

UDK 091 (497.5) "10/12"
 264-1 (497.5) "10/12"
 949.75 "10/12" (093)
 Pregledni rad
 Primljeno: 23. 12. 1998.

11th and 13th Century Liturgical Manuscripts (mostly from Zagreb) as Historical Sources

László Veszprémy

CEU - Institut za vojnu povijest, Budimpešta, Republika Mađarska

The most important document of Hungarian book of culture in the Árpád Age (1000-1301) is the Pannonhalma book list of 80 items dating around 1093, more than half of which are liturgical in content.¹ Typically enough, none of these items have been identified with extant copies. However, thanks to the medieval manuscripts, mainly those preserved in Zagreb, research into liturgy and liturgical books in the Árpád Age can also be investigated. These manuscripts are not merely sources of church history but complex historical sources whose significance in the history of culture, palaeography and politics is outstanding.

Interest in these liturgical manuscripts was at most sporadic after 1945, so it can safely be stated that research overlooked them, both those inside and those outside Hungary. In this way they failed to be included in the second edition of Radó's *Libri liturgici* of 1973,² a collection of liturgical books from historical Hungary. After 1945, the first major representative exhibition of medieval Hungarian manuscripts was staged in 1985 at the National Library in Budapest.³ For practical reasons, however, all manuscripts preserved today in Slovakia and Croatia were missing, which indicates that there is pressing need for a new exhibition, the joint elaboration of the material and the publication of facsimile editions.

An upswing came in the research of these manuscripts in Hungary when in the 1980s László Dobszay and Janka Szendrei of the Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences initiated an investigation of medieval liturgical manuscripts with musical notation in

¹ György Györffy ed., *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima*. Vol. 1. Budapest, 1992. Nr. 100. pp. 295-301., L. Veszprémy, *La biblioteca nell'inventario della fine del secolo undicesimo (1093-1095)*, in József Pál-Ádám Somorjai eds., *Mille anni di storia dell'Arcidiocesi di Pannonhalma*, 1997. Roma-Pannonhalma, 1997. pp. 83-100.

² P. Radó, *Libri liturgici manuscripti bibliothecarum Hungariae et limitropharum regionum*. Budapest, 1973. The best catalogue on Zagreb manuscripts is D. Kniewald, *Zagrebački liturgijski kodeksi XI.-XV. stoljeća*, Zagreb, 1940.

³ András Vizkelety ed., *Kódexek a középkori Magyarországon [Codices in Medieval Hungary]*, Budapest, 1985.

order to identify them and collate them with diocesan practice.⁴ It is their insight that the structure of the *Antiphonale* material is the best suited to differentiate local traditions. They also pointed out that within the books, the *temporale* contained the more constant elements while *sanctorale* was more exposed to fashion and individual interpretation. The examination of the structure of these books has shown that one can safely make hypotheses about the early liturgy in the Árpád Age, its regional characteristics from the 14th-15th century sources, and, on the basis of the established features, the earliest, mostly solitary manuscripts can also be identified by their liturgical characteristics. As a result of these researches, the usus of Kalocsa, Zagreb, Transylvania and Esztergom could be differentiated among the manuscripts.

Out of our early manuscripts, the Transylvanian practice is illustrated by *Codex Albensis* (12th/1 c. Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 211),⁵ that of Zagreb by *Missale notatum* of Güssing (13th/1 c. Klosterbibliothek der Franziskaner, Ms I/43, earlier 28),⁶ that of Esztergom by *Breviarium* in Zagreb (13th/2 c. MR67) and by a *Breviarium notatum* (13th-14th c. Prague, Pam. národ DE, I, 7).⁷ Not only liturgical but also historical arguments suggest that the Esztergom tradition is mirrored by the earliest "St Margaret" *Sacramentarium* of Zagreb (MR 126),⁸ by the Szelepcsényi *Evangelistarium* (Nitra, Chapter Library)⁹ and a *Benedictionale* also from Zagreb (MR 89), as well as *Codex Prayanus* (Budapest, Nat. Lib. MNy 1),¹⁰ while the *Pontificale* alludes to its Győr origin (MR 165).¹¹ The structural analysis led the musicologists to conclude that in these archiepiscopal, episcopal practices there was a common layer represented in the Hungarian liturgical manuscripts, and the basic stratum of this proved to be unchanged from the 12th to the 17th century inside the borders.¹²

My own investigations focussing on the *sanctorale* and the palaeographic characteristics of the manuscripts fits well the above discussed results. While the *temporale* plays the greatest role in the reconstruction of a diocesan usus, the wanderings, codicological and liturgical proveniences

⁴ Janka Szendrei, *A magyar középkor hangjegyes forrásai* [Music Sources of the Hungarian Middle Ages], Budapest, 1981; László Dobszay, *The System of the Hungarian Plain-song Sources*. *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 27, 1985, pp. 37-65; L. Dobszay-Gábor Prószéky, *Corpus antiphonarium Officij. Ecclesiarum Centralis Europae. A Preliminary Report*, Budapest, 1988.

