Spanheim” adjective is not in Gams. Both “von Spanheim” and “von Ortenburg” occur with the names of the bishops of Magdeburg and Regensburg. As I have pointed out earlier, Emperor Henry V made the Hartwig, abbot of Hersfeld the anti-archbishop of Magdeburg for a few months. Thus at this time even the anti-archbishop was named Hartwig.

²⁰³ 1105 is another possible date for the end of his activity. According to certain sources “von Ortenburg” was Hartvik II, bishop of Regensburg between 1155 and 1164.

²⁰⁴ 1119 is also a possible date for the end of his activity.

²⁰⁵ This is the opinion of Varjú and Szigeti, and it was considered a possibility by Madas and Dobszay.

musical notation, and why an attempt was made to rub it out. Taking into consideration that the Benedictional of the BS, which stands very close to the H, displays a manifest relationship with Magdeburg, the most likely candidate for “our” Chartvirgus is Hartwig von Spanheim, archbishop of Magdeburg between 1079 and 1102.²⁰⁶ Yet my final conclusion is that in trying to determine the origin of the H, we cannot attribute too much significance to the name Chartvirgus – whoever he may have been.

Patronages

Inseparable from the Hartwick-hypothesis is the other pivotal aspect of the Győr-hypothesis, namely, the topography, or more accurately stated: the patronages of the churches mentioned in the H. Morin recognised that the rubrics make references to two churches, one dedicated to the Virgin Mary – in Morin’s opinion the cathedral itself – and another one dedicated to St Stephen which was the station church of processions. Since the patroness of the Győr cathedral is the Assumption of Our Lady and it has a St Stephen chapel (which enjoys great popularity due to the fact that the famous head-reliquary of King St Ladislav is preserved there), Morin saw his hypothesis vindicated by these topographical data. Kniewald somewhat modified this theory by proposing that the station church was not the cathedral’s chapel but the parish church of St Stephen just outside of the city walls. He tried to reconstruct on site the actual route of the procession described by the H, making use also of the information he gathered about the processional practices of later periods in Győr.²⁰⁷ Eventually, Szendrei identified a third church. Two of the orations for Rogation Days mention St Peter which – in Szendrei’s opinion – indicates the existence of a third station in a church dedicated to St Peter. The weak points of the Győr-hypothesis are the following:

(1) It is true that the Győr cathedral’s patroness is the Virgin Mary,²⁰⁸ but based on the rubrics it is not at all certain that this church of Marian dedication is the cathedral of the city. Especially because a rubric (that is, a text which is purely practical in purpose) hardly ever mentions the title of the church for which it was written. It

²⁰⁶ The only problem with this argument is what date we assign to this compilation from several sources resulting in the H. If the compilation was done during the reign of King St Ladislav, it is a reasonable solution to think of the contemporary archbishop of Magdeburg, but if it is from the time of King St Stephen and the H is an extract copy of an earlier Pontifical, the only possibility is the archbishop of Salzburg. In any case, it is very difficult to explain why such an untimely, decade-long reference would be copied into the codex. Given the fact that there is no available Pontifical bearing witness to the contemporary Use of Magdeburg (at least Kay is not aware of such a source), it is impossible to make a conclusive comparison.

²⁰⁷ BEDY: *A győri székeskáptalan története* 20–22., 26.

²⁰⁸ As to the medieval topography of Győr, see the article “Győr” in GYÖRFFY: *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* II. 589–600, and Péter TOMKA’s article “Győr” in KRISTÓ—ENGEL—MAKK: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon* 243–244. The Marian “title” is first mentioned in writing some time in the beginning of the 13th century.

would be like referring to one's own house to a family member by the exact street address. In rubrical texts whose origin we know for certain, this basically never happens, and an active member of the local community would be very unlikely to do that in a ceremonial situation. The church mentioned by its title is either the station of the procession, obviously different from the principal place of the ceremony, or one of the main places of the liturgy which changes from time to time (e.g. the stational basilicas in Rome). Hence it cannot be said with any certainty whether the Marian church mentioned in the H is the cathedral itself.

(2) The weakest point is the church of St Stephen. It is indubitably the regular target of the processions described in the H, but it is uncertain whether it can be identified in Győr. St Stephen Protomartyr was one of the most popular saints of the Carolingian era and the period immediately following. For instance, he was the patron of Passau and other dioceses along the Danube; the first Hungarian king was also named after him. Therefore, St Stephen's cult is not a local feature, in and of itself it is insufficient for tracing the origin of the H to Győr. Kniewald is right in revising Morin's theory, since one of the chapels in the cathedral cannot serve as the station for outdoor processions, accompanied by long processional chants. Nevertheless, Kniewald's suggestion is not any more convincing because the existence of the parish church of St Stephen just outside of Győr is not yet documented in the 11th century,²⁰⁹ and even if it eventually became the target of processions in a later age, it was never a particularly important building in the liturgical topography of the city.²¹⁰ If the cathedral of Győr – in harmony with the customs of the age – had a stational church, it was most likely the church of St Lazarus in the immediate neighbourhood of the cathedral.²¹¹ In any case, trying to harmonise the rubrics with a concrete topography is misleading, since the same rubrical texts can appear in sources associated

²⁰⁹ GYÖRFFY: *op. cit.* 595–596. Making an explicit reference to Kniewald, Györffy quotes the H itself, as the 11th-century proof for the church's dedication to St Stephen Protomartyr. If we disregard this reference, the first mention of the church of St Stephen as one of the three parish churches of Győr (along with St Benedict's and St Adalbert's) is from the 16th century.

²¹⁰ According to Tomka, in the 12th century there was a village-like settlement in Váralja (outside of the fortified walls). This settlement may have had a parish church dedicated to St Stephen, and this could be the church that is later documented. Váralja, however, was not part of the city in the 12th century.

²¹¹ In Györffy's opinion this is the parish church of St Lazarus which is first mentioned in 1403, and it is most likely identical to the 11-12th century church which was found by archeologists nearby the cathedral. I think that topographically this church is the most probable target of liturgical processions. The other significant churches in Győr, such as St. Stephen's, the Franciscan St. Elisabeth's, the Dominican St Dominic's, and the Hospitaller St Catherine's are too far. Just for comparison: we know from OS 105 that the Corpus Christi procession in 15-16th-century Esztergom was a grandiose event; the procession passed by the churches of St Ambrose and St George which were located North of the fortified walls, just at the bottom of the castle hill. For the medieval topography of Esztergom, see the article "Esztergom" in GYÖRFFY: *op. cit.* II. 237–269. and István HORVÁTH's article "Esztergom" in KRISTÓ—ENGEL—MAKK: *op. cit.* 199–201. The distance between the cathedral of Győr and the church of St Stephen, which was supposedly used for smaller processions, is significantly greater.

with a completely different topography, that is, their “tradition” is more textual than practical. Consequently, the church of St Stephen mentioned in the H may very well be a different church than the parish church of St Stephen in Győr.

(3) The titular church of St Peter is not connected to the Győr-hypothesis, in fact, it contradicts that hypothesis, as we do not know of any church dedicated to the Prince of the Apostles in that city. It cannot be excluded with absolute certainty either, because our knowledge of Győr’s topography in the 11th century is incomplete; there are several churches well-documented archeologically whose patronage is unknown to us. Even if one of these churches was dedicated to St Peter, we should not look for it in the vicinity of the cathedral but somewhere on the edge of the city, because rogational processions typically targeted peri-urban churches or chapels. The question is furthered obscured by the fact that Szendrei herself admits: in the parallel text of the P, one of the orations also mention St Peter,²¹² and the two codices cannot be from the same city. At least, this much can be said: the church of St Peter mentioned in the H does not lend support to the Győr-hypothesis.

After laying out my doubts, I now turn to the primary sources for a possible answer. I am not looking for a simple registry of the loci mentioning patronages, I am determined to pay heed also to their functionality and parallels. Since on the basis of different arguments I see Esztergom as the most likely place of origin for the H,²¹³ I lay special emphasis on the topographical data that support or disaffirm the Esztergom-hypothesis.

(1) The Marian-patronage is only mentioned once in the rubrics of the H, in connection with the procession for the Easter Sunday Mass.²¹⁴ After the aspersion with holy water, the procession goes to the church of St Stephen, a versicle and an oration are sung, and accompanied by chants they return “ad ecclesiam sanctæ Mariæ” where two clerics ascend to the choir screen in order to sing the verse (*Crucifixum Dominum*) of the actual processional responsory (*Sedit angelus*), alternately with the choir. This is followed by a Marian oration (*Suscipe Domine preces nostras*), then the choir begins the Introit of the Mass. Most likely, the procession enters the church during the Introit. Dramatically and in terms of chant material, this description is essentially the same as what we find in the P, MNS, OS, and even in the much later Processionals of the Zagreb cathedral. These later ones localise the singing of the verse in front of the altar of St Ladislav, but this obviously cannot be projected back to the time of that king’s reign. Since after the verse – and the oration, if there is one – the Mass immediately follows, we cannot assume that the church of the Virgin Mary was a third

²¹² P 58^v (the real sequence and hence the numbering of the P’s pages are uncertain. Here and in the following I will use the numbering done in pencil.)

²¹³ In addition to the philological and liturgical connections which I will analyse later: Zagreb was a suffragan of Esztergom, the other two members of the “Zagreb three” are from Esztergom or from its immediate surrounding, and the synodal Ordo presupposes an archbishop.

²¹⁴ H 103^r–104^r, cf. P 55^v–56^r, MNS 139^v–140^v, OS 81., Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 108 23^r–26^v

building, different from the cathedral and the church of St Stephen. The question still remains: why is there a need to name the titular saint?

I can offer two kinds of solutions. The first one necessitates a correction of the text. The medieval Esztergom cathedral had a Lady altar, possibly with its own choir, in the middle of the nave, in front of the choir screen.²¹⁵ This would be an obvious place for the procession to stop, and it is actually here that the OS localises the station and the oration. The H also mentions a Lady altar in the middle of the church, just outside of the choir screen. This is the place where one of the magi begin the Epiphany Play, and where he meets the other two magi arriving from the right and the left in order to pick up their gifts to be presented to the Christ-child.²¹⁶ From this it follows that if instead of ‘church’ we read ‘altar’ (“ad ecclesiam [ante altare] sanctæ Mariæ”), it will become understandable how this title made its way into the text, and this solution harmonises completely with the topography of the cathedral presupposed by the H, as well as with the later Esztergom tradition.

The weakness of this argument is that I cannot explain why the words “ante altare” would have been left out, and why the concluding oration of the procession still supports the thesis of a Marian patronage. The earliest occurrence of this oration is from the SGV with the title: *Oratio in atrio*.²¹⁷ In Hungarian sources this prayer regularly features an insertion mentioning the patron of the particular church in which the ceremony is performed. At this point, the H addresses the Virgin Mary while later Esztergom sources call upon a martyr whose name is not determined. This could, of course, be St Adalbert, the titular saint of the archcathedral. Admittedly, the Virgin Mary was the co-patron of the Esztergom archcathedral, and I have already made reference to that in one of my earlier studies on the subject, but it cannot be proved that at any time previously she was the sole patroness of Esztergom.²¹⁸ It is interesting, however, that the P, which is in close philological relationship with the H, also asks for the intercession of the Virgin Mary first, and then mentions St John the Baptist in second place, although it presupposes a monastic church of St John the Baptist and a station church of St Margaret, while the procession stops in front of the altar of the Holy Cross. This mention of the Virgin Mary is foreign to the classical Esztergom sources but stands very close to the common prototype source of the H and the

²¹⁵ FÖLDEVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 396–400.

²¹⁶ H 28^v–29^r

²¹⁷ SGV 3, 80, 2 (page 229)

²¹⁸ If the BS is indeed from Esztergom, it is the earliest source attesting to the cathedral’s dedication to St Adalbert because the second oldest reference is from 1118. St Adalbert suffered martyrdom in 997, and his cult was encouraged by Emperor Otto III. One of St Adalbert’s clerics, Anasthasius (Ascherik/Achéry) later became archbishop of Esztergom. Cf. GYÖRFFY: *István király és műve* 141–144. These data would sufficiently explain why St Adalbert was chosen as the patron of the cathedral which was built between 1001 and 1010. Horváth speaks of a double-title without any reservations, while according to KNIEWALD: *Esztergomi Benedictionale* 221 the Marian title first appears during the time of archbishop Dénes Széchy (1410–1465) when the cathedral was rededicated after a much-needed renovation.

P. In addition to that, I have already proven that the act of entering as a liturgical gesture is always under the protection of the Virgin Mary, regardless of the title of the church in question.²¹⁹

My other insight follows a different logic. If we accept the accuracy of the text: “ad ecclesiam sanctæ Mariæ”, we must presume a situation in which naming the titular saint has real informative value. Such is the system of Roman stational liturgies where the pope and the Roman populace celebrated in different basilicas each day or week. The stational basilica of Easter Sunday happened to be the basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore. The OR and the subsequent texts depending on it preserved the Roman topographical references very faithfully, at times demonstratively as tokens of authenticity, and the Marian patronage is, in fact, specifically mentioned in the Roman rubrics of the Easter Sunday procession.²²⁰ Although the archaic sources do not yet connect the procession and the *Oratio in atrio*, this superfluous reference to the Marian patronage may well be a “relic” of the complex process of passing down the text in tradition. That such a proposal is not without foundation will be demonstrated below, in connection with the patronage of St Peter.

(2) The patronage of St Stepehn is mentioned by the rubrics of the H twice, on Easter Sunday and on Ascension day.²²¹ Both times it is described as the target of processions setting off from the cathedral, which is confirmed on Easter also by the versicle and oration to be sung at the station. While in Győr it is difficult to make a connection between the patronage of St Stephen and the stational church of the cathedral, in Esztergom the first church of the castle hill happened to be dedicated to St Stephen. This one-nave basilica was built in 973 or a little later by King St Stephen’s father, Prince Géza. According to tradition, it was here that Géza’s son, Vajk was baptised with the name Stephen. Once the archcathedral of St Adalbert had been built, it became a collegiate chapter, and until the time of the Turkish invasion (when regular liturgical functions were permanently interrupted) this church was the principal target of the archcathedral’s processions.²²² Unfortunately, this church was demolished in the 19th century.

It is interesting that the at the parallel sections of the Esztergom sources the title of the station is not mentioned, and the versicles and orations used are more “neutral” in the sense that any name could be inserted into their texts. This may be explained by the fact that their redactors intended to provide more than a book to be used in the archcathedral; they wanted to create a prototype to be followed in the entire diocese, or even ecclesiastical province. The P, in age very close to the H, replaces the titles at Easter but on Ascension Day it leaves out the references.²²³ The church of St Stephen and its liturgical function are very clearly documented in the H. The func-

²¹⁹ FÖLDEVÁRY: *A római rítus változatainak kutatása* 29.

²²⁰ OR 50, 33 (volume, page 308) = PRG 99, 401 (volume II, page 113)

²²¹ H 103^r, 112^r

²²² OS passim

²²³ P 59^r

tion of the church of St Stephen in Esztergom was actually the same all throughout the Middle Ages, and since it was built before the archcathedral, its use in the 11th century is beyond doubt. Consequently, the patronage of St Stephen could best be interpreted as referring to Esztergom.²²⁴

(3) The patronage of St Peter can be deduced from two orations of the H. According to the rubrics for the Monday of Rogation Days the clergy and the faithful gather in front of the cathedral, then the incipits of processional antiphons and orations follow alternately. Among the sic orations, the last two mention the intercession of St Peter.²²⁵ Based on the liturgical order of processions on Rogation Days we can reconstruct the event the following way: the procession sets out singing by singing the antiphons, while the orations are prayed at the stations. The stations are appointed at different quarters of the city, therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that the last two orations were intended to be prayed in a church dedicated to St Peter which could not have been very far from the cathedral. We do not know of such a church in Győr. In Esztergom there was a St Peter's but its existence in the 11th century cannot be documented, and it was far from the archcathedral, on the edge of the so-called Italian-town.²²⁶ Even though it cannot be excluded that the church of St Peter in Esztergom already existed in one form or another at the time when the H was written, and the procession may actually have gone that far, this identification is still not very convincing.

It is more enlightening and more promising of concrete results if we compare the H with Roman sources. In fact, the six orations of the H are the same as the orations of the SGr for the procession of the Major Litanies.²²⁷ We know very well the route of this Roman procession: it began at the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina where the first oration was sung, then it went on to St Valentine's, to the Milvian (Molbi) bridge and an unidentifiable Cross, finally it arrived to the atrium of the basilica of St Peter where the Mass of the day was celebrated. The SGr provides one oration for each station, and two for St Peter's. The concrete references to St Peter's patronage are found in these orations, and in the oration at San Lorenzo's. The redactor of the H adopted these orations in the same exact order without identifying the stations, inserting pro-

²²⁴ The fourth topographical detail is also most sensible if applied to Esztergom. A "domus monasticarum" is mentioned (H 84^r) but we do not know of an early convent in Győr; this is the reason why Karsai spoke of Pannonhalma. According to Horváth, the Benedictine Convent "of the Isle" at the foot of the castle hill was one of the earliest foundations in Esztergom. Its first mention is from 1141–1146 and its cemetery is from the 11th century. It is a bold but not improbable idea that this convent was the original owner of the St Margaret Sacramentary since the problem with Dömös is that it was a secular and not a monastic church.

²²⁵ H 108^r

²²⁶ The "Italians", that is, merchants of Latin origin, were present in Esztergom since the middle of the 11th century. The so-called "Italian-town" was farther away, south of the castle and the royal city, along the Danube river. The church of St Peter – first mentioned in 1284 – was not one of the major churches of the city; it was probably located just east of the so-called Water-gate.