⁵ Facsimile edition Zoltán Falvy-László Mezey eds., *Codex Albensis. Ein Antiphonar aus dem 12. Jh.*, Budapest-Graz, 1963. This codex according to marginal notes probably was used in the Zagreb Bishopric during the 13th century. *Kódexek*, op. cit., pp. 88.

⁶ L. Dobszay, *Árpád-kori misekönyvünk provenienciója* [Provenience of a Missal from Medieval Hungary], *Zeneturományi Dolgozatok*, 1984, pp. 7-12.

⁷ J. Szendrei, *Esztergomi Breviarium Notatum Prágában* [Breviarium Notatum Strigoniense in a Prague Library], in: *Tanulmányok*, pp. 137-154. Identified by the *temporale* part, because the *calendarium* and *sanctorale* parts of the manuscript are missing.

⁸ Legutóbb L. Veszprémy, *Legkorábbi hazai sacramentáriumaink* [The First Sacramentaries in Hungary], in: László Szelestei N. ed., *Tanulmányok a könyvkultúráról*, Budapest, 1989., pp. 121-135.

⁹ Facsimile edition: J. Sopko - J. Valoch eds., *Codex Nitriensis-Nitriansky kódex*. Martin: Matica Slovenská, 1987.; Legutóbb Veszprémy L., *A nyitrai evangelistarium. az ún. Szelepcsényi kódex* [The Evangelistarium of Nitra, the So Called Szelepcsényi Codex], *Ars Hungarica*, 1993., 5-9.

¹⁰ A short description by J. Szendrei - L. Veszprémy in: *Kódexek*, op. cit. Nr. 23., pp. 89-90.

¹¹ D. Kniewald, *Hartwick győri püspök Agenda pontificalisa* [The Agenda Pontificalis of Hartwick, Bishop of Győr], *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 1941., pp. 1-21.

¹² L. Dobszay, *A középkori magyar liturgia István-kori elemei* [Some Parts of the Hungarian Liturgy of Stephen the Saint's Age], in: F. Glatz - J. Kardos eds., *Szent István és kora*, Budapest, 1988., pp. 151-155.

of the codices can best be retraced on the basis of references to saints.

Only sporadic information has come down to us about the contacts of the early, 11th-12th century Hungarian church with other regions in Europe, e.g. about foreign bishops and monks visiting Hungary, their missionary activity, pilgrimages or office tenure. It was precisely this scarcity of sources and data that directed the attention of researches at the liturgical codex sections referring to the feasts of saints - the *sanctorale* and the *calendarium*, and their writing. However many times a manuscript was copied, the feasts of saints in it - perhaps never heard of earlier - were preserved while the names of the patron saints venerated at the place of copying, or of saints typical of the region or country and their prayers were also added.

On the basis of feasts, as well as paleographic and text critical considerations one may venture to tie a reconstructed former state of the text prior even to several instances of copying to a place and region. In this case, one can speak about the reconstructed master copy of the codex (*Masterexemplar*), or, if even earlier state can be hypothesized, it is the original master copy (*Ur-masterexemplar*). The establishment of the origin of the codices, the retracing of their itineraries can turn the otherwise international manuscripts - copied all over Latin christianity with smaller or greater variations - into identifiable and intelligible historical sources for the cultural history of individual countries.

Research into the lists of saints in liturgical manuscripts was initiated in the interwar period by Dragutin Kniewald, a university professor of Zagreb, who achieved lasting results. Most regrettably, he had no followers - at least in Hungary. Investigations so far, however, often overlooked the possibility of multiple copying and complementation, thus washing over the different liturgical strata. His findings were also influenced by politics between the two world wars: together with two of his Hungarian colleagues (Polikárp Radó, Flóris Kúhár) he firmly opposed the excessive German cultural influence, e.g. Fritz Valjavec. Valjavec subsumed the Hungarian manuscripts in general, even those of a Frankish character such as the codex of St. Margaret church, under the "German cultural sphere".¹³ Emphasis shifted to the "nationality" of saints, hence escalating into a Franco-German rivalry. The one-sided stressing of the French influence characterized the articles of F. Kúhár in *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie* in 1938 and a planned paper of P. Radó to be published in *Revue d'histoire comparée* in 1948.¹⁴ The investigations of the liturgical material (*temporal*, *sanctorale*, *calendarium*) and the examination of writing complement and interpret one another's outcomes.