²²⁷ SGr 100, 1–6 (page 64)

cessional antiphos in between. From the first oration he eliminated the reference to St Lawrence (“intercedente beato Laurentio martyre tuo”), but he forgot to do the same in the last two prayer texts. Thus the St Peter’s mentioned in the H is actually the Roman basilica of St Peter. This also explains why we find the same at the parallel section of the P.

The survival of these obvious allusions in the H to the topography of Rome also confirms the possibility that the Marian church mentioned therein might actually be the basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore. But there is yet another, more general conclusion. This highlights the fact that in liturgical books the preservation and passing down of topographical – and other historical – data is a very complex phenomenon. If the orations of the H would be exact copies of the Roman prototypes, the words in reference to St Lawrence would not have been omitted. If the orations would bear a totally reliable witness to the actual practices of the church using the codex, the words in reference to St Peter would have been left out. In actual fact, neither of these is completely true. Therefore, my primary conclusion is that in trying to determine the origin of a liturgical book we cannot absolutise the historical data we think we may have obtained from their liturgical content. Secondly, the historical references we find in the H do not contradict the hypothesis of its origin from Esztergom.

Alternative methods for determining the origin

Those methods which try to determine the origin of a liturgical book based on non-liturgical, and consequently, accidental data, I call historiographical methods. I set against this approach a method founded on philology and liturgiology. What these sources are really meant to convey is the text (perhaps the concomittant music), and through the text, the liturgy itself. The careful analysis of these two components offers better and more reliable conclusions than the sporadic references to historical personages or institutions. The real question is how we can obtain trustworthy pieces of information about the text and the liturgy.

(1) From the perspective of philology we encounter two kinds of texts: rubrics and actual liturgical items. These two “behave” differently. Rubrics can be independent compositions by the redactor of a particular book, or they can be characteristic to a smaller circle involved in passing them down from one generation to another. The actual liturgical texts form part of a common heritage which has spread – more or less in its entirety – over the whole of Europe. What exactly and in what manner will be used from this common heritage in a particular ceremony is not a philological, but already a liturgical question. Philological conclusions can only be made on the basis of textual variants and concrete formulas.

The analysis of rubrics promises more extensive and reliable results. While keeping the liturgical content intact, ceremonial instructions can be worded very differently. In the process of passing down texts, it involves much less work to copy more or less accurately the rubrics already formulated by previous generations. Therefore, the textual content, phraseology, and telling details of the rubrics can become important markers for reconstructing the process of tradition. If this rubrical tradition can be

identified and distinguished from other traditions, this could be a true indication of the relationship between sources.

The actual liturgical texts are basically fixed; there is much less variability in this area. Nonetheless, theoretically some special textual variants could just as well become markers for the relationship of sources. Here, however, we are not dealing with independent compositions. Variations could be inadvertent or careless mistakes, they could be corrected later, and the redactors or copiers could consult different sources during their work. Hence, the process of tradition is hardly mechanical. Following minor variants is a microphilological activity, and since most of the prototype sources have been lost in the vicissitudes of history, there are too many variables. For this reason, any results based on “microphilology” must be treated critically, and practical experience often shows that this minute work is not worth the monumental effort. The philological analysis of liturgical texts is best applied simply to confirm or refine conclusions based on the study of rubrics.

(2) From a liturgical point of view ceremonies can be described by the choice and arrangement of liturgical items. When it comes to rites of a flexible structure – and most of the rites are of this kind in Pontificals – this is complemented by the organisation of the ceremony itself and the association of certain items with given functions -- their so-called assignation. The first, wider cluster is defined by identifying the repertory. The second, somewhat narrower conglomerate is designated by the characteristic arrangement of the items within that repertory. And finally, the third, smallest conglomerate is determined by the structure and the concomitant assignations.

This, however, is only the first step necessary for describing an actual liturgical source. By comparing sources of the same or similar traditions certain differences come to light. Thus it is necessary to evaluate them one by one in order to identify all the minor variants and historical modifications. This way we can differentiate between the permanent, “hard” elements and the variable, “soft” ones. As a result of this work, we will have before us the ideal type of a liturgical order specific to a given Use.

The final step is to place this ideal within the system of a given rite’s variants. This analysis necessitates familiarity with the widest possible collection and a similar description of European parallels. This way it will become possible to eliminate all the uniform European elements that are not informative from this perspective, and to highlight all the items, structures, and assignations that are characteristic to a particular Use. It is based on these principles that a trustworthy, accurate determination of a liturgical book’s origin becomes feasible.

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

The structure of the H is rather well organised. Recognising the principles of the juxtaposition of chapters will help us not only to orient ourselves within the material of the manuscript but also provides important information about the function of indi-

vidual Ordos, the genre, sources and relatives of the book. For this reason the subsequent chapters have more than a descriptive significance.²²⁸

Divisions and Strata of the Structure

The previous researchers of the H have correctly recognised that in terms of content the codex can be divided into three principal parts, but the titles they use for these units are misleading, and, as a result, they drew unwarranted conclusions about the genre of the book. The first unit is that of the rites of ecclesiastical government; this is what Morin, and after him others, considered a Pontifical properly speaking. The second unit contains the extraordinary ceremonies of the liturgical year which Morin and his followers called an Ordinal. The third unit is that of the exodiastic rites which Morin and others treated as a Ritual. Based on the content of the Pontificals we have described so far it is clear that up to the PGD the second and third sections were also regular features of Pontificals, and so their presence here does not require us to treat the H as a manuscript with a composite genre. What seems to be a real problem at first sight is the lack of typical pontifical Ordos.

Almost 80% of the book is made up of the second unit which follows the order of the liturgical cycle, from Advent to the Vigil of Pentecost – due to the lacuna at the end of the manuscript. A common feature of the Ordos in this section is that they contain the rubrics and texts of ceremonies that are extraordinary in comparison with the daily liturgy. There are some highly important Ordos among them, especially the Ordo of Maundy Thursday. Their importance is due to their length and richness in details; they are truly episcopal Ordos. The Baptism and Confirmation of Holy Saturday also belongs to this category, since the bishop is considered the sole administrator of Confirmation and the ordinary administrator of Baptism.²²⁹

The “progress” of the liturgical year seems to be interrupted by Ordos that are independent from the annual cycle, and theoretically could be celebrated any time during the year. It is not difficult to recognise that their place within the book was not assigned in a haphazard fashion. They are all connected to a period, day, or ceremonial aspect of the liturgical year with which they are thematically associated. In my opinion these are primarily the Ordos that were marked by the tabs I have already described above. It is an obvious tendency of modern liturgical books to present the yearly cycle continuously, and include everything else that does not fit into this logic organically, either before or after the Ordos of the liturgical year. This is why votive

²²⁸ I have already treated of these subjects in Part I of FÖLDVÁRY: *A Hartvik-agenda és a Német-római pontifikále*.

²²⁹ The bishop being the ordinary administrator of Baptism is only a canonical formality since the high Middle Ages, as children are normally christened by parish priests soon after their birth. Nevertheless, the H and its relatives still presuppose that children who were born in the course of the previous year – unless there was an emergency – are baptised by the bishop and his clerics on Holy Saturday, in the cathedral’s Baptistry.

ceremonies and other supplementary elements are usually published at the end of Missals or Breviaries, and this also explains why only a short section of modern Pontificals follow the order of the annual cycle. The H follows a different logic: everything that may be associated with the liturgical year is inserted within the section on the yearly cycle. What it means is that in the H the principle of organisation is not determined by abstract categories but by the liturgical year. Before and after the annual cycle we only find *Ordos* that obstinately resist this logic. In this sense, the H is actually an edifying monument of an essentially liturgical “world view”.

The same principles of organisation are applied in the Gelasiana and the PRG but the H seems more consistent. The PRG arranged the blessings of water and the special *Ordos* in connection with Baptism (e.g. emergency Baptism, reception of pagans, reconciliation of heretics) into a special category after the annual cycle, whereas in the H they are integrated into the liturgical year at the appropriate sections. In the H this method is used more consistently even within individual *Ordos*. The PRG first presents the entire *Ordo* of the given day, and only afterwards, as if in appendix, describes the *Ordo* associated with it. The H, on the other hand, with absolute consistency disrupts the day’s *Ordo* and inserts the associated *Ordo* at its most logical place. Undoubtedly, this is not a very “user friendly” solution but it is entirely consonant with the self-assertive – if not pedantic – personality of the redactor whose sophistry is made manifest through his eccentric orthography as well.

The *Ordos* of the H are organised on three levels. The three principal units (determined by content) contain smaller divisions, that is *Ordos*. The *Ordos* of the liturgical year are then divided into subdivisions that are thematically associated with them:

(1) The unit with the rites of ecclesiastical government and discipline contain the following *Ordos*: synod, degradation and restitution of clerics, excommunication, and reconciliation.

(2) These are the periods, days, and ceremonies included in the unit on the yearly cycle: Advent, Nativity, Christmas and its octave, Epiphany (blessing of water, liturgical Play), Candlemas, Ash Wednesday and Lenten *feriæ*, Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday (reconciliation of penitents, consecration of oils, washing of the feet), Good Friday, Holy Saturday (including Baptism and Confirmation), Easter (liturgical Play, procession, blessing of foods, Baptismal Vespers) and its octave, Invention of the Holy Cross, Rogation Days, Ascension Day, Vigil of Pentecost.

Within this category we find the following *Ordos* whose connection with the liturgical year is only indirect: general greater blessing of water (after the blessing of water at Epiphany), Confession (before the reconciliation of penitents on Maundy Thursday), general blessing of oil against sickness (between Extreme Unction and the consecration of Chrism on Maundy Thursday), general blessing of incense (after the blessing of incense at the blessing of fire on Holy Saturday), blessing of water for washing the white garments of the neophytes, emergency Baptism, reconciliation of heretics, admittance of a pagan in the Catechumenate (after Baptism and Confirmation on Holy Saturday), minor general blessing of water (before the *Vidi aquam*

which began the procession on Easter Sunday), votive procession for rain, clement weather, against lightening, epidemic, and war (after the processions on Rogation Days).

(3) Finally the *Ordos* of the exodiastic part are: Confession, Visiting the Sick, and Extreme Unction. There are lacunae in between the Vigil of Pentecost and the exodiastic part, and at the end of the book. The first missing section must have included Pentecost and the greater Summer feasts, the latter the funeral rites and – according to analogies to be explained later – perhaps the rites of Matrimony, child birth, and birth bed.

The threefold structure of the H may be described as follows:

(1) RITES OF ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNANCE AND DISCIPLINE

- (a) Synod
- (b) Degradation of clerics
- (c) Restitution of degraded clerics
- (d) Excommunication
- (e) Reconciliation of excommunicates

(2) EXTRAORDINARY CEREMONIES OF THE LITURGICAL YEAR

- (a) Advent
- (b) Nativity
 - (c) Octave of Christmas
 - (d) Epiphany: blessing of water, liturgical Play
 - *general greater blessing of water*
 - (e) Candlemas
 - (f) Ash Wednesday
 - (g) Lenten feriae
 - (h) Palm Sunday
 - (i) Maundy Thursday: reconciliation of penitents, consecration of oils
 - *confession*
 - *general blessing of oil against sickness*
 - (j) Good Friday
 - (k) Holy Thursday: Baptism, Confirmation
 - *general blessing of incense*
 - *blessing of water for washing the white garments of the neophytes*
 - *emergency Baptism*
 - *reconciliation of heretics*
 - *admittance of a pagan in the Catechumenate*
 - (l) Easter: liturgical Play, procession, blessing of food, Baptismal Vespers
 - *minor general blessing of water*
 - (m) Octave of Easter
 - (n) Invention of the Holy Cross
 - (o) Rogation Days
 - *procession for rain*
 - *procession for clement weather*
 - *procession against lightening*
 - *procession in time of epidemic*
 - *procession in time of war*
 - (p) Ascension Day

- (q) Vigil of Pentecost
[...]
- (3) EXODIASTIC RITES
 - (a) Confession
 - (b) Visiting the sick
 - (c) Extreme Unction
[...]

Genre and Context

In defining the exact genre of the H the earlier authors were distracted by the fact that the liturgical cycle seems more emphatic than the specifically pontifical Ordos. The H – especially its richly rubricated parts – is, in fact, more reminiscent of an archaic Ordinal than a Pontifical. If we disregard the divisions of the third major unit, the contrast is somewhat mitigated, because the ceremonies of the liturgical year take up a smaller percentage of the codex. The question still remains: why can we not find in the H pontifical Ordos in the strict sense, such as Ordinations, the consecration of virgins, dedication, or coronation? I will approach the problem from two directions: from the perspectives of possible prototypes and eventual practical use.

The prototype: a two-volume Pontifical of the PRG-type

The kind of editorial principle that associates the different elements of the liturgy with the divisions of the annual cycle is a primary characteristic of the Gelasiana and the PRG. In the 11th century, throughout Europe and especially in the Central European region, Pontificals were copies or rearrangements of the PRG. Although later on the Uses that remain very faithful to the PRG are restricted to Bavaria and Austria, in the 11-12th century the copies or relatives of the PRG are still rather wide-spread. It is a reasonable supposition that the redactors of the H also knew and used the PRG. This is confirmed by the fact that the rubrics in many Ordos of the H are in perfect harmony with the parallel texts of the PRG, and the selection of liturgical items – although with significant differences in arrangement – also heavily rely on the PRG's material.²³⁰ The Gelasiana were also integrated into the PRG, hence their influence is indirect.

Therefore, the PRG or one of its derivatives was one of the prototypes, most likely the principal prototype of the H. Upon studying the structure of the PRG (but pre-scinding from the shorter, more loosely edited sections that contain separate orations or votive appendices in between the larger groups of Ordos) we can see that the following are its major units:

- (1) Ordinations and other consecrations of persons
- (2) Dedication and other blessings of objects

²³⁰ For a more detailed study of the subject, see the following chapters and the appendix on page ???.

- (3) Inauguration/coronation of prelates and secular leaders
- (4) Rites of ecclesiastical governance
- (5) Extraordinary rites of the liturgical year
- (6) Baptism and other associated rites
- (7) Exodiastic rites
- (8) Supplementary material: Matrimony

Notwithstanding that the H inserts Baptism and its associated rites (number 6 in the list above) into the liturgical cycle at Holy Saturday, the sequential order of the H is in apparent agreement with the second part of the PRG. This gives us the impression that the H may actually be the second volume of a Pontifical that closely follows the structure of the PRG. This hypothesis would also explain why the most typical pontifical *Ordos* are missing. They must have been contained in the first volume (since lost). The material of the PRG is very abundant, indeed, and both its mediaeval and more modern editions were often published in two separate volumes.²³¹ Nothing excludes the possibility that the H is actually the second book of a two-volume Pontifical. This also means that in the H the selection of *Ordos* is not haphazard, thus it cannot be considered a primitive Pontifical. In the history of the genre, the H must have developed parallel to the PRG to which it is equivalent, or even superior.

The interrelationship of Pontificals used in Zagreb

This is also confirmed by the “afterlife” of the H. The philological and liturgical connection of the PZ, a 13th-century Pontifical of the Zagreb cathedral, with the H is evident.²³² The redactors of the PZ altered the H in two ways: they abridged it and associated it with further pontifical *Ordos*. The result was a single volume Pontifical that more closely corresponded to the 13th-century requirements of the genre. The PZ integrates the material of the H, and thereby proves: the H was used as a Pontifical but the redactors had access to another volume from which they adopted the *Ordos* that are not included in the H. These editors knew the second volume, and by abridging both books they produced the PZ.

It would seem obvious to make a connection somehow between the missing volume of the H and the BS, since the PRG does not have a Benedictional, and the contemporary European churches customarily supplemented their Pontificals with a Benedictional. This “joined material” was either a separate volume or an appendix in the beginning or (more rarely) at the end of the collection of *Ordos*. Hence it does not seem inconceivable to identify the first volume of the H with a codex that contains a Benedictional, the Ordinations and the Dedication. Besides the structure and

²³¹ Such two-volume copies among the 11-12th-century Pontificals that I have studied are: München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm. 21587 és 6425; Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek Cod. 139. és 140. Both are derivatives of the PRG; their second volume begins with the liturgical cycle. Other two-volume Pontificals, according to the listing of KAY: *Pontificalia* (thanks to Attila Józsa for this information) are : 31 (Autun), 49–50 (Bamberg?), 397 (Westminster), 516 (Augsburg). Three-volume copies: 52 (Hildesheim), 83 Besançon), 706–708 (PGD).

²³² Documentation and further details on the subsequent topics: FÖLDVÁRY: *Egy hiányzó láncszem*

content, this solution is supported by the facts that (1) both codices belong to the “Zagreb three”, (2) the origin of the BS is Esztergom, and (3) the blessings, Ordinations and Dedication of the PZ can be deduced from the BS without any problem.

However, there are counter-arguments as well. The BS is a smaller, more elegant codex than the H. From a codicological point of view they certainly do not belong together. There is only one small overlap between them: the Ordo of Confirmation. As to their relationship, this is both a positive and a negative argument at the same time. It is positive because the text of the Confirmation Ordo is the same word by word in both codices. Although in the Middle Ages this Ordo – despite its brevity – was highly variable, these two texts are identical both rubrically and on the level of liturgical content. Indubitable, the two books represent the same liturgical Use. This equivalence is also a negative aspect, since if these two books were, in fact, two volumes of the same Pontifical, they would mutually exclude each other insofar as the content is concerned.²³³ Finally this theory is contradicted by the fact that the PZ contains a few Ordos which cannot be found either in the H or in the BS. These are as follows: benediction of abbots, consecration of cemeteries, blessing of bells, reconciliation of a desecrated church, and the pontifical Mass Ordo.

These Ordos – with the exception of the benediction of abbots and the pontifical Mass Ordo – can be found in other Hungarian books, such as the P and the PV. The PZ, despite the fact that it is an abridged version in comparison with the H, features a few rubrics which are not in the H, although the redactors left enough free space for them on the pages. These blank spaces can easily be distinguished from places where the rubrics were erased by a corrector or simply faded away.

A Proto-Pontifical of Esztergom?

I am not going to attempt a complete reproduction but I will risk the assertion that the BS and the H are not the only representatives of the original Pontifical which was transferred in the 11th century from Esztergom to Zagreb. The Ordos that are missing from the H and the BS but are present in the PZ, the P, and the PV are mementos of a more complete collection that made its way to Zagreb. The additional material we find in the PZ points towards a prototype (both to the H and its lost second volume) which was likewise used in Zagreb but has since gone missing.²³⁴ In a certain sense the H abounds in material but at times we can recognise telltale traces of abbreviations. The lost or skipped parts of the H can be found in related sources, especially in the P. It seems even more applicable to the BS, in which the Ordos that are in-

²³³ At least theoretically. This is not necessarily true of voluminous works compiled from several sources. The same text may be featured in a different context, the shorter ones may be integrated into longer sections or annexed at the end of the book. The PRG itself contains numerous duplications.

²³⁴ We cannot exclude the influence of an intermediary version based on the H, nor that the lacunae – in light of practical liturgical observations – were filled in independently, without any written prototypes.

cluded after the Benedictional seem almost like an appendix. My opinion is that both codices are but extracts of a more complete version.

This more complete version I have named “Esztergom proto-Pontifical”. I suppose it consisted of two volumes and followed the structure of the PRG. It began with the Benedictional, followed by the Ordinations, the consecration of virgins and the benediction of abbots. Then came the Ordo of Dedication, the reconciliation of a desecrated church, the consecration of cemeteries, and the blessing of bells. The first volume ended with the Ordination of bishops and the coronation of the king and queen. The second volume was essentially equivalent to the H. In the subsequent liturgical tradition of Hungary the ceremonies of the funeral rites and Matrimony are permanent and characteristic. The funeral rites would be a logical continuation of the maimed eodiastic section of the H, while the rite of Matrimony and its associated *Ordos* are in the ultimate section of the PRG. It is not improbable that these are the *Ordos* that concluded the proto-Pontifical, and that the preparation and ordinary of the Pontifical Mass were also part of it.

The long-range objective of the analysis and critical edition of the H, the BS and the other Hungarian Pontificals is the reconstruction of the proto-Pontifical of Esztergom. In addition to a Sacramentary, this was the book that collected all the ceremonies of the early Hungarian Use (not including the Divine Office). This book can demonstrate that formative period of the Hungarian Use which, based on the available sources, was capable of creating something thoroughly traditional yet truly novel.

TEXTUAL TRADITION

The hypothesis of a proto-Pontifical best explains the textual agreements between the extant sources. The rubrics and liturgical texts of the H conspicuously and consistently concur with the best 12-14th-century sources of the central Esztergom tradition. The textual tradition that we may reconstruct differs from the parallel texts in foreign liturgical sources, including the PRG, and those Hungarian sources that are not from Esztergom. On this basis, three conclusions may be drawn: (1) The H stands much closer to the later tradition of Esztergom than to the traditions of any other diocese in the mediaeval kingdom of Hungary, including Zagreb. (2) The textual tradition of Esztergom is already contained in the H in its complete form, therefore, it must have come into existence before the 1090's, and its carrier was a Pontifical. (3) Individual sources were constructed or extracted from the material of a proto-Pontifical in accordance with the needs of their genre or the demands of their users.²³⁵

²³⁵ KNIEWALD (*Hartwick győri püspök Agenda Pontificalis-a* 12.) was the first to point out (with due reference to Radó) the rubrical correspondences between the H, the MNS, and a related 15th-century

Rubrics

The foundation of my opinion in this regard is the observation that some of the rubrics of the H and other representative Esztergom sources agree not only in content but also on the level of concrete phrasing. This is very important – as I have already explained – because in liturgical books it is the rubrics that constitute the potentially new, proper texts. We can profit from this observation especially if we determine accurately: (1) which ones are the rubrics in common; (2) how many sources share the same rubrics; (3) what is the common source of these correspondences. Once I will have answered these questions, I shall return to the H (4) in order to find its proper place within reconstructed textual tradition of the Esztergom rubrics.

Sources: ceremonial rubrics of the annual cycle

Since there are only a few surviving mediaeval Pontificals from Hungary, our research has to rely on the rubrical material of the liturgical year because this is the only area where we have a large enough corpus of comparable texts. In analysing the rubrics, we encounter three well distinguishable types:

- (1) Liturgical items, ceremonies and the titles of liturgical days
- (2) Sections on directorial, that is, calendar-related problems
- (3) Ceremonial descriptions about the extraordinary ceremonies of the year

The significance of these rubrical texts is not the same. The titles are “handed down” steadily and faithfully but due to their brevity it is easy to change them. Their concurrence only becomes informative if they are confirmed by other data, as well. Directorial rubrics are often very long; their terminology and phraseology are characteristic but they are later developments, almost completely missing from earlier, 11-13th-century sources. The ceremonial rubrics of the extraordinary services of the liturgical year are ample, old and characteristic. They are also present in several parallel genres which enhanced their chances of surviving.

If we consider the ceremonial rubrics and their titles, we can determine the group ceremonies in which they are used:

- (1) Candlemas
- (2) Ash Wednesday
- (3) Palm Sunday
- (4) Maundy Thursday
 - (a) *Tenebrae*, the Offices of the Sacred Triduum
 - (b) Reconciliation of penitents
 - (c) Consecration of oils
 - (d) Washing of the feet

Missal. It was Gabriella Galbács, a doctoral student of church music who directed my attention to the phenomenon in connection with the Ordos of Holy Week. For a detailed analysis, see FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 199–240. For a summary in English, see FÖLDVÁRY: *Unknown Fragments of Ordines*, in Hungarian: *Ismeretlen ordótöredékek*.

- (5) Good Friday
- (6) Holy Thursday
- (7) Easter Sunday
 - (a) liturgical Play
 - (b) procession before Mass
 - (c) procession at Baptismal Vespers

After realising that the rubrical texts of the above mentioned ceremonies are closely related in certain Hungarian sources, I put these texts next to each other, leaving the liturgical texts out. This way I had continuous Ordos in front of me which could be easily compared to each other from a philological point of view.

In addition to my primary experience, I gave preference to sources based on their age and origin. I could not be sure about the origin of the H and the P but it was certain that they are witnesses of the 11-12th-century Hungarian liturgy and that we can exclude any direct relationship between them. The H is a Pontifical which was used in a secular (non-monastic) environment and in Zagreb, that is in the South of the country. The P is a Sacramentary which was used in a monastic setting and in the North of the country; according to our knowledge today, in Boldva. Even if one doubts the P's origin from Boldva, all the other possible places of origin are located in the Northern part of the country (partly in what is now Slovakia). Thus the P cannot possibly be a descendant of the H; their relationship may only be explained with a common predecessor or more.

Among the later sources I preferred the ones that certainly represented the mainstream of the Esztergom Use, that is, the liturgy of the archcathedral itself. The first documents of this tradition are the BNS and the MNS from the 13-14th century, its last documents are the printed Missals and Breviaries of the 15-16th century. The rubrical material of the latter are unchanged, even the 15th-century manuscript Missals and Breviaries fit well into this chain of tradition. Therefore, the classical Esztergom rubrics can be reconstructed with the help of the BNS, the MNS, and the first printed editions (BS and MS). The basis of my study was the rubrical material in the Ordos of six sources (H, P, BNS, MNS, BS, MS) whose philological connection is undeniable.²³⁶

Foreign and Hungarian references

By looking at these six sources, it becomes clear that the rubrics had a textual tradition which determined Hungarian sources from the 11th to the 16th century. The next step was to find out where are the borders of the region within which this tradition

²³⁶ Its detailed documentation was published in Appendix III of FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis*, with the title: *Fragmenta Pontificalis antiqui Strigoniensis*. This collection contains the complete critical text and comparative tables of the rubrics found in the six principal sources, along with a reconstruction of the common material with philological notes and the critical text of the parallel rubrics in all of the control sources. In the appendix of the present edition (see pp. ??? of the appendix) I have only kept the most characteristic sections of these tables and the references from the PRG and other Hungarian sources.

was valid. We have to look for the borders both within and without Hungary. What it means is that we had to check whether the Esztergom rubrics were part of a broader tradition transcending the country's borders, and if not, whether it was valid for the whole country or only within a certain region. In order to answer these questions, I compiled a control material consisting of extracts from thirty different sources.²³⁷ These are my results:

(1) The Esztergom rubrical tradition has no foreign counterpart. It is markedly different from the rubrical material of both the Western European and the surrounding Central European churches. Wherever there were agreements, they could always be traced back to the PRG. Since certain sections of the Esztergom rubrics use the phraseology of the PRG, they are in a direct philological relationship with rubrics that the PRG assimilated from earlier sources (especially the OR and the SGV/SGF), or with rubrics that later sources inherited from the PRG (Central European, primarily Bavarian sources). Based on the dependence on the PRG, or independence from it, the Esztergom rubrics can be pigeonholed in four categories:

- (1) Borrowed texts in a proper version: consecration of oils
- (2) Borrowed texts in a proper version with supplementation: reconciliation of penitents, Good Friday
- (3) Proper texts partly with the phraseology of the PRG: *Tenebrae*, Holy Thursday
- (4) Proper texts: Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Easter Sunday

This order also corresponds to the relationship of each Ordo's liturgical content to the PRG. Besides the PRG there is no Central European rubrical tradition to which the Esztergom tradition would be closely related, nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that the foundation was not the original, unaltered version of the PRG but one of its derivatives. Due to the unavailability of comparable sources at this time, I could not check this hypothesis, but it is not impossible that this tradition was mediated through one of the German Uses, perhaps – because of the analogy of the BS – those of East Saxony.

(2) The Esztergom rubrical tradition can be differentiated from other rubrical traditions within mediaeval Hungary. Its separation is not chronological but institutional. The way that can be verified is to compare it with early Hungarian sources (besides the H and the P) and with the later sources of Hungarian ecclesiastical institutions that differ from Esztergom.

To the first category belong the 13th-century Codex of Németújvár (today Güssing in Burgenland, Austria) and the so-called Missal of Istanbul. Both are definitely Hungarian manuscripts and the rubrics of the days in question can be reliably evalu-

²³⁷ The control sources were chosen from three groups: (1) old or commonly known Western European sources: OR; RASMUSSEN: *Les pontificaux du haut moyen âge*; PRG; PR12; AER; PGD (2) Central European sources from neighbouring countries (e.g. Krakow, Aquileia, Prague, Salzburg, and others); (3) Hungarian sources (for their specifics, see pp. ??? of the Appendix). Finally, this collection was supplemented by information gathered from Magdeburg, Passau and Regensburg.

ated. These rubrics use an archaic terminology very close to the PRG,²³⁸ but have absolutely no connection with the Esztergom rubrics (hence with the rubrics of the H and the P).

To the second category belong those 14-15th-century Hungarian books that bear witness to the liturgy of other Hungarian dioceses or the Pauline monks who adopted the Esztergom Use. As regards dioceses, or more accurately speaking, cathedrals, there is information only about Pécs, Eger and Zagreb. We have a Missal from Pécs in two editions, and an OA from Eger, also in two editions. We know nothing about either the earlier or later sources of these cathedrals. In this sense, Zagreb is a better location: from the early period we have the PZ, while from the later period several manuscript Missals and Breviaries are still extant, along with their printed versions. The situation is similar with the Paulines where the 15th century manuscript and printed books well conserved the Use. Finally, it is worthwhile to take a look at the rubrics of a few non-representative Hungarian sources in connection with the *Tenebrae*. These Breviaries are from the regions of Erdély-Várad, Szepes and Kalocsa. None of them contain any Esztergom rubrics.²³⁹

Fragmentary remnants: Pécs and Eger

Since the Missal of Pécs is an isolated source, it is impossible to determine if there is a permanent, uniform rubrical tradition from Pécs. The relevant rubrics of the Missal of Pécs are archaic enough in terminology not to be from the 15th century,²⁴⁰ but they are also different enough from the Esztergom rubrics to make it reasonable to assume that they witness to the existence of a proper Pécs tradition. Unlike the Zagreb and Pauline rubrics which have absolutely no textual relationship with those of Esztergom, in Pécs a number of sentences or phrases are identical, and the rubrical material of the Palm Sunday Ordo is basically completely from Esztergom. That this connection can be traced back to a common prototype is proven by the fact the Missal of Pécs contains certain sentences that are not found in the H or in other Esztergom sources, whereas they are part of the P and the PZ. Since their direct relationship is improbable, these sentences seem to be remains of a prototype text that is more complete than the H.

The tradition of Eger is even more isolated than that of Pécs. Its only survivor, the OA is an Ordinal, which means that it does not contain rubrical material comparable with Pontificals, Missals and Breviaries; the genre of Ordinals was still at its

²³⁸ The characteristic features of archaic rubrics are the PRG reminiscences, added explanatory liturgical notes, poetical phrases. Easily recognisable terminological archaisms are the verb *impono* 'with the meaning 'I begin, intone', and the use of *versus* to mean 'hymn'. For a detailed exposition of the linguistic aspects, see FÖLDVÁRY: *Rubrica Strigoniensis* 245–288, as to chronology, especially: *ibid.* 259–263.

²³⁹ For the list of sources and the page numbers of the extracts, see pp. ??? of the Appendix.

²⁴⁰ In addition to these archaisms, such characteristic expression is *certus locus*, meaning 'statio'.

genesis in the 11th century.²⁴¹ The Ordinal of Eger does contain, however, the reconciliation of penitents which is clearly related in its phraseology to the parallel sections of the H and the MNS. These few sentences can most likely be traced back to a Pontifical or Missal that was used in Eger, and they are parallel to those rubrics from Pécs that seem to be remainders of an early Esztergom substratum.

New, uniform rubrics: Zagreb and the Paulines

In Zagreb the PZ still belongs to the Esztergom rubrical tradition, which is not surprising if we consider its dependence on the H, but from the 15th century new rubrics make their appearance. These are identical word by word in all the manuscript and printed sources,²⁴² hence they confirm that in the beginning of the 14th century, most probably while Ágoston Gazotti was in office, there was a new liturgical reform that, among other things, produced a specifically Zagreb rubrical tradition, independently from Esztergom. It is interesting to note that in its own right this tradition is much more uniform than that of Esztergom: the Zagreb books seem to be faithful copies of the very same prototype. At the same time, the rubrical changes of Zagreb seem more like a disciplinary and redactory than a liturgical phenomenon. In terms of liturgical content, the Zagreb Use hardly ever changes, the only thing that does change is the way the Use is codified.²⁴³

The new Zagreb rubrics – except for a few insignificant textual fragments – are related to Esztergom in one single detail: the description of the Holy Saturday procession to the baptismal font. This happens to be the place where the Esztergom tradition diverges: one version is in the “old sources”, that is, the H and the P, while the other is in the “new sources”, namely, the MNS and the MS. Zagreb follows the latter. From this we may deduce that the 14th-century liturgical redaction of Zagreb took account of the contemporary Esztergom practice but ignored the H, preserved in the Zagreb cathedral’s library.

The Pauline liturgy behaves very similarly to that of Zagreb. The rubrics of the 15th-century manuscripts and 16th-century printed books are identical word by word,²⁴⁴ thus both the liturgical content and the codification of this monastic liturgy

²⁴¹ A short summary of the rubrical genres: OS X–XIII.

²⁴² In the appendix I included the Zagreb rubrics according to the Printed Missal of 1511 and a 15th-century manuscript Breviary (Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 46). The printed Missal was duly compared with a 15th-century Missal (MR 133) and several 14-15th-century Breviaries.

²⁴³ Although the hypothesis that the Use of Zagreb eventually developed Dominican characteristics is untenable, it is still noteworthy that bishop Augustine (who was a Dominican) may have been inspired by the Order in his attempt to make the cathedral’s liturgical books more uniform. It is a well known fact that the Order of Preachers, since the time of Humbertus Romanus, their superior general, methodically harmonised their liturgical books with normative “editions”.

²⁴⁴ In the appendix I included the Pauline rubrics according to a 15th-century manuscript Breviary (Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek Cod. 107. R 79) and the printed Breviary of 1540. The Missal was compared with the printed version of 1514 (which contains more material but the texts of the rubrics, in parallel with the manuscript version, are identical). As to the rubrics of the Breviary I could not found

are uniform. There is – at least since the 15th century – a proper Pauline rubrical tradition. While the liturgical content is very close to the Esztergom Use, and to an archaic form at that, the rubrical material is completely new and independent from Esztergom.

The origin of rubrics

The fragmentary data may be summarised the following way:

In the 11th century, before the H was produced, the ceremonial rubrics of the liturgical year's extraordinary rites had already been composed. In this process of redaction the PRG or one of its contemporary derivatives was used, but in certain *Ordos* it was supplemented by proper additions, while in others they decided to follow completely different sources. This rubrical tradition cannot be found anywhere else but in Hungary. Within the country it can be found in its complete form, extending to all of the *Ordos* only in two of the earliest sources that are independent from each other, and in the central Esztergom sources. It is not present at all in other, non-Esztergom Hungarian sources. Pécs and Eger kept certain fragments of it but also diverged significantly, while Zagreb and the Paulines exchanged it for a completely independent, more modern rubrical tradition, most probably in the 14th century.