Coming to individual manuscripts, let me first make a short mention of ones belonging to the Esztergom usus. Not all the relevant manuscripts survive in Zagreb, but since the earliest ones of the Zagreb episcopacy are of Esztergom origin, the choice is not unjustified. The earliest relic of the Esztergom *officium* is the Zagreb breviary MR 67, but the Esztergom origin of the "St Margaret" *sacramentarium* (MR 126) and the *Benedictionale* (MR 89) of Zagreb is also unquestionable. Also to be mentioned are the Szelepchényi *evangelistarium* and the *sacramentarium* of the *Codex Prayanus*, as well as the early 14th century *Missale notatum* also of Esztergom, prior to

¹³ F. Valjavec, *Geschichte der deutschen Kulturbeziehungen zu Südost-Europa*. Bd. 1. Mittelalter. München, 1953./1st ed., 1940/ 40, 43, 241-242.

¹⁴ F. Kúhár, *Les sources francaises de la vie liturgique en Hongrie*. *Nouvelle Revue de la Hongrie*, 1938, pp. 423-427.; P. Radó's paper "Sur l'origine française de la liturgie hongroise" finally was published only in Hungarian: *Vigilia*, 1957, pp. 391-399.

1341.¹⁵ Let it be noted at this juncture that if at the end of the 11th century Zagreb was supplied with books conformous with the Esztergom usus, it is hard to presume that the archbishopric of Kalocsa, to which Zagreb was later subordinated, was founded by King St Stephen I. On the other hand it is the hypothesis of musicologists that Zagreb was the very diocese that had preserved most faithfully the distinguishing characteristics of a local usus within the Kalocsa-Bács archdiocese.

The earliest of our extant liturgical books is the so-called Szelepchényi *evangelistarium* of Nitra.¹⁶ Since Radó's researches, it has been proven convincingly that its system of *pericopae* is identical with that in the Cologne-Trier usus, and even some Old Gallican liturgical features can be detected in it. It was, however, reworked into its present form in Hungary, in the late 11th century, unequivocally proven by the feast of St Adalbert. The unusually high number of feasts for St Benedict suggests that it originated with the Benedictines. At the same time, however, there is a distinct representation of the group of saints around St Gallen and Cologne, apart from the local Norman feast of Michael (16 Oct.) and that of Gildardus, bishop of Rouen (8 June). The Cologne-Trier origin is also confirmed by the art historical analysis of the initials and the palaeographic examination of the script, with analogies in volumes of dated French manuscripts. The Cologne feasts (of Pantaleon, Gereon, Severinus, 11 thousand virgins) and the St Gallen group (Gallus, Othmar and other German saints) can be markedly differentiated. The latter were apparently added in the course of the wanderings of the original copy. Mention should also be made here of another manuscript of a lettering and illustration definitely in French style, the *Evangelistarium* of Zagreb MR 154. This, however, was probably not copied in Hungary.¹⁷

The earliest among liturgical codices with truly Hungarian specificities is the "St Margaret" *sacramentarium* of the late 11th, turn of the 12th century.¹⁸ With the exception of Zoerard/Andrew and Benedict, the Hungarian saints canonized in 1083, as well as Adalbert received their place among the votive masses. It can be presumed that the prayers of Andrew and Benedict were copied into the manuscript before their canonization; Andrew is called *patronus noster* in the manuscript and is included in the litanies of All Saints. The *Urmusterexemplar* of the manuscript is referred to by the locally worshipped saints in the western areas of the Carolingian Empire mentioned in the *sanctorale*: Samson (bishop of Dol, Bretagne), Wandregilis (first abbot of Fontenelle), Audonius (Rebais, Fontenelle), whom his prayer calls "our father". This much knowledge led Germain Morin and Kniewald to name Fontenelle, the Abbey of St Wandrille, as the original source of the copy. The interpolated prayers of the Afra must have made their way into the codex during its peregrinations, perhaps when copied in Hungary.

It compounds the question that the location of the feasts of Andrew and Benedict in the main text of the codex suggests the manuscript had been revised at a place patronized by Andrew

¹⁵ Fascimile edition J. Szendrey-Richard Rybáříč eds., *Missale notatum Strigoniense ante 1341 in Posonio, Budapest, 1982, Musicalia Danubiana, 1.*

¹⁶ See note 9.

¹⁷ T. Wehli, *A zágrábi püspökség Szt. László-kori kódexei* [Codices of the Zagreb Bishopric from St. Ladislav's Age], in: *Szent László és Somogyvár. Tanulmányok a 900 éves somogyvári bencés apátság emlékezetére*, Kaposvár, 1992, pp. 83-97.