The original rubrical tradition must have been connected directly with the Esztergom archcathedral. This is the only way to explain (1) why it is present both in a Northern Hungarian Benedictine Sacramentary and in a Croatian Pontifical, (2) that some of its details are featured in the sources of suffragan dioceses, and (3) that it is only to be found in its entirety in Esztergom sources, all the way until the 16th century. From the 13th century we find traces of different Hungarian rubrical traditions, and the Missal of Pécs demonstrates that the suffragans did not adopt automatically the rubrics of Esztergom.²⁴⁵

The original “carrier” of the Esztergom rubrical tradition must have been an 11th-century Pontifical. In addition to the text's adaptation to other genres, especially to Sacramentaries (P) – which I shall discuss later –, this is proven by the following:

- (1) The only known, although partial source is the PRG, that is, a Pontifical.
- (2) Its most complete “carrier” is the H, that is, also a Pontifical.
- (3) It provides information regarding both the Mass and the Divine Office.
- (4) But it only describes extraordinary *Ordos*.
- (5) Processions and specifically episcopal *Ordos* form part of it.
- (6) The titles of its chapters begin with the word ‘Ordo’.
- (7) It is connected to complete ceremonial texts and not only to incipits.

All this may be placed most naturally within the framework of the genre of PRG-type Pontificals. In the H itself we can find the complete rubrical material of each *Ordo*, except for the few sentences that probably by mistake were not written in the spaces

any parallels.

²⁴⁵ This is important because if the H were really from Győr – as Morin and in his wake many others thought), its rubrical material would “behave” the same way as the parallel material from Pécs.

specifically left blank for them. In the H the rubrics are both at their logical places and proportionate. If we take into account the entire H, including even its supposed first volume, the rubrics are organically connected to other kinds of rubrics that do not describe the ceremonies of the liturgical cycle. These could likewise be included in our comparison, if the relevant textual parallels were not limited to so few sources..

Redactions of the rubrics

In my opinion the beginning of this tradition is the same proto-Pontifical of Esztergom whose decisive role I have already confirmed in relation to liturgical content and structure. In terms of age and structure, it must have been very close to the H, but the H is not identical to that prototype, because in its rubrical tradition we can find certain sentences that are missing from the H while present in other independent sources. Therefore, the beginning of the 1090's is only the *terminus ante quem* for the genesis of this proto-Pontifical. The process how the H was produced from it cannot be reconstructed in all its details. I think that we could make deductions about this process by analysing the redactive inconsistencies of the H, but since the proto-Pontifical itself must have been the product of a serious redaction, it is not always possible to differentiate between the original inconsistencies and those that resulted from the copying and extracting procedures leading up to the H.

The MNS stands closest to the H. Even though the MNS is a Missal, it preserved almost all of the Pontifical Ordos. If there are a few missing, it is because a large part before Good Friday got lost from MNS.²⁴⁶ This damage involves the Ordos of Palm Sunday and Maundy Thursday, although there is a small fragment from the latter,²⁴⁷ which proves the original presence of the reconciliation of penitents and the consecration of oils in the codex, as well as the fact that these Ordos were also in harmony with the known rubrical tradition. It cannot be doubted that the Palm Sunday Ordo was no exception. The Only Ordos that are not included in the MNS (they are actually integrated into its relative the BS) are the Ordos of the Divine Office, although the Baptismal Vespers are, in fact, mentioned. This is exaggerated in a Missal, even if it was produced for episcopal use. The MNS is actually a witness to a change of genre: some time in the 13th or 14th century the Pontifical ceased to be the only means of codifying Ordos and gave place to Missals. This change of genre saved certain Ordos or at least rubrics from disappearing altogether, once the use of the PGD spread also in Hungary.

²⁴⁶ The lacuna is between folios 56 and 109, from the third Wednesday of Lent until Good Friday. In the Lenten section there are also other lacunae (34–48 and 50–53).

²⁴⁷ At the end of the 19th century, folio 100 was still in its place. Its text was transcribed in 1893 by DANKÓ: *Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariae* 577, note 28. The fragment was located a few years ago by Zsuzsa Czagány who also made a transcription: Trnava/Nagyszombat, Literárny Archív Spolku Svätého Vojtecha Fasc. 322. Nr. 10. I used the text transcribed by Zsuzsa Czagány which I duly compared to Dankó's.

The other sources bear the traces of a redactive process during which the rubrics of the Pontifical were altered or abridged in accordance with the needs of a particular genre. The most obvious traces are found in the P which also prove that the alterations modified a Pontifical into a Sacramentary, and not the other way around. The specifically episcopal *Ordos* are omitted, and from the other *Ordos* the redactor tried – with partial success – to remove all the episcopal details. Three characteristic examples:

(1) According to the relevant rubric of the P, on Maundy Thursday the celebrant recites the Canon until the words “*intra quorum nos consortium*”. The same rubric is also found in the H because in the pontifical Chrism Mass, the consecration of the *oleum infirmorum* begins at this place. However, the P – not being an episcopal book – omits the consecration of holy oils, and hence this particular rubric becomes devoid of reason. The fact that it still made its way to the text is indicative of an oversight in redaction. At the same time, this oversight demonstrates that the rubrics were adopted from a Pontifical.

(2) According to the relevant rubric of the P, on Good Friday, after the Passion the priest sings the festal orations “*sicut in libro continentur*”. In the parallel section of the H the same rubric says: “*sicut in libro sacramentorum continentur*”. It is written with due reason, as the H does not contain the festal orations. However, the P is a Sacramentary and as such the orations are contained in it in their entirety. This means that in the rubric – quite illogically – the book refers to itself. The epithet “*sacramentorum*” is not adopted because the P recognises its own genre in it, but the reference is included, although it was only necessary or reasonable in the P’s Pontifical prototype.

(3) According to the relevant rubric of the P, on Holy Saturday two deacons take the Chrism and the Oil of Catechumens to the Baptismal Font. The parallel section of the H says that they proceed “*obviam domino pontifici*”. The P, while otherwise keeping the text intact, changes the phrase in question to “*obviam presbyteris*”. In the sentence following, however, which is also common between the H and the P, the redactor forgot to erase the words “*ante eum*” in reference to the bishop. As it stands, it makes no sense in the P’s text. At least it should have been changed to “*ante eos*” in order to make it agree with “*presbyteris*”. Thus we see frequent signs of a redactor’s activity who was supposed to remove any reference to bishops...

It must be explained, if the non-episcopal and the suffragan episcopal rubrics break away from Esztergom, why is a Benedictine Sacramentary so faithful to it. This question is answered by the study of the Uses of contemporary monastic centres. It is well known that the Order of St Benedict developed into a uniform institution only very slowly, and only with a significant delay was this process followed by the formation of a particular Benedictine liturgy. For this reason the Uses of monasteries are always closely related to the secular Uses of the given region. The Benedictine monasteries adapt the local Uses, utilising them as raw material. The P adapts its secular Pontifical source rather inconsistently, sometimes clumsily. It seems to witness an at-

tempt to develop Hungarian monastic customs on the basis of secular Esztergom sources.

Finally, printed Missals and Breviaries document the rationalisation and abbreviation of rubrics. Whatever is left of these rubrics is still recognisable due to its phrasing, but the specifically episcopal *Ordos* are omitted (retaining the washing of the feet seems to be accidental), along with the *Ordo* of Baptism which by this period is contained in the *Baptismale/Obsequiale Strigoniense*. The omission of the “sepulture” on Good Friday and of the Easter Play is probably the result of actual changes in liturgical practice. It is certain that the redactors of the 15th-century books did not use the proto-Pontifical but Missals and Breviaries that belong to the tradition of the MNS/BNS. Nonetheless, their rubrics bear witness to the Esztergom identity of the propo-Pontifical’s textual tradition.

Liturgical Texts

Analysing the different variants of the liturgical texts is less revealing but not without some interesting details. The liturgical items occur in an incredible number of sources, thus their variants amount to an even more unimaginable number. In this area the editor of these texts must face a specific question: how wide should our analysis of parallel texts be extended, the study of how many and what kind of textual variants would constitute an informative analysis?²⁴⁸

The most revealing detail about a mediaeval liturgical book is not the text of any particular item but the composition in which the book arranges its items. For this reason we cannot consider a text truly parallel unless it is actually in a parallel composition. This means liturgical books of the same Use and possibly of the same genre. The involvement of further parallels are not only unnecessary but downright misleading because the same text may have equally sensible variants. It is possible that one of these variants may be preferable from a philological point of view, but what really matters liturgically is the typical version (*textus receptus*) of the text within the given Use.

Unfortunately, this typical version is not easily reconstructed. Experience shows that liturgical books do not preserve textual variants automatically. In the process of “handing them down” they are slightly changed, sometimes deliberately revised.²⁴⁹ We must differentiate between the more significant textual variants that identify traditions or uses and less important variants that developed spontaneously or purposefully within the same tradition. Whether a variant is major or minor is not deter-

²⁴⁸ As to the practical consequences of the problem, see what is written about the principles of this edition below.

²⁴⁹ Recently PFAFF (*The Liturgy in Medieval England 153–156*) demonstrated with an interesting experiment how unproductive the microphilological approach is when it comes to the classification of liturgical books. This subtle critique relativises the usefulness of DESHUSSES—DARRAGON: *Concordances et tableaux pour l'étude des grands Sacramentaires*.

mined by philological criteria. Only by the comparison of parallel texts that belong to already identified Uses can we find out if our philological conclusions concur with our liturgical conclusions. The phenomenon is demonstrated on the Ordo of blessing the ashes:

PRG	H 34 ^v	MNS 30 ^r	
<i>supplicibus</i>	Omnipotens, sempiternus Deus: parce metuentibus, propitiare <i>supplicantibus</i> , et mittere dignare sanctum angelum tuum de cælis, qui benedicat et sanctificet <i>cineres istos</i> , ut sint remedium <i>salutare</i> omnibus, nomen <i>tuum sanctum</i> humiliter implorantibus, ac semetipsos pro conscientia <i>delictorum suorum</i> accusantibus, <i>ante</i> conspectum divinæ clementiæ tuæ facinora sua deplorantibus, vel serenissimam <i>pietatem</i> tuam suppliciter obnixè que flagitantibus. <i>Præsta, quæsumus</i> , per invocationem sanctissimi nominis tui, ut, quicumque eos super se asperserint pro redemptione <i>peccatorum</i> , corporis sanitatem et animæ tutelam percipiant.		
<i>hos cineres</i>		<i>hos cineres</i>	
<i>salubre sanctum tuum</i>			
<i>atque [ante</i>			<i>suorum delictorum</i> <i>et [ante</i>
<i>maiestatem</i>			
<i>et [præsta quæsumus</i>			
<i>peccatorum] suorum</i>			

This oration is not found in Roman Sacramentaries, its first occurrence is in the PRG's section on the liturgical year, that is, in Ordo 50 of the OR. The textual variants in the left column are from the principal text of Andrieu's edition which was prepared by the comparison of 21 codices from the 11-12th centuries. Hence in choosing the sources, the deciding factor was the antiquity of the manuscripts. Vogel's PRG-edition extended the source base with two other codices. The uniform appearance of the texts is not altered by the critical apparatus either, at least from the perspective of the textual variants of the H and the MNS. The textual editions of Vogel and Andrieu²⁵⁰ identify the following variants based on the considered 23 early sources (the supposed place of use for each codex is indicated in parentheses):

PRG 99, 74 *supplicantibus* Monte Cassino, Archivio dell' Arciabazia Ms. 451 NN (Rome); Pistoia, Archivio capitolare del duomo Ms. C 141 (Lucca) — OR 50, 18, 45 *supplicationibus* Rome, Biblioteca Alessandrina (Universitaria) Ms. 173 (Salzburg, Rome); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France Lat. 820 (Salzburg, Séz); Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek Ms. Guelf. 15 Weißenburg (Besançon); Wolfenbüttel, etc. 555 Helmst. (Ansbach?); Vitry-le-François, Bibliothèque municipale Ms. 36 (Salzburg, Châlons-sur-Marne) — *cineres istos* Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana Ms. Z 52 sup. (?) — *cineres hos* Eichstätt, Diözesenarchiv, Ms. B 4 (Eichstätt) — *et præsta [quæsumus]* Milan, etc. [*ibid.*]

According to this comparison, "*supplicantibus*" is documented in Rome and Lucca, "*cineres istos*" and "*præsta quæsumus*" without the "et" only in a codex from Milano whose original place of use cannot be identified. The other variants of the H and the MNS do not occur anywhere else.

²⁵⁰ Cf. OR V. 124; PRG II. 21–22.

We get a completely different picture if the source basis is compiled not chronologically but according to liturgical origin. The oration is an emblematic item of the Eastern liturgical region I call “Germanic”. In churches East of the Rhine or in the Rhine valley this oration is placed in the very beginning of the blessing of the ashes or right after the initial exorcism, whereas it is never featured in Western Europe.²⁵¹ The Westernmost region to which it spread is Lotharingia and Switzerland, and it made its way into the PR12 and through it to the Roman Curial practice by means of the PRG.²⁵² Hence the occurrence or non-occurrence of the item is suitable for distinguishing wider liturgical regions.

In order to check the liturgical connection between textual variants, I highlighted five “strong” variants of the text: (1) *supplicibus/supplicantibus*, (2) *hos cineres/cineres istos*, (3) *salubre/salutare*, (4) *maiestatem/pietatem*, and (5) *et praesta/præsta quæsumus*. I suppose that these are not haphazard, that is, the choice of words and the rhythm of the text are deeply set into the memory of the liturgical community. These five variants are then compared in 15-16th-century, printed secular Rituals and Missals whose origin is certain. The results are as follows:²⁵³

Salzburg	supplicibus	hos cineres	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
Olmütz	supplicibus	hos cineres	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
Lüttich	supplicibus	cineres istos	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
Strassburg	supplicibus	cineres istos	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
Basel	supplicibus	cineres istos	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus

²⁵¹ For identifying the geographical origins of liturgies, see FÖLDVÁRY: *A római rítus változatainak kutatása* 71–101. Under the collective term ‘Western European’ I include the Gallican, Anglo-Normann, Ibero-Provencal regions. For sure, to this category belong Norway, the British Isles, the greatest part of France, Iberia and Sicily. The border region between Western and Eastern regions is Flandria, Lotharingia, Burgundy, Helvetia (today’s Switzerland) and Italy. It is typical that according to Radó the “birthplace” of the Hungarian liturgy is located at the border of three markedly different regions: the Anglonormann, the Gallican and the Northern transitional (Flandria-Lotharingia). From a liturgical point of view “Northern France” is a category with no real meaning.

²⁵² The variant of the PR12 can be considered a real Roman version of the text. The “classical” *Missale Romanum*, on the other hand, is unreliable because it bears the marks of “scholarly” interventions. This is demonstrated by the otherwise unheard-of exchange of *metuentibus* to *pænitentibus*. Otherwise, it uses a likewise unique group of variants: *supplicantibus*, *hos cineres*, *salubre*, *pietatem*, *et præsta*.

²⁵³ The sources of the oration in proper order: *Agenda Saltzburgensis* 14^v; *Agenda Olomucensis* 64^v; *Missale Leodiensis ecclesie* 31^r; *Missale Argentinense* 34^v; *Missale Basieliense* 31^v; *Obsequiale Frisingense* 23^v; *Missale Coloniense* 40^v; *Agenda Paderbornensis* (despite its rather late dating, it preserved an authentically mediaeval content) 241; Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky XLIV. G 44. (The contemporary printed version is a reliable witness to the Agenda of Prague) 9^v; *Missale Gnesnense et Cracoviense* 22^v; *Agenda ecclesie Moguntinensis* 94^v; *Missale ad usum Virdunensis ecclesie* 16^v; *Agenda ecclesie cathedralis Plocensis* 122^r; *Agenda [Magdeburgensis]* 58^v; *Agenda sive benedictionale de actibus Ecclesie secundum chororum et observationem ecclesie Pataviensis* 31^v; *Obsequiale Ratisponense* 47^v; *Agenda rerum ecclesiasticum secundum consuetum usum Mindensis diæcesis* 45^r; PR12 28, 2 (p. 209); *Missale Hildense-mense* 35^v; *Obsequiale Eystetense* 40^v; *Obsequiale Brixinense* 3^v; *Obsequiale Augustense* 7^v; *Obsequiale sive benedictionale secundum ecclesiam Constantiensem* 41^r. As regards multilingual cities, I decided to use their German names to indicate that liturgically they are Germanic in character.

Freising	supplicibus	hos cineres	salutare	pietatem	et præsta
Cologne	supplicibus	cineres istos	salutare	pietatem	et præsta
Paderborn	supplicibus	cineres istos	salutare	pietatem	et præsta
Prague	supplicantibus	hos cineres	salutare	pietatem	et præsta
Gnézna	supplicantibus	cineres istos	salubre	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
Mainz	supplicibus tuis	cineres istos	salubre	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
Verdun	supplicibus	hos cineres	salutare	maiestatem	præsta quæsumus
Plock	supplicantibus	cineres istos	salubre	maiestatem	præsta quæsumus
Magdeburg	supplicantibus	cineres istos	salutare	maiestatem	et præsta
Passau	supplicantibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Regensburg	supplicibus tuis	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Minden	supplicibus tuis	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Rome	supplicibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Hildesheim	supplicibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Eichstätt	supplicibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Brixen	supplicibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Augsburg	supplicibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
Konstanz	supplicibus	cineres istos	salubre	maiestatem	præsta quæsumus

Three conclusions may be drawn from these 23 more or less contemporaneous sources adopted proportionately from the same region within which the oration was used:

(1) All of the variants that seem sporadic in the H and the MNS occur abundantly, almost 50-50 percent in these sources. Only “supplicantibus” seems to be in a “minority”, but it is featured in some really authoritative sources. Consequently, the Hungarian sources are much less isolated than initially they seemed on the basis of the PRG’s critical apparatus.

(2) The variants cannot be arranged into groups according to institutions. Especially the sources using the variant “*salubre+maiesatem*” seem unified, even though they cannot be grouped together either geographically or institutionally. The item is typically Eastern or Germanic but within that category there is no recognisable separation between Northern and Southern, Eastern and Western, German and non-German (e.g. Polish, Moravian, Lotharingian, Swiss, Italian). These elements are freely and independently varied by the different Uses.

(3) The H and the MNS concur in four places out of five. They contain an identical combination of “strong” versions which does not feature in this form in any other Use. The first, well-documented constellation relate them to the Salzburg-Olmütz-Lüttich-Straßburg-Basel group, while the somewhat rarer *supplicantibus* puts them in one group with Prague-Gnézna-Plock-Magdeburg-Passau, but there are no overlaps between the two groups. It cannot be ruled out that we might be able to find a foreign source that is in harmony with both the H and the MNS, but the result is really food for thought.

In the end this result must be measured against the other witnesses of the Hungarian tradition. The question is whether these concurrences between the H and the MNS are haphazard or this combination of their “strong” textual variants is permanently linked with the Hungarian tradition. The other question – similarly to the ru-

brics – is whether this constellation is characteristic to the entire Hungarian tradition or only to a well-definable partial tradition within it. Based on the sources consulted earlier, we get the following information (the Missal of Pécs [Quinqueecclesiæ] is designated with the acronym MQ, the Zagreb Missal with MZ, the Missal of Németújvár [Güssing] with MG):

MS 17 ^r	supplicantibus	hos cineres	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
MQ 33 ^r	supplicantibus	hos cineres	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
MZ 19 ^v	supplicantibus	cinerem istum	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
PZ 46 ^r	supplicibus	cinerem istum	salutare	pietatem	præsta quæsumus
P 38 ^r	supplicibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta
MG 50 ^r	supplicantibus	hos cineres	salubre	maiestatem	et præsta

Pondering the other variants of the H and the MNS, we can see that the “*delictorum suorum*” of the H and the “*hos cineres*”, “*et ante*” of the MNS became the Hungarian *textus receptus*. The “*ante*” without “*et*” of the H is preserved by the MZ, while the “*atque ante*” of the PRG is featured on the appropriate pages of the P, the PZ and the MG. We cannot find any other PRG variants in the sources representing the principal stratum of the Hungarian tradition.

The data gained from Esztergom, Pécs and Zagreb of the late Middle Ages confirm the witness of the H. The only one minor difference is the “*cinerem istum*” of the MZ which can probably be traced back to the tradition of the PZ. The value of the PZ’s witness is reduced by the fact that there the oration does not occur in the context of Ash Wednesday but as part of the Ordo of Dedication, at the blessing of the ashes necessary for the so-called “water of St Gregory”. This may indicate that the PZ relies on other textual traditions as well. The variation of the words pertaining to the ashes does not have the same weight as the other ones, these words were used differently already in the H and the MNS.

However, even after the analysis of a wide source base, the “*supplicantibus+salutare+pietatem+præsta quæsumus*” group of variants is proper to Hungarian dioceses. Yet we find a different variant in the P and the MG. After the analysis of the rubrics, the latter turned out to be a peripheral source. It is more difficult to explain the difference of the P. Here it is not on the basis of philology but of liturgical content that we can determine what other foreign material was imposed on the Esztergom foundations. Since the analysed oration is a common treasure of the Central European region, its textual source may not have necessarily been of Esztergom origin.

The oration was picked at random, and so the microphilological analysis derived from it was not meant to prove a predetermined conclusion. I am convinced that the results thus obtained are much less reliable than the ones I have gained from the analysis of the rubrics, nonetheless the conclusions may be briefly summarised as follows:

(1) The textual variants of liturgical items should not be arranged into diachronic stemmas but into synchronic typologies based on Uses. (2) The typology we obtain this way does not delineate the process of “handing down” these texts; the result is

sporadic and seemingly random. (3) Nevertheless, the particular constellations of textual variants may actually be suitable for identifying individual Uses, provided it is supported by other philological and liturgical considerations. — I do have to add, however, that the compilation of a really informative liturgical critical apparatus would require an extremely broad knowledge of sources and an incredible amount of work, while this work would not produce substantially new results in comparison with the analysis of rubrics and liturgical composition.

Having pursued this train of thought we can now assert that the continuity of the H with the central Esztergom tradition has been confirmed also from a philological perspective. On a higher level we are justified in saying that the Uses behave philologically the same was as in a liturgical sense: known basic elements are combined in a constellation that is permanently characteristic of the given Use.

Bibliography

Secondary Literature and Modern Prints

- AER = MARTÈNE, Edmond OSB: *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus ...* Rouen 1700–1702¹. Antwerpen 1764². (Facsimile: MARTÈNE)
- Agendarius. Liber continens ritus et caeremonias, quibus in administrandis sacramentis, benedictionibus, & aliis quibusdam ecclesiasticis functionibus, parochi, & alii curati, in Diœcesi & provincia Strigoniensi utuntur ...* Nagyszombat 1583. (RMK I. 27. — RMNy 528) (Részleges facsimile: FEKETE)
- AMIET, R.: *Pontificale Augustanum. Le Pontifical du XI^e siècle de la Bibliothèque capitulaire d'Aoste.* Aosta 1975. (Monumenta Liturgica Ecclesiae Augustanæ 3)
- ARX, Walter von: *Das Klostrituelle von Biburg (Budapest, Cod. lat. m. æ. Nr. 330, 12. Jh.).* Universitätsverlag, Freiburg Schweiz 1970. (Spicilegium Friburgense 14)
- EVERY, M.: „The Relation of the Casanatense Pontifical (Ms. Casanat. 724 B I 13) to Tenth Century Changes in the Ordination Rites at Rome”, in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*. Città del Vaticano 1946. (Studi e Testi 126) VI. 258–271. and 8 tables.
- BAILEY, Terence: *The Fleury Play of Herod*. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto 1965.
- BAILEY, Terence: *The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church*. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto 1971.
- BALIĆ, Charles: „Les anciens manuscrits de la Bibliothèque métropolitaine de Zagreb”, in *Studia Mediaevalia in honorem admodum Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin, Ordinis Prædicatorum s. theologiae magistri LXX^{um} natalem diem agentis*. De Tempel, Brugge/Bruges 1948. 438sq.
- BALUZE, Étienne (ed.): *Capitularia regum Francorum*. Antonius Zatta, Velenca 1773. (*Marculfi monachi formularum libri duo*: II. 252sq.)
- BANTING, H. M. J.: *Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals (The Egbert and Sidney Sussex Pontificals)*. London 1989. (Henry Bradshaw Society 104)
- Baptismale Strigoniense*. Wien 1500. (RMK III. 54.)
- BARION, Hans: *Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters*. Albert Michael Koeniger, Bonn 1931. (Kanonistische Studien und Texte 5–6)
- BARRIGA PLANAS, J. R.: *El sacramentari, ritual i pontifical de Roda*. Barcelona 1975.
- BARTONIEK Emma: „Az Orsz. Széchényi Könyvtár 317. sz. középkori kódexéről”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* XXX (1923) 200–204.
- BEDA VENERABILIS: *Homilia XXV in Cæna Domini*. Migne, Paris 1844–1855. (Patrologia Latina 94) 130C–132C
- BEDY Vince: *A győri székeskáptalan története*. Győregyházmegyei Alap, Győr 1938. (Győregyházmegye múltjából 3) <<http://mek.oszk.hu/09400/09415/09415.pdf>>
- BEISSEL, Stephan: *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches. Zur Geschichte der Evangelienbücher in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters*. Herdersche Verlagshandlung, Maria-Laach 1907. (Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Ergänzungsheft 96)
- BERNARD, Madeleine: „L'officium stellæ nivernais”, *Revue de Musicologie* LI (1965) 52–65.
- BESSON, Jules: „Collections of Ancient Canons.” *The Catholic Encyclopedia III*. Robert Appleton Company, New York 1908. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03281a.htm>>
- BLUME, Friedrich (ed.): *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik I–XVII*. Bärenreiter, Kassel—Basel 1949–1986.

- BÓNIS György: *Középkori jogunk elemei. Római jog, kánonjog, szokásjog*. Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest 1972.
- BÓNIS György: *Szentszéki regeszták. Iratok az egyházi bíraskodás történetéhez a középkori Magyarországon*. Püski, Budapest 1997. (A szerző hátrahagyott kéziratát gondozta Balogh Elemér)
- BOUDINHON, Auguste: „Excommunication”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia V*. Robert Appleton Company, New York 1909. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05678a.htm>>
- BOUDINHON, Auguste: „Formularies”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia VI*. Robert Appleton Company, New York 1909. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06141a.htm>>
- BOUDINHON, Auguste: „Penitential Canons”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia XI*. Robert Appleton Company, New York 1911. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11636a.htm>>
- Breviarium Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum. Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Apud Paulum Manutium, Roma 1568. (Facsimile: SODI—TRIACCA)
- BROCKETT, Clyde Waring: „Osanna! New Light on the Palm Sunday Processional Antiphon Series”, *Plainsong and Medieval Music IX/2* (2000) 95–129.
- BROU, Louis OSB: *The Monastic Ordinal of St. Vedast's Abbey Arras*. London 1954–1955 (=1957). (Henry Bradshaw Society 86–87)
- BURCHARDUS WORMATENSIS: „De excommunicatione”, in *Decretorum liber undecimus*. Migne, Paris 1853 (Patrologia Latina 140) 355sqq.
- BURN, Andrew Ewbank: *Niceta of Remesiana, His Life and Works*. University Press, Cambridge 1905.
- CAGIN, Paul OSB (ed.): *Le Sacramentaire gélasien d'Angoulême. Paris, Bibl. Nat., Ms. Lat. 816*. Société historique et archéologique de la Charente, Angoulême 1919.
- CASSANDER, Gregorius: *Ordo Romanus de officio missæ ...* Köln 1561.
- CATTIN, Giulio: *Musica e Liturgia a San Marco. Testi e Melodie per la Liturgia delle Ore dal XII al XVII secolo I–III*. Fondazione Levi, Venezia 1990.
- CHAVASSE, Antoine: *Les lectionnaires romains de la messe au VII^e et au VIII^e siècle. Sources et dérivés I. Procédés de confection. II. Synoptique général. Tableaux complémentaires*. Éditions Universitaires, Fribourg Suisse 1993. (Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 22)
- CHEVALIER, Ulysse: *Sacramentaire et martyrologe de l'Abbaye Saint-Remy. Martyrologe, calendrier, Ordinaires et Prosaire de la métropole de Reims (VIII^e–XIII^e siècles)*. Alphonse Picard, Libraire, Paris 1900. (Bibliothèque Liturgique 7) (Ordinarius servicii Remensis ecclesie; Ordo legendi et cantandi Remensis ecclesie)
- CHEVALLIER, Philippe: *Dionysiaca. Recueil donnant l'ensemble des traductions latines des ouvrages attribués au Denys de l'Aréopage...* Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges 1937. I. 565.
- Codex Iuris Canonici*. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Roma 1917.
- Collectio Rituum ad instar appendicis Ritualis Romani ad usum diœcesium et parœciarum lingue Hungarica a Sancta Sede approbata*. Societas S. Stephani [Szent István Társulat], Budapest 1961.
- CONYBEARE, Frederick Cornwallis — MACLEAN, Arthur John: *Rituale Armenorum Being the Administration of the Sacraments and the Breviary Rites of the Armenian Church Together with the Greek Rites of Baptism and Epiphany*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1905.
- CORBIN, Solange: *Palaeographie der Musik I. 3. Die Neumen*. Arno Volk Verlag, Hans Gerig, Köln 1977.
- COUSSEMAKER, Charles Edmond Henri de: *Drames liturgiques du moyen-âge*. Didron, Paris 1861.
- CROSNIER, A. — LEBLANC DE LESPINASSE, R. — MORIZET, Charles — FOUCHÉ, M.: *Sacramentarium ad usum Æcclesie Nivernensis*. Nevers 1873¹. Farnborough 1969². (Publications de la Société Nivernaise 8)
- CSAPODI Csaba — CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI Klára: *Bibliotheca Hungarica. Kódexek és nyomtatott könyvek Magyarországon 1526 előtt. I–II: Fönnmaradt kötetek. III: Adatok elveszett kötetekről*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1988, 1993, 1994. (Az MTA Könyvtárának Közleményei 23, 31, 33)

- CZAGÁNY Zsuzsa: „Magyar-normann zenei kapcsolatok a középkorban II.”, in KISS Gábor (ed.): *Zenetudományi Dolgozatok*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 2010. 11–22.
- CZAGÁNY Zsuzsa: „Magyar-normann zenei kapcsolatok a középkorban?”, *Zenetudományi Dolgozatok* XII (1990/1991) 9–21.
- DANKÓ József: *Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariae*. Franklin, Budapest 1893.
- DARVASY Mihály SchP: „Középkori Stella-játék”, *Magyar Kórus* XII (1942) 856–857.
- DE CLERCK, Paul: *La „prière universelle” dans les liturgies latines anciennes. Témoignages patristiques et textes liturgiques*. Aschendorff, Münster 1977. (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 62)
- DEMOVIĆ, Miho: „Spomenici glazbene kulture u Hrvatskoj od. 10. do 12. stoljeća [A zenei kultúra emlékei Horvátországban a X-től a XII. századig]”, in *Muzičke Večeri u Donatu. Zbornik radova*. Zagreb-Zadar 1983. 55–91.
- DENYSENKO, Nicholas E.: *The Blessing of Waters and Epiphany. The Eastern Liturgical Tradition*. Ashgate, Farnham—Burlington 2012. (Liturgy, Worship and Society)
- DENYSENKO, Nicholas E.: *The Blessing of Waters on the Feast of Theophany in the Byzantine Rite. Historical Formation and Theological Implications*. ProQuest, Washington D. C. 2008. <http://books.google.hu/books?id=nXyygX2h58QC&dq=inauthor:%22Nicholas+E.+Denysenko%22+inauthor:%22The+Catholic+University+of+America%22&hl=hu&source=gbs_navlinks_s>
- DESHUSSES, Jean — DARRAGON, Benoît: *Concordances et tableaux pour l'étude des grands Sacramentaires I–III/1–3*. Éditions Universitaires, Fribourg 1982–1983 (Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 9–14)
- DESHUSSES, Jean (ed.): *Le sacramentaire grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits I–III*. Éditions Universitaires, Fribourg 1971–1982. (Spicilegium Friburgense 16, 24, 28)
- DOBLE, G. H.: *Pontificale Lanelatense (Bibliothèque de la ville de Rouen A. 27. Cat. 368). A Pontifical Formerly in Use at St. Germans, Cornwall*. London 1937. (Henry Bradshaw Society 74)
- DOBSZAY László — PRÓSZÉKY Gábor: *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii Ecclesiarum Centralis Europae. A Preliminary Report*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 1988.
- DOBSZAY László — SZENDREI Janka: *Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi V. 1–3. Antiphonen*. Bärenreiter, Kassel—Basel—London—New York—Praha 1999.
- DOBSZAY László: „A középkori magyar liturgia István-kori elemei?”, in GLATZ Ferenc — KARDOS József (szerk.): *Szent István és kora*. MTA Történettudományi Intézet, Budapest 1988. 151–155.
- DOBSZAY László: *Az esztergomi rítus*. Új Ember, Budapest 2004.
- DOBSZAY László: *Liber Ordinarius Agriensis (1509)*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 2000. (Musicalia Danubiana Subsidia 1)
- DREVES SI, Guido Maria — BLUME SI, C. — BANNISTER, H. M. (ed.): *Analecta hymnica medii aevi I–LV*. Leipzig 1886–1922¹. Frankfurt am Main 1961²; Register: LÜTOLF, Max (I–III. Francke, Berne 1978).
- DREVES, Guido Maria — BLUME, Clemens — BANNISTER, Henry Marriott: *Analecta hymnica medii aevi I–LV*. Leipzig 1886–1922¹. Frankfurt am Main 1961²; Register: LÜTOLF, Max (I–III. Francke, Berne 1978).
- DUCHESNE, Louis (ed.): *Le Liber Pontificalis I–III*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Paris 1955–1957.
- DYKMANS, Marc SI: *Le Pontifical Romain révisé au XV siècle*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1985. (Studi e Testi 311)
- ELLARD, G.: *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 A. D.* Cambridge Massachusetts 1933. (The Medieval Academy of America 16)
- Éneklő Egyház. Római Katolikus Népepektár liturgikus énekekkel és imádságokkal*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest 1983¹. 2004⁶.

- ERDÉLYI László (szerk.): *A Pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek rend története*. Stephanæum, Budapest 1916.
- ERDŐ Péter: „Kanonjogi kódexek és töredékek Magyarországon”, in SZELESTEI N. László (szerk.): *Tanulmányok a középkori magyarországi könyvkultúráról. Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtárban 1986. február 13–14-én rendezett konferencia előadásai*. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1989. (Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kiadványai. Új Sorozat 3) 51–61.
- ERDŐ Péter: *Az egyházjog forrásai. Történeti bevezetés*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest 1998.
- FALCONER, Keith: *Some Early Tropes to the Gloria*. Mucchi, Modena 1993.
- FALVY Zoltán — MEZEY László: *Codex Albensis. Ein Antiphonar aus dem 12. Jahrhundert*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1963. (Monumenta Hungariæ Musica 1)
- FANCEV, Franjo: „Liturgijsko-obredne igre u zagrebačkoj stolnoj crkvi [Liturgikus-szertartási játékok a zágrábi székesegyházban]”, *Narodna Starina* I (1925) 1–16.
- FANCEV, Franjo: „O najstarijem bogoslužju u Posavskoj Hrvatskoj [A Száva menti Horvátország legrégebb istentiszteletéről]”, in *Zbornik Kralja Tomislava*. Zagreb 1925. 521–533.
- FEKETE Csaba (kiad.): *Nagyszombati Agendarius. Magyar nyelvű szertartási betétek az esztergomi rítusból 1583, 1596*. Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen 2011. (Nyelvi és Művelődéstörténeti Adattár. Kiadványok 11)
- FEKETE Csaba (kiad.): *Nagyszombati Agendarius. Magyar nyelvű szertartási betétek az esztergomi rítusból 1583, 1596*. Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen 2011. (Nyelvi és Művelődéstörténeti Adattár. Kiadványok 11)
- FINGERNAGEL, Andreas — GASTGEBER, Christian (ed.) *The Most Beautiful Bibles*. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek—Taschen, Köln 2008.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „« Ligatis natibus ». Egy romlatlan szöveg hely tanulságai”, *Magyar Egyházzene* XII (2004/2005) 387–408.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „A Hartvik-agenda és a Német-római pontifikále”, in KOVÁCS Andrea (szerk.): *Hagyomány és megújulás a liturgiában és zenéjében. A Liszt Ferenc Zeneművészeti Egyetem Egyházzene Tanszéke újraindításának 20. évfordulóján tartott szimpózium előadásai. Budapest, 2010. szeptember 8–10*. Liszt Ferenc Zeneművészeti Egyetem Egyházzenei Kutatócsoport, Budapest 2012. 147–158.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „A Hartvik-agenda kiközösítési és visszafogadási rítusainak szerkezete és eredete”, in DÉRI Balázs és mások (szerk.): *Conversio. Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Karán 2011. szeptember 22–23-án tartott vallástudományi konferencia előadásai*. Argumentum Kiadó, Budapest 2012. (AGION Könyvek 1) 529–542. (forthcoming)
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „A liturgiamagyarázat nyomai a XIV. század előtti Magyarországon. A Praykódex *Micrologus*-a és annak környezete”, in DÉRI Balázs (szerk.): *Oratoris officium. Tanulmányok a hetvenéves Adamik Tamás tiszteletére*. L’Harmattan — ELTE BTK Latin Nyelvi és Irodalmi Tanszék, Budapest 2008. 87–98.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „A zsinattartás rendje a Hartvik-agendában”, *Magyar Egyházzene* XIX (2011/2012) 3–32.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „Egy hiányzó láncszem. Az MR 124-es zágrábi pontifikále”, *Magyar Egyházzene* XIX (2011/2012) (forthcoming)
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „Egy hiányzó láncszem. Az MR 124-es zágrábi pontifikále”, *Magyar Egyházzene* XIX (2011/2012) 383–416.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „Ismeretlen ordótöredékek a középkori Magyarországon és a környező közép-európai egyházakban”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* CXXVI (2010/3) 366–375.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „Középkori pontifikálék Magyarországon”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* CXXVI (2010/2) 242–247.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „Liturgikus könyvek”, in *Ars Sacra. A liturgikus művészet kézikönyve*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest (forthcoming)

- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „The Variants of the Roman Rite. Their Legitimacy and Revival”, *Usus Antiquior* III/2 (2012) 121–129. Magyarul: „A római rítus változatai. Törvényességük és újjáéledésük”, in UŐ — TALMÁCSI József (szerk.): *XVI. Benedek pápa és a Szent Liturgia. Nemzetközi konferencia, Budapest, 2008. augusztus 21–24.* Szent István Társulat, Budapest 2011. 109–119.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: „Unknown Fragments of Ordines in Medieval Hungary and Related Central European Churches”, in LECLANT, Jean — VAUCHEZ, André — HUREL, Daniel-Odon (szerk.): *Dom Jean Mabillon figure majeure de l'Europe des lettres. Actes des deux colloques du tricentenaire de la mort de dom Mabillon. Abbaye de Solesmes, 18–19 mai 2007. Palais de l'Institut, Paris, 7–8 décembre 2007.* Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris 2010. 671–683.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: *A római rítus változatainak kutatása. Módszertani vázlat és esettanulmány.* [How to Study Latin Liturgical Uses? A Methodological Draft and Case Study] http://class-phil.elte.hu/sites/default/files/profilok/foeldvaymiklosistvan/A%20római%20rítus%20változatainak%20kutatása_0.pdf
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: *Ordinarius Strigoniensis. Impressum pluries Nurenbergæ, Venetiis et Lugduni annis Domini 1493–1520 (RMK III Suppl. I 5031, RMK III 35, 134, 165, 166, 238).* Argumentum Kiadó, Budapest 2009.
- FÖLDEVÁRY Miklós István: *Rubrica Strigoniensis. A középkori Esztergom liturgiájának normaszövegei.* PhD disszertáció, Budapest, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Nyelvtudományi Doktoriskola, Ókortudományi Program 2008. = http://latin.elte.hu/munkatarsak/FM_files/disszertacio.shtml
- FRANZ, Adolph: *Die kirchlichen benediktionen im Mittelalter I–II.* Herder, Freiburg 1909. = Nova & Vetera, Bonn 2006.
- FÜRST, Carl Gerold: *Cardinalis. Prolegomena zu einer Rechtsgeschichte des römischen Kardinalskollegiums.* Fink, München 1967.
- GAMBER, Klaus: *Codices liturgici Latini antiquiores. Editio secunda aucta.* Universitätsverlag, Freiburg Schweiz 1968. (Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 1)
- GAMS, Pius Bonifacius OSB: *Series episcoporum Ecclesie catholice a beato Petro Apostolo.* Georg Joseph Manz, Regensburg 1873.
- GENNEP, Arnold van: *Átmeneti rítusok.* L'Harmattan, Budapest 2007. (Kultúrák keresztútján 9) (Eredetije: *Les rites de passage.* Paris 1909. Ford. Vargyas Zoltán)
- GERICS József — LADÁNYI Erzsébet: „A Kálmán-kori szinodális bíraskodás valószínű mintája”, in BÁNRÉVY Gábor et alii (ed.): *Iustum, aequum, salutare. Emlékkönyv Zlinszky János tiszteletére.* Osiris, Budapest 1998. 112–115.
- GERICS József: „A korai állelmélet érvényesülése István korában”, in UŐ (ed.): *Egyház, állam és gondolkodás Magyarországon a középkorban.* Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, Budapest 1995. 65–70.
- GERICS József: „Hartvik győri (?) püspök, I. (Szt.) István életrajzának írója”, in KRISTÓ Gyula — ENGEL Pál — MAKK Ferenc (ed.): *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század).* Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1994. 255.
- GOMBOS Ferenc Albin: *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungariae aeo ducum et regum ex stirpe Arpad descenduntium ab anno Christi DCCC usque ad annum MCCXI. I–IV.* Budapest 1937–1943¹. Nap 2011².
- GOULLET, Monique — LOBRICHON, Guy — PALAZZO, Éric: *Le pontifical de la curie romaine au XIII^e siècle.* Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris 2004.
- GRÄF, H. J.: *Palmenweihe und Palmenprozession in der lateinischen Liturgie.* Kaldenkirchen 1959. (Veröffentlichungen des Missionspriesterseminars St. Augustin Siegburg 5)
- GREENWELL, W.: *The Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York, A. D. 732–766.* Durham—London—Edinburgh 1853. (Publications of the Surtees Society 27)
- GREGORIUS MAGNUS: *Homiliae in Evangelia I.* Migne, Paris 1849. (Patrologia Latina 76)

- GROS I PUJOL, Miquel dels Sants: *El Pontifical Romà de Vic. Vic, Arx. Cap., ms. 103 (XCIII)*. ld. <http://publicacions.iec.cat/repository/pdf/00000052%5C00000053.pdf>
- GY, Pierre-Marie OP: „Die Segnung von Milch und Honig in der Osternacht”, in FISCHER, Balthasar — WAGNER, Johannes (ed.): *Paschatis Sollemnia. Studien zur Osterfeier und Osterfrommigkeit*. Herder, Freiburg 1959. 206–212. 208.
- GYÖRFFY György (ed.) *Diplomata Hungariæ antiquissima I. 1000–1131*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1992.
- GYÖRFFY György: *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza I–IV*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1987.
- GYÖRFFY György: *István király és műve*. Gondolat, Budapest 1977¹. Balassi, Budapest 2000².
- HAHN, AUGUST — HAHN, GEORG LUDWIG — HARNACK, ADOLF VON: *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*. E. Morgenstern, Breslau 1897³. Hildesheim 1962⁴.
- HANSSENS, Ioannes Michael SI: *Amalarii Episcopi Opera Liturgica Omnia. II. Liber officialis*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1948. (Studi e Testi 139)
- HARRINGTON, Michael L.: *A Thirteenth-Century Textbook of Mystical Theology at the University of Paris*. Peeters, Leuven 2004. 22–26.
- HINSCHIUS, Paul: *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ et Capitula Angilramni*. Bernhard Tauchnitz, Leipzig 1863¹. Scientia, Aalen 1963².
- HITTORP, Melchior: *De divinis catholice Ecclesie officiis et mysteriis ...* Köln 1568¹, Roma 1591², Paris 1610³.
- HOLTZMANN, Robert (ed.): *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon. Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier Überarbeitung*. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin 1935¹ München 1996². (Monumenta Germaniæ Historica. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum. Nova Series 9)
- HOURLIER, Jaques: „Le domaine de la notation messine”, *Revue Grégorienne* XXX (1951) 96–113. 150–158.
- HUDOVSKÝ, Zoran: „Neumatski rukopis Agenda pontificalis MR 165 Metropolitanske knjižnice u Zagrebu [A zágrabi érseki könyvtár MR 165 Agenda pontificalis neumás kézirat]”, *Arti Musices* II (1971) 17–30.
- HUGLO, Michel: *Les Manuscrits du Processional I. Autriche à Espagne. II. France à Afrique du Sud*. Henle, München 1999–2004. (Répertoire International des Sources Musicales B XIV^{1–2})
- JACKSON, R. A.: *Ordines Coronationis Franciæ. Texts and Ordines for the Coronation of Frankish and French Kings and Queens in the Middle Ages I*. Philadelphia 1995.
- JAFFÉ, Philip: *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita Ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*. Veit et socius, Berlin 1851.
- JOANNES ROTOMAGENSIS ARCHIEPISCOPUS: *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*. [Auctor incertus]: *Officium stelle*. Migne, Paris 1844–1855. (Patrologia Latina 147) 27–62. 135–140.
- JÓZSA Attila: „Benedictio pontificalis sollemnis. Az ünnepélyes főpapi áldás”, *Magyar Egyházzene* XIX (2011/2012) 227–234.
- JÓZSA Attila: *Ordo in Purificatione Sanctæ Mariæ. Mária tisztulásának ünnepe a középkori Esztergom liturgiájában. A gyertyaszentelés és a processzió szertartása*. PhD értekezés, Budapest, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Hittudományi Kar, Hittudományi Doktori Iskola 2009.
- JUNGMANN, Josef Andreas SI: *Missarum sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe I–II*. Herder, Wien 1948¹ 1952³. Verlag Nova & Vetera, Freiburg 1962⁵.
- KARDOS Tibor (ed.): *Régi magyar drámai emlékek I*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1960.
- KARDOS Tibor: „Koraközépkori magyarországi misztérium a betlehemi ‚Csillag-ról’”, *Diárium* XI (1941) 34–35.
- KARDOS Tibor: *Középkori kultúra, középkori költészet*. Magyar Történelmi Társulat, Budapest 1941.

- KARSAI Géza OSB: *Középkori vízkeresztj játékok. A győri «Tractus stellae» és rokonai*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest 1943. (Először megjelent: *Pannonhalmi Főapátsági Szent Gellért Főiskola Évkönyve. Új folyam* III (1942/1943); Recenzió: GÁBRIEL Asztrik OPræm, *Magyar Könyvszemle* LXIX/4 (1945) 140–141.
- KAY, Richard: „*Pontificalia*. A Global Checklist of Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals”, *Antiphon* XI/2 (2006) 192–202.
- KAY, Richard: *Pontificalia. A Repertory of Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals*. The University of Kansas, Lawrence 2007. Id. <http://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/dspace/handle/1808/4406>
- KELLY, Thomas Forrest: „Introducing the Gloria in excelsis”, *Journal of American Musicological Society* XXXVII (1984) 479–506.
- KÉRY, Lotte: *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400–1140). A bibliographical guide to the manuscripts and literature*. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D. C. 1999. (History of Medieval Canon Law 1)
- KING, Archdale A.: *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*. Verlag Nova & Vetera, Bonn 2005.
- KING, Archdale A.: *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*. Verlag Nova & Vetera, Bonn 2005.
- KLANICZAY Gábor: *Az uralkodók szentsége a középkorban*. Balassi, Budapest 2000.
- KLÖCKENER, Martin: „Eine liturgische Ordnung für Provinzialkonzilien aus der Karolingerzeit”, *Annuaire Historie Conciliorum* XII (1982) 109–182.
- KLÖCKENER, Martin: *Die Liturgie der Diözesansynode. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des Ordo ad Synodum des Pontificale Romanum. Mit einer Darstellung des Pontifikale und einem Verzeichnis seiner Drucke*. Aschendorff, Münster 1986. (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 68)
- KNIEWALD D. Károly: „Hartwick győri püspök Agenda Pontificalis-a”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* LXV (1941) 1–21. (Ford. Kühár Flóris OSB)
- KNIEWALD D. Károly: „Officium et missa de Conceptione et Nativitate B. M. V. secundum consuetudinem veterem Zagradiensem”, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* LXXIII (1959) 3–21.
- KNIEWALD Dragutin (Károly/Karl): *Illuminacija i notacija zagrebačkih liturgijskih rukopisa* [A zágrábi liturgikus kéziratok díszítése és hangjelzése]. Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, Zagreb 1944.
- KNIEWALD, Dragutin (Károly/Karl): „A «Hahóti kódex» (zágrábi MR 126. kézirat) jelentősége a magyarországi liturgia szempontjából”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* LXII (1938) 99–112.
- KNIEWALD, Dragutin (Károly/Karl): „Zagrebački liturgijski kodeksi XI.–XV. stoljeća. Codices liturgici manuscripti Zagradienses a saeculo XI. usque ad finem saeculi XV.” *Croatia Sacra* XIX/10 (1940) 1–128.
- KNIEWALD, Dragutin (Károly/Karl): *Liturgika*. Tipografija, Zagreb 1937.
- KNIEWALD, Dragutin: „Esztergomi Benedictionale (XI. század)”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* LXV (1941) 213–231. (Ford. Kühár Flóris OSB)
- KOLLAR, A. F.: „Bénédictionnaire épiscopale du Codex Vindob. Lat. 1815.”, in *Analecta Monumentorum omnis Aevi Vindobonensis*. Wien 1761. 415–446.
- KOVÁCS Andrea: „A nagyszombati próféciákról”, *Magyar Egyházzene* XVII (2009/2010) 401–404.
- KOZACHEK, Thomas Davies: *The Repertory of Chants for Dedicating Churches in the Middle Ages. Music, Liturgy, and Ritual*. PhD disszertáció, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, Department of Music, 1995.
- KRISTÓ Gyula — ENGEL Pál — MAKK Ferenc (ed.): *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1994.
- LÉDERER Emma: *Szöveggyűjtemény Magyarország történetének tanulmányozásához I*. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest 1964.
- LEROQUAIS, Victor: *Les pontificaux. Manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* I–IV. 1937.

- LIPPHARDT, Walther: „Das Herodesspiel von Le Mans nach den Handschriften Madrid, Bibl. Nac. 288 und 289 (11. und 12. Jhd.)”, in FISCHER, Pieter (ed.): *Organica voces. Festschrift Joseph Smits van Waesberghe*. Instituut voor Middeleeuwse Muziekwetenschap, Amsterdam 1963. 107–122.
- LIPPHARDT, Walther: *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele II*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin—New York 1976¹. 1990².
- LLOPART, E. M.: „Les formules de la confirmacio en le Pontifical Romà”, *Liturgica II* (1958) Montserrat (Scripta et Documenta 10) 121–180.
- LÜDTKE, Willy: „Bischöfliche Benediktionen aus Magdeburg und Braunschweig”, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft V* (1925) 97–122.
- MABILLON, Jean OSB: *Museum Italicum*. Paris 1724. II. 118–154. (Benedicti, Beati Petri Canonici, Liber politicus, ad Guidonem de Castello, tunc Cardinalem S. Marci, qui postmodum factus est Cælestinus II) = MABILLON, Jean OSB: *Musei Italici tomus II. complectens antiquos libros rituales sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ cum commentario prævio in Ordinem Romanum*. Paris 1689. (Patrologia Latina 78) 851–1406.
- MADAS Edit: „A legkorábbi fennmaradt magyarországi prédikációk”, in ROZSONDAI Marianne (ed.): *Jubileumi csokor Csabodó Csaba tiszteletére. Tanulmányok*. Argumentum, Budapest 2002. 173–190.
- MADAS Edit: *Középkori prédikációirodalmunk történetéből. A kezdetektől a XIV. század elejéig*. Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen 2002. 49–81. (Csokonai Könyvtár 25)
- MAGISTRETTI, M.: *Pontificale in usum ecclesiæ Mediolanensis necnon Ordines Ambrosiani ex codicibus sæc. IX–XV. Milano 1897*. (Monumenta Veteris Liturgiæ Ambrosianæ 1) 1–92.
- MAI, Angelo: *Novæ patrum bibliothecæ tomus primus continens s. Augustini novos ex codicibus Vaticanis sermones*. Typis Sacri Consilii Propagando Christiano Nomini, Roma 1852.
- MALATERRA, Gaufridus: *De acquisitione regni Siciliae per Robertum Guiscardum et fratres*. Migne, Paris 1844–1855 (Patrologia Latina 149) 1093–1209.
- MARKOV, Antun: „Katalog Metropolitanskih Riedkosti” [Érseki ritkaságok katalógusa], in *Dissertationes et monumenta historiam culturæ gentis Croaticæ illustrantia I/1*. Hrvatski Izdavački Bibliografski Zavod, Zagreb 1945. I. 505–508.
- MARQUESS OF BUTE, John — WALLIS BUDGE, Ernest Alfred: *The Blessing of the Waters on the Eve of the Epiphany*. H. Frowde, London 1901.
- MARTÈNE, Edmond OSB (ed.): *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus etc*. Antwerpen 1764. = id.: *De antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus libri I–IV*. Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim 1967–1969.
- MARTÈNE, Edmond OSB: *De antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus libri I–IV*. Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim 1967–1969.
- MARTIMORT, Aimé-Georges: *La documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène. Étude codicologique*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1978. (Studi e Testi 279)
- MARTINI, A.: *Il cosidetto Pontificale di Poitiers*. Roma 1979. (Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series Maior. Fontes 14)
- MÉNARD, Nicolas-Hugues: *Notæ et observationes in librum sacramentorum Sancti Gregorii papæ I*. Bechet, Paris 1641¹. Migne, Paris 1849². (Patrologia Latina 78) 330 D.
- METZGER, M. J.: *Zwei karolingische Pontifikalien vom Oberrhein*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1914. (Freiburger Theologische Studien 17)
- MEZEY László: „A Pray-kódex keletkezése”, *Magyar Könyvszemle LXXXVII* (1971) 109–123.
- MEZEY László: „Adalékok a középkori dráma történetéhez. Két liturgikus ludus”, *Filológiai Közlöny IV* (1958) 103–106.
- MEZEY László: „Egy ismeretlen középkori drámai emlékünök és európai rokonai”, *Filológiai Közlöny I* (1955) 59–63.
- MEZEY László: *Probleme der Entstehungsgeschichte des Pray-Kodex*, in DEZSÉNYI-SZEMZŐ P. (ed.): *Armarium. Studia ex historia scripturæ, librorum et ephemeridum*. Budapest 1976. 23–40.

- MIAZGA, Tadeusz: *Die Gesänge zur Osterprozession in den handschriftlichen Überlieferungen vom 10. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, Graz 1979.
- MIKÓ Gábor: „Szent István törvényei és a pszeudo-izidori hamisítványok”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* CXXIII/2 (2007) 153–168.
- Missale fratrum heremitarum ordinis divi Pauli primi heremite sub regula beati Augustini doctoris eximii summo Deo militantium*. Peter Liechtenstein—Stephan Heckel, Venezia 1514.
- Missale Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum. Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Apud heredes Bartholomæi Faletti, Ioannem Variscum et socios, Roma 1570. (Facsimile: SODI—TRACCA)
- Missale secundum chorum et rubricam almi episcopatus Zagradiensis ecclesie roboratum et approbatum in sacra synodo et generali capitulo ...* Venezia 1511.
- Missale secundum morem alme ecclesie Quinqueeclesiensis*. Ioannes Pap, Venezia 1499. (RMK III. 52.)
- MOELLER, Edmond (Eugène) OSB: *Corpus benedictionum pontificalium*. Brepols, Turnhout 1971–1979. (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 162 A–C)
- MOHLBERG, Cunibert OSB — EIZENHÖFER, Leo OSB — SIFFRIN, Petrus OSB (ed.): *Sacramentarium Veronense (Cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. LXXXV [80])*. Herder Editrice e Libreria, Roma 1994. (Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series Maior. Fontes 1)
- MOHLBERG, Kunibert — BAUMSTARK, Anton: *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber sacramentorum anni circuli der römischen Kirche (Cod. Pad. D 47, fol. 11'–100')*. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster Westfalen 1927. (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 11–12)
- MOHLBERG, Kunibert: *Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alamannischer Überlieferung (Codex Sangallensis 348)*. Münster in Westfalen 1918. (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 1/2)
- MORANDI, Nausica: „Before and After Musical Signification in Middle Ages Liturgical Drama *Officium Stellae*”, in NAVICKAITĖ-MARTINELLI, Lina: *Before and After Music. Proceedings from the 10th International Congress of the International Project on Musical Signification, Vilnius, 21–2 October 2008*. Technologija, Kaunas 2010. (Acta Semiotica Fennica 37) 471–477.
- MORANDI, Nausica: „The Hungarian *Officium stelle* Within a European Network of Epiphany Dramas”, in IMS Study Group Cantus Planus, Dobogókő, Hungary, 25 August 2009. 835–848.
- MORIN, Germain OSB: „Manuscripts liturgiques hongrois des XI^e et XII^e siècles”, Münster, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* VI (1926) 54–67.
- MORIN, Jean: *Commentarius de sacris Ecclesiae ordinationibus ... I–II*. Antwerpen 1695.
- MORONI, Gaetano: *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica da S. Pietro sino ai nostri giorni*. Tipografia Emiliana, Venezia 1852. („Giavarino” [Győr] XXX. 229.)
- MS = DÉRI Balázs: *Missale Strigoniense 1484*. Argumentum Kiadó, Budapest 2008. (Monumenta Ritualia Hungarica 1)
- MUNIER, Charles: „L'Ordo Romanus qualiter concilium agatur d'après le cod. Coloniensis 138”, *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* XXIX (1962) 288–294; uő: „L'Ordo de celebrando concilio wisigothique. Ses remaniements jusqu'au X^e siècle”, *Revue des sciences religieuses* XXXVII (1963) 250–271.
- MUNIER, Charles: *Concilia Africae A. 345 – A. 525*. Brepols, Turnhout 1974. (Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 149) 30sq.
- MURATORI, Lodovico Antonio (ed.): *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores V*. Societas Palatina in Regia Curia, Milano 1724.
- MURATORI, Ludovicus Antonius: *Liturgia Romana vetus ...* Venezia 1748.
- NASS, Klaus (ed.): *Die Reichschronik des Annalista Saxo*. Hahn, Hannover 2006. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores 37)
- OBERTYŃSKI, Zdzislaw: *The Cracow Pontifical (Pontificale Cracoviense Saeculi XI) Cracow, Jagellonian*

- Library, MS. 2057.* C. Nicholls & Company Ltd., The Philips Park Press, Manchester 1977. (Henry Bradshaw Society 100)
- Obsequiale seu baptismale secundum chorum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis.* Impensis Ioannis Pæp, Venezia 1501.
- OCC = SCHNEIDER, Herbert: *Ordines de celebrando concilio. Die Konzilsordines des Früh- und Hochmittelalters.* Hahnsche Buchhandlung, Hannover 1996. (Monumenta Germaniæ Historica)
- OGDEN, Dunbar H.: *The Staging of Drama in the Medieval Church.* University of Delaware Press, Newark 2002. 155–172.
- OR = ANDRIEU, Michel (ed.): *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge.* Ravenstraat 112, Louvain 1931–1961. (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 11, 23, 24, 28, 29)
- Ordo et ritus sanctæ metropolitane Ecclesie Strigoniensis, quibus Parochi et alii animarum Pastores in Ecclesiis suis uti debent.* In ædibus Collegii Cæsarii Societatis Iesu, Wien 1560. (RMK III. 474.)
- PALAZZO, Éric: *Histoire des livres liturgiques. Le Moyen Age. Des origines au XIII^e siècle.* Beauchesne, Paris 1993.
- PAULER Gyula: „Ki volt Hartvic püspök?“, *Századok* XVII (1883) 803–804.
- PERTZ, Georg Heinrich (ed.): *Annales, chronica et historia ævi Saxonici.* Hahn, Hannover 1839¹ 1986² (Monumenta Germaniæ Historica. Scriptorum 3)
- PERTZ, Georg Heinrich (ed.): *Chronica et annales ævi Salici.* Hahn, Hannover 1844¹ 1980² (Monumenta Germaniæ Historica. Scriptorum 6)
- PFAFF, Richard W.: *The Liturgy in Medieval England. A History.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- PGD = ANDRIEU, Michel (ed.): *Le Pontifical Romain au moyen-âge III. Le pontifical de Guillaume Durand.* Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1940. (Studi e Testi 88)
- POTTHAST, August: *Regesta pontificum Romanorum inde ab a. post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad a. MCCCIV. I.* Rudolf de Decker, Berlin 1874.
- POTTHAST, August: *Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters von 375–1500.* Hugo Kastner & C^o, Berlin 1862¹. 1896². 1584.
- POZZI, Gian Pietro: *Il „De modo celebrandi Concilium“ nel manoscritto Vat. Lat. 5748.* Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1965.
- PR = *Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII. Pont. Max. iussu restitutum atque editum.* Apud Iacobum Lunam, impensis Leonardi Parasoli et sociorum Roma 1595. (Facsimile: SODI—TRIACCA)
- PR12 = ANDRIEU, Michel (ed.): *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)
- PR13 = ANDRIEU, Michel (ed.): *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)
- PRG = VOGEL, Cyrille — ELZE, Reinhard (ed.): *Le pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle I–III.* Città del Vaticano 1963, 1972. (Studi e Testi 226–227, 269)
- PSEUDO-ALCUIN: *De divinis officiis liber.* Migne, Paris 1863. (Patrologia Latina 101) 1173–1286.
- PUNIET, Pierre de: „Formulaire grec de l'Épiphanie dans une traduction latine ancienne“, *Revue Bénédictine* XXIX (1912) 29–46.
- RADBERTUS, Pascasius: *De corpore et sanguine Domini.* (Patrologia Latina 120) (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediævalis 16). (magyarul: RADBERTUS, Paschasius — RATRAMNUS: *Az Úr Testéről és Véréről.* Budapest 2001. [Ford. Rokay Zoltán] 11–177.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: „A magyar középkor kótás kéziratái. Latin egyházi kéziratok jegyzéke“, *Magyar Zenei Szemle* I (1941) 93–101.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: „A magyar liturgia eredete a XI. században“, *Vigilia* XXII (1957) 391–399.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: „De originibus liturgiæ Romanæ in Hungaria sæculi XI.“, *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* XI (1959) 299–309.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: „Le plus ancien livre liturgique de Hongrie. Hazánk legrégebb liturgikus könyve,

- a Szelepchényi-kódex”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* (1939) 352–412.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: „Magyarország legrégebb liturgikus könyve: a Szelepchényi kódex”, *Szent István Akadémia Értesítője* XXIV (1939) 1–6.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: *Enchiridion liturgicum complectens theologiae sacramentalis et dogmata et leges iuxta novum codicem rubricarum* I–II. Herder, Roma—Fribourg—Barcelona 1961.
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: *Libri liturgici manu scripti bibliothecarum Hungariae*. Budapest 1947. (Az Orsz. Széchényi Könyvtár Kiadványai 26)
- RADÓ Polikárp OSB: *Libri liturgici manuscripti bibliothecarum Hungariae et limitropharum regionum*. Budapest 1973.
- RAJECZKY Benjamin OCist (ed.): *Magyarország zenetörténete I. Középkor*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1988.
- RASMUSSEN, Niels Krogh — HAVERALS, Marcel: *Les pontificaux du haut moyen âge. Genèse du livre de l'évêque*. Leuven 1998. (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 49)
- Rituale Romanum Pauli V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Ex typographia Reverendae Camerae Apostolicae, Roma 1614. (Facsimile: SODI—ARCAS)
- Rituale Romanum Pauli V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*. Ex typographia Reverendae Camerae Apostolicae, Roma 1614. (Facsimile: SODI — ARCAS)
- Rituale Strigoniense seu formula agendorum in administratione sacramentorum ac ceteris Ecclesiae functionibus*. Pustet, Regensburg—Roma—New York—Cincinnati 1909.
- Rituale Strigoniense, seu Formula Agendorum in administratione Sacramentorum, ac ceteris Ecclesiae publicis functionibus, iussu et auctoritate ... Petri Pázmány ... nunc recenter editum*. Pozsony 1625. (RMNy 1346)
- ROEDERER, Charlotte D.: „Can We Identify an Aquitanian Chant Style?”, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* XXVII (1974) 75–99.
- SAINT-ROCH, Patrik: *Liber sacramentorum Engolismensis, (MS.B.N.Lat. 816) Le sacramentaire Gélasiens d'Angoulême*. (Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 159/C) Brepols, Turnhout 1987.
- SAKAČ, Stjepan Krizin SI: „Krapina, Kijev, Ararat (krapinska, kijevska i armenska priča o trojici braće i jednoj sestri) [krapinai, kijevei és örmény mese a három fivérről és az egy nővérrel]”, *Život* XXI (1940) 129–149.
- SAn = Deshusses III.
- ŠAŠKO, Ivan (ed.): *Zagrebački pontifikal MR 124 (Metropolitanska knjižnica u Zagrebu, MR 124). Diplomatičko izdanje rukopisa i prikaz liturgijskoga ozračja*. Societas historica archi-episcopatus Zagrabienensis — Društvo za povjesnicu Zagrebačke nadbiskupije Tkalčić, Zagreb 2005. Monumenta liturgica ecclesiae Zagrabienensis — Bogoslužni spomenici Zagrebačke crkve 1)
- SCHMITTH Miklós SI: *Archi-Episcopi Strigonienses*. Typis Academicis Societatis Iesu, Nagyszombat/Trnava 1752¹ 1758².
- SCHRAMM, P. E.: „Die Krönung bei den Westfranken von 878 bis um 1000”, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* XXIII (1934) 117–242. Appendix IV. 201–207. and V. 208.
- SGF = DUMAS, A. OSB: *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis* I–II. Brepols, Turnhout 1981. (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 159–159A)
- SGr = LIETZMANN, Hans (ed.): *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Urexemplar*. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster Westfalen 1921. (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 3)
- SGV = MOHLBERG, Cunibert OSB — EIZENHÖFER, Leo OSB — SIFFRIN, Petrus OSB (ed.): *Liber sacramentorum Romanae ecclesiae ordinis anni circuli (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (Sacramentarium Gelasianum)*. Casa Editrice Herder, Roma 1960. (Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series Maior. Fontes 4)

- SODI, Manlio — ARCAS, Juan Javier Flores: *Rituale Romanum. Editio princeps (1614)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2004. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 5)
- SODI, Manlio — ARCAS, Juan Javier Flores: *Rituale Romanum. Editio princeps (1614)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2004. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 5)
- SODI, Manlio — TRIACCA, Achille Maria: *Breviarium Romanum. Editio princeps (1568)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1999. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 3)
- SODI, Manlio — TRIACCA, Achille Maria: *Missale Romanum. Editio princeps (1570)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1998. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 2)
- SODI, Manlio — TRIACCA, Achille Maria: *Pontificale Romanum. Editio princeps (1595–1596)*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1997. (Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini 1)
- SODI, Manlio — TONIOLO Alessandro: *Pontificale Romanum. Editio typica 1961–1962*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 2008.
- SOMOGYI Szilvia: „A Hartvik-agenda és a kánonjog”, in KÁDÁR Zsófia — MIKÓ Gábor — PÉTERFI Bence — VADAS András (ed.): *Micæ mediæuales. Tanulmányok a középkori Magyarországról és Európáról*. ELTE BTK Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola, Budapest 2011. 119–129.
- SOPKO, Július — VALACH, Július: *Codex Nitriensis. Nitriansky kódex*. Matica slovenská, Martin/Túrócszentmárton 1987. (garamszentbenedeki evangeliárium)
- STÄBLEIN, Bruno (ed.): *Hymnen (I). Die mittelalterlichen Hymnenmelodien des Abendlandes*. Bärenreiter, Kassel—Basel 1956. (Monumenta Monodica Medii Ævi 1)
- STÄBLEIN, Bruno: *Schreibbild der einstimmigen Musik*. VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, Leipzig 1975.
- STEINER, Ruth: „Tropé”, in SADIE, Stanley (ed.): *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. MacMillan, London 1980. XIX. 172–187.
- STOTZ, Peter: *Ardua spes mundi. Studien zu lateinischen Gedichten aus Sankt Gallen*. H. Lang, Bern—Frankfurt am Main 1972. (Geist und Werk der Zeiten 32)
- STOTZ, Peter: *Handbuch der lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters I–IV*. Verlag C. H. Beck, München 1998–2002.
- SZASZOVSKY Ágnes: *A Veszprémi pontifikále templomszentelési ordója*. DLA disszertáció, Budapest, Liszt Ferenc Zeneművészeti Egyetem, Egyházzenei Doktori Iskola 2013. (forthcoming)
- SZENDREI Janka — Richard RIBARIČ (ed.): *Missale Notatum Strigoniense ante 1341 in Posonio*. Budapest 1982. (Musicalia Danubiana 1)
- SZENDREI Janka (ed.): *Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense sæculi XIII*. Budapest 1998. (Musicalia Danubiana 17)
- SZENDREI Janka: „« Lætabitur deserta ». Itáliai repertoárdarabok a közép-európai gregoriánumban”, *Magyar Egyházzene* IX (2001/2002) 193–204.
- SZENDREI Janka: „A Veszprémi Pontificale mint zenetörténeti forrás”, in V. FODOR Zs. (ed.): *Tudomány és művészet Veszprémben a 13–15. században*. Veszprém 1997. 29–41.
- SZENDREI Janka: „Tropenbestand der ungarischen Handschriften” in *International Musicological Society Study Group Cantus Planus, Papers Read at the Third Meeting, Tihany, Hungary, 19–24. September 1988*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 1990. 297–325.
- SZENDREI Janka: *A „mos patriæ” kialakulása 1341 előtti hangjegyes forrásaink tükrében*. Balassi, Budapest 2005.
- SZENDREI Janka: *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 1981. (Műhelytanulmányok a magyar zenetörténethez 1) (Recenzió: HUGLO, Michel, *Scriptorium* XXXV 90*-91*.)
- SZENDREI Janka: *Középkori hangjegyzírások Magyarországon. A magyar notáció története — Német neumatírások Magyarországon*. MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, Budapest 1983. (Műhelytanulmányok a magyar zenetörténethez 4) (Recenzió: HUGLO, Michel, *Scriptorium* XXXV 90*-91*.)
- SZENTIRMAI Sándor: „Die ungarische Diözesansynode im Spätmittelalter”, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-*

- Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* LXXVIII (1961) 266–292.
- SZENTPÉTERY Imre: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadiana gestarum II*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia — Magyar Történeti Társaság, Budapest 1938¹. Nap, Budapest 1999². (Függelék és utószó: SZOVÁK Kornél — VESZPRÉMY László: „Pótlás”. 683skk.)
- SZIGETI Kilián OSB: „A magyarországi római szertartású liturgia vázlatos története”, in VÁRNAGY Antal: *Liturgika*. Lámpás, Abaliget 1999. (először 1975-ben jelent meg jegyzetként)
- SZIGETI Kilián OSB: „Denkmäler des gregorianischen Chorals aus dem ungarischen Mittelalter”, *Studia Musicologica* IV (1963) 133. 135. 150.
- SZIGETI Kilián OSB: „Mesko veszprémi püspök (1334–44) Pontificaléja”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* LXXXVIII (1972) 5–14.
- SZOVÁK Kornél: „Győri püspökség története”, in KRISTÓ Gyula — ENGEL Pál — MAKK Ferenc (ed.): *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1994. 244.
- SZUROMI Szabolcs Anzelm OPræm: „Az ankyrai zsinat kánonja az első két esztergomi zsinaton”, in ERDŐ Péter (ed.): *Tanulmányok a magyarországi egyházjog középkori történetéről. Kézírtos kódexek, zsinatok, középkori műfajok*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest 2002. 77–86.
- SZUROMI Szabolcs Anzelm OPræm: „Egy XII. századi lelkipásztori zsebkönyv. A National Library of Scotland, Edinburg Ms. 18. 8. 6. jelzetű kézírata”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* CXXII/4 (2006) 468–478.
- SZUROMI Szabolcs Anzelm OPræm: „Les synodes d’Esztergom et les collections canoniques en Hongrie au XII^e siècle”, in UŐ (ed.): *Medieval Canon Law Collections and European Ius Commune. Középkori kánonjoggyűjtemények és az európai ius commune*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest 2006. 32–46.
- TAKAYAMA, Hiroshi: *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily*. E. J. Brill, Leiden—Boston 1993. (The Medieval Mediterranean 3)
- TELLER Frigyes: „Monumenti di musica sacra nell’ Ungheria medievale”, *Corvina* LXV (1942)
- TELLER Frigyes: *Magyarország középkori hangjelzett kódexei*. Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum Országos Széchényi Könyvtára, Budapest 1944. 31.
- THÉRY, Gabriel: *Études dionysiennes*. Vrin, Paris 1932. I. 101.
- THOROCZKAY Gábor: „Megjegyzések a Hartvik-féle Szent István-legenda datálásának kérdéséhez”, in PITI Ferenc — SZABADOS György: „Magyaroknak eleiről”. *Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvanesztendő Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*. Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, Szeged 2000. 569–591.
- TKALČIĆ, Ivan Krstitelj — LASZOVSKI, Emilij: *Povjesni spomenici slobodnog kraljevskog grada Zagreba prijestolnice kraljevine dalmatinsko-hrvatsko-slavonske I–XI*. [Zágráb szabad királyi város és dalmát-horvát-szlavón királyi főváros történelmi emlékei]. K. Albrecht, Zagreb 1884–1905.
- TKALČIĆ, Ivan Krstitelj: „Dva inventara prvostolne crkve zagrebačke iz XIV. i XV. vieka” [A zágrábi káptalan két inventáriuma a XIV. és a XV. századból], in *Starine na sviät izdaje Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti XIII*. Zagreb 1881.
- TOMKA Péter: „Győr”, in KRISTÓ Gyula — ENGEL Pál — MAKK Ferenc (ed.): *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1994. 243–244.
- TÖRÖK József: „11–12. századi liturgikus kódexeink tipológiája”, in SZELESTEI N. László (szerk.): *Tanulmányok a középkori magyarországi könyvkultúráról. Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtárban 1986. február 13–14-én rendezett konferencia előadásai*. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1989. (Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kiadványai. Új Sorozat 3) 63–76. 70–71.
- TÖRÖK József: „A középkori magyarországi liturgia története”, in SZELESTEI N. László (szerk.): *Kódexek a középkori Magyarországon*. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1985. 49–65.
- TÖRÖK József: „Az Esztergomi Benedictionale”, in BEKE Margit (ed.): *Kezds és újakezds*. Márton Áron Kiadó, Budapest 1993. (Prímási Levéltár Kiadványai. Strigonium Antiquum 2) 69–71.
- TÖRÖK József: *A magyar pálosrend liturgiájának forrásai, kialakulása és főbb sajátosságai (1225–1600)*. Római Katolikus Hittudományi Akadémia, Budapest 1977.

- TÖRÖK József: *A tizenegyedik század magyar egyháztörténete*. Mikes Kiadó, Budapest 2002.
- TURNER, Cuthbert Hamilton: „The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum Attributed to Gennadius”, *The Journal of Theological Studies* VII (1906) 89sk.
- TURNER, Cuthbert Hamilton: *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima. Canonum et conciliorum Graecorum interpretationes Latinae I–II*. Clarendon, Oxford 1899–1935. 304.
- TURNER, D. H.: *The Claudius Pontificals (From Cotton Ms. Claudius A.iii in the British Museum)*. Chichester 1971. (Henry Bradshaw Society 97)
- UNTERKIRCHER, E. F.: *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale des Bischofs Baturich von Regensburg (817–848). Mit einer liturgiegeschichtlichen Untersuchung von Klaus Gamber*. Fribourg 1962. (Spicilegium Friburgense 8)
- VALJAVEC, Fritz: *Der deutsche Kultureinfluss im nahen Südosten. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Ungarns I*. M. Schick, München 1940.
- VARJÚ Elemér: *Legenda sancti regis Stephani. Szent István király legendái a legrégebb kézirat alapján az Ernst-kodex hasonmásával*. Singer & Wolfner, Budapest 1928.
- VESZPRÉMY László: „A 12. századi magyar kódexírás alakulása”, *Századok* CXXXII (1998) 222–230.
- VESZPRÉMY László: „Legkorábbi hazai sacramentariumaink”, in SZELESTEI N. László (szerk.): *Tanulmányok a középkori magyarországi könyvkultúráról. Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtárban 1986. február 13–14-én rendezett konferencia előadásai*. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest 1989. (Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kiadványai. Új Sorozat 3) 121–135.
- VOGEL, Cyrille: *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources. Revised and Translated by William Storey and Niels Rasmussen*. Pastoral Press, Portland—Oregon 1986.
- WAGNER, Peter: *Einführung in die gregorianischen Melodien III. Gregorianische Formenlehre: Eine korallische Stilkunde*. Breitkopf und Härtel, Leipzig 1921.
- WARNER, G. F. — WILSON, H. A.: *The Benedictional of St Aethelwood, Bishop of Winchester (A. D. 963–984)*. Oxford 1910. (Publications of the Roxburghe Club 156)
- WASSERSCHLEBEN, Friedrich Wilhelm August (ed.): *Reginonis abbatis Prumiensis libri duo de synodali bus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*. Guil. Engelmann, Lipsce 1840. 369sq.
- WILSON, H. A.: *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*. London 1903. (Henry Bradshaw Society 24)
- WILSON, Henry Austin (ed.): *The Gelasian Sacramentary. Liber sacramentorum romanæ ecclesie (Vat. Reg. 316)*. Oxford 1894.
- WOOLEY, R. M.: *The Canterbury Benedictional*. London 1951. (Henry Bradshaw Society 51)
- WRIGHT, Craig: „The Palm Sunday Procession in Medieval Chartres”, in FASSLER, Margot E. — BALTZER, Rebecca A.: *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages. Methodology and Source Studies, Regional Developments, Hagiography*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2000. 344–371. <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=90322578>>
- YOUNG, Karl: *The Drama of the Medieval Church I–II*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1933.
- ZALÁN Menyhért: „A Pray-kódex benedictiói”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* (1927) 44–66.
- ZÁVODSZKY Levente: *A Szent István, Szent László és Kálmán korabeli törvények és zsinati határozatok forrásai*. Szent István Társulat, Budapest 1904.
- ZSOLDOS Attila: *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301*. História — MTA Történettudományi Intézete, Budapest 2011. (História Könyvtár. Kronológiák, adattárak 11)

Manuscripts

- Albi, Bibliothèque Rochemade Ms. 20 (olim 34). *Akvitánia (Albi/Aurillac?)*, s. X.
- BNS = Praha, Strahovská Knihovna (Bibliotheca Monasterii Strahoviensis) DE. I. 7. *Breviarium notatum Strigoniense seculi XIII*. (Facsimile: SZENDREI)
- Bruxelles, Bibliothèque des Bollandistes 299. s. XI.

- Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Clmæ. 330. *Biburg 1178–1199*.
- CA = Graz, Universitätsbibliothek No. 211. (olim 40/90, 4^o) (Facsimile: FALVY—MEZEY)
- Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Barb. Lat. 631.
- Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Cod. Lat. 7701. *Italia, s. X*.
- Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ms. Barberini Lat. 631. *Pontificale abbatis Desiderii, Monte Cassino 1057–1086*
- Częstochowa, Archiwum Paulinów, 583. R. I. 215. *Cantuale Paulinum sæculi XV*.
- Eichstätt, Diözesenarchiv, Ms. B 4 (PRG Eichstätt, II. Gondekar)
- Escorial, Real biblioteca, ms. J. III. 24. *Pontificale Arelatense (Arles) s. XIII. ineuntis*. 114sqq.
- Esztergom, Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár Ms. I. 214. *Cosenza 1491–1495*.
- Esztergom, Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár Mss. III. 180. *Evangelistarium Leodiense (Liège/Lüttich) (?) s. XII*. („Codex Oláh”)
- Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek Cod. 107. R 79. *Missale Paulinorum*.
- Güssing, Klosterbibliothek der Franziskaner Cod. 1/43. *Missale notatum Zagradiense s. XIII/1*. („Németújvár Missal”)
- Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi 2429. *Graduale Budense (?) 1463*. („Gradual Futaki”)
- Köln, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek Cod. 139–140. *Pontificale Coloniense (PRG) s. XII*.
- Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek Frag. 1. (Lambach) s. XI.
- Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale Ms. 263. s. XIII.
- Leyden, University Library BPL (Codices Bibliothecæ Publicæ Latini) 111:2. *Beauvais, s. IX–X*.
- London, British Library Add. 23922. *Argentinum (Straßburg)*
- London, British Library Ms. Addit. 57.337 (Anderson Pontifical). *Angolszász (Canterbury/Winchester?)*, ca. 1000
- Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, ms. 678. 146sqq.
- Magdeburg, Domgymnasium Ms. 154. *Benedictionale* (destroyed)
- Milánó, Biblioteca Ambrosiana Ms. Z 52 sup. (PRG ?)
- MNS = Bratislava, Archiv Mesta EC. Lad. 3. & EL. 18. *Missale notatum Strigoniense ante 1341*. (Facsimile: SZENDREI — RIBARIČ)
- Monte Cassino, Archivio dell' Arciabazia Ms. 451 NN (PRG Roma)
- Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H 304. (*Montpellier*) s. XII.
- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14477. (*Malmédy*)
- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6264a. *Frisingense (Freising) s. XI*.
- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm. 21587 et 6425. *Pontificale Egilberti, episcopi Frisingensis, s. XII/1*.
- Nyitra/Nitra, Káptalani Könyvtár, jelzet nélkül. *Evangelistarium s. XII*. („Codex Szelepcsényi”)
- OA = *Ordinarius secundum veram notulam sive rubricam alme ecclesie Agriensis de observatione divinarum officiorum et horarum canonicarum*. Kraków 1509. (RMK III. 157.) (Edition: DOBSZAY)
- Orléans, Bibliothèque de la Ville 201. *Floriacense (St Benoit sur Loire/Fleury) s. XIII*. (XII?)
- Orléans, Bibliothèque de la Ville Ms. 201. *Livre de Jeux de Fleury/Fleury Playbook ca. 1200*.
- OS = *Ordinarius seu ordo divinus secundum aliam Strigoniensem ecclesiam*. [Nürnberg, s. XV. end] (RMK III. 70a) (Kiadás: FÖLDVÁRY)
- P = Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár MNy. 1. Codex Pray, monastic sacramentary of Boldva, s. XII.
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 1224. *Sagiense (Sées) s. XV*.
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 13070 & 13072. (*Reims*) s. XIV. (ismeretlen)
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 13074. s. X. (toldalékos bejegyzés)
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 1708. *Nivernense (Nevers) s. XI*.
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 4278. *Canonical collection of 309 chapters, Reims, s. IX/2*.

- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 4278. s. IX/2.
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 820. (Regius 3866) *Pontificale Salisburgense (Salzburg) ad usum ecclesiae Sagiensis (Sééz) s. XI.*
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 904. *Rotomagense (Rouen) s. XIII.*
- Paris, Bibliothèque national de France Lat. 943. (*Canterbury*) s. XI/2.
- Párizs, Bibliothèque national de France Ms. Lat. 1217. *Moissac (Cahors?), IX–XI. század*
- Párizs, Bibliothèque national de France Ms. Lat. 943 (Dunstan Pontifical). *Anglo-Saxon (Sherborne?), 960–1001*
- Pistoia, Archivio capitolare del duomo Ms. C 141 (PRG Lucca)
- Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky XLIV. G 44. *Agenda Pragensis 1476–1479.*
- PZ = Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 124. *Pontificale Zagradiense saeculi XIII. ineuntis.* (Facsimile: ŠAŠKO)
- Reims, Bibliothèque municipale Ms. 340. *Pontificale, Reims, s. X–XI.*
- Reims, Bibliothèque municipale Ms. 340. *Reims, s. X–XI.*
- Róma, Biblioteca Alessandrina (Universitaria) Ms. 173 (PRG Salzburg, Róma)
- Roma, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Lat. 479.
- Roma, Biblioteca Valliscelliana, cod. D. 5: s. XI. (beneventan script thus probably South Italy)
- Rouen, Bibliothèque de la Ville Ms. 384. *Rotomagense (Rouen) s. XIV.*
- Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. A 143.
- Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. A 27. (*Saint-Germans [Cornwall]*) s. X.
- Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. A 293. (*Jumièges?*) s. XII.
- Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. A 425.
- Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. Y 62a (*Évreux*) s. XV.
- Szentpétervár, National Library of Russia Ms. Q. v. I, no 35. *Sens, 900 körül*
- Szentpétervár, Orosz Nemzeti Könyvtár ms. Q. v. I, no 35. *Senonense (Sens) ca. 900.*
- Tnava, Literárny Archív Spolku Svätého Vojtecha Fasc. 322. Nr. 10. *Fragmentum MNS*
- Tnava/Nagyszombat, Literárny Archív Spolku Svätého Vojtecha Fasc. 322. Nr. 10. *Fragmentum MNS (Reconciliatio penitentium)*
- Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 14: s. XI/1. (uncertain origin)
- Vitry-le-François, Bibliothèque municipale Ms. 36 (PRG Salzburg, Châlons-sur-Marne)
- Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. *Biblia 834–866.* („Rado-Bibel”)
- Wolfenbüttel stb. 555 Helmst. (PRG Ansbach?)
- Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek Ms. Guelf. 15 Weißenburg (PRG Besançon)
- Wolfenbüttel, Landes-Hauptarchiv Ms. VII B 313. *Benedictionale (Braunschweig)*
- Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 108. *Processionale Zagradiense 1698.*
- Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 133. *Missale Zagradiense s. XIV.*
- Zagreb, Knjižnica Metropolitana MR 46. *Breviarium Zagradiense s. XV.*

Incunables and Early Prints

- Agenda [Magdeburgensis].* Moritz Brandis, Magdeburg 1497.
- Agenda ecclesiae cathedralis Plocensis.* Scharffenberg, Kraków 1554.
- Agenda ecclesiae Moguntinensis.* Franz Behem, Mainz 1551.
- Agenda Olomucensis.* Nürnberg 1498.
- Agenda Paderbornensis.* Matthæus Pontanus, Paderborn 1602.
- Agenda rerum ecclesiasticum secundum consuetum usum Mindensis diæcesis omni Christi ovium pastori summe necessaria.* Melchior Lotther, Leipzig 1522.
- Agenda Saltzburgensis.* Jakob Pfortzheim, Basel 1511.

- Agenda sive benedictionale de actibus Ecclesie secundum chorum et observationem ecclesie Pataviensis.* Basel 1514.
- Missale ad usum Virdunensis ecclesie.* Jean de Prato, Paris 1491.
- Missale Argentinense.* Basel 1486/1490.
- Missale Basieliense.* Michael Wenssler, Basel 1488.
- Missale Coloniense.* Köln 1494.
- Missale Gnesnense et Cracoviense.* Mainz 1492.
- Missale Hildensemense.* Georg Stuchs, Nürnberg 1511.
- Missale Leodiensis ecclesie.* Speier 1502.
- Obsequiale Augustense.* Erhard Ratdolt, Augsburg 1487.
- Obsequiale Brixinense.* Erhard Ratdolt, Augsburg 1493+.
- Obsequiale Eystetense.* Michael Reyser, Eichstätt 1488.
- Obsequiale Frisingense.* Erhard Ratdolt, Augsburg 1493.
- Obsequiale Ratisponense.* Georg Stuchs, Nürnberg 1491.
- Obsequiale sive benedictionale secundum ecclesiam Constantiensem.* Erhard Ratdolt, Augsburg 1510.