¹⁸ See note 8.

and Benedict jointly. Finally, the codex acquired its third, and extant state at a church with St Margaret of Antioch's *patrocinium*, clearly mentioned in *Missa in monasterio pro fratribus*. The recording of Adalbert's second mass *orationis* again directs attention to the area of the Esztergom diocese. If this Margaret *patrocinium* is identical with the St Margaret monastery included in the list of churches in the Esztergom *Benedictionale* preserved in Zagreb, and this can be presumed with justification, then the manuscript itself is brought into connection with the St Margaret chapter church of Dömös: either the Margaret *patrocinium* is set before the known foundation of the Dömös church by the Hungarian prince Álmos in 1108, or the copying of the *sacramentarium* together with the *Benedictionale* cannot be dated to earlier than the first years of the 12th century.

It is also illuminating to analyse the Esztergom *Missale Notatum* (Bratislava, City Archives, EC Lad. 3, EL 18) dating prior to 1341. Being fairly late and highly stratified, only the local layers of feasts are to be discussed here. Most interestingly, these mostly coincide with the group of feasts that are missing from the first printed Esztergom missal (1484), which means, they remained alien to a range of liturgical development in Hungary. The long row of Trier bishops is conspicuous among them: Marius, Valerius (29 Jan.), Modoaldus (12 May), Maximinus, Ludvinus (29 Sept.) and Nicetius (1 Oct.), who normally only turns up on his feast day in Trier, and Eucharius (9 or 10 Dec.). their involvement in the list of saints in Esztergom must have been done centuries earlier. Their origin apparently goes back to the early centuries.¹⁹

The importance of the Esztergom Breviary in Zagreb for Hungarian history and literary history was pointed out by Kniewald himself. What intrigues the scholar here is the inclusion of the same little known imperial saints in the list of saints as in other Esztergom books. Let only three be named here: Audonius (24-25 Aug.) revered in Fontenelle as was seen in the St Margaret *Sacramentarium*. He occurs five times in Hungarian manuscripts, all five times in Esztergom documents; Maurilius, the bishop of Angers (12-13 Sept.) is mentioned 5 times, 4 times in Esztergom manuscripts and once in a documents of the Paulite order ad hereing to the Esztergom rite; Ewurtius, bishop of Orleans (7 Sept.) occurs practically only in Esztergom documents, 5 times. This cautions us again that besides the *temporale*, the *sanctorale* also preserves local traditions.²⁰

Similar stratified construction can be uncovered in several other manuscripts e.g. in the missal of Güssing (first half of 13th c.) copied for the Zagreb diocese, in which the Metz master copy centered around Terentianus, bishop of Metz, is complemented with a considerable layer of German saints.²¹

In recent years, palaeographic analyses have contributed important aspects to our knowledge of the history of manuscripts. Hungarian palaeography used to see the writing of *Codex Prayanus* (1190s) as a sign of falling behind West European advance, a solitary relic of a conservative Central European writing. Several other remains having been investigated, it could be proven that a great part of Hungarian writing was characterized by the survival of late Carolingian book writing in the 11th-12th centuries, and by the relatively late appearance of mature Gothic

¹⁹ L. Veszprémy, Szentkultusz korai liturgicus kódexeinkben [Cult of Saints in Early Liturgical Codices from Hungary], *Ars Hungarica*, 1989, I, 19-20.

²⁰ See the index of P. Radó, *Libri liturgici manuscripti*, op. cit.

²¹ L. Veszprémy, *Szentkultusz*, op. cit., 19.

script. It seems increasingly verified that the cause is the direct or indirect influence of the so-called slanting-oval style spreading in the South German, Bavarian and Austrian areas after the turn of the 10th-11th centuries. Although this style was not exclusively used with late Carolingian script in this area for a long time. The specificities of several Hungarian codices can be inferred from this: Hungarian writings fell behind the West European, chiefly French usages mainly on account of this regional practice.²²

The first Hungarian example of the above writing usage is the Esztergom *Benedictionale*.²³ Analogies of the writing can be found in contemporary charters (1086, 1093-95, Pannonhalma) confirming the well-known fact that charters and manuscripts were made in the same way up to the end of the 12th century. Historian of liturgy József Török pointed out lately that about 90 % of the prayers are identical with the Magdeburg-Braunschweig type, and the Hungarian manuscript is earlier than the extant variants of this type. The hypotheses prevalent so far - in that the French master copy only arrived in German areas around 1124 - will certainly be modified. The writing of the *Benedictionale* proves that the German reception of the text began years before 1124 and even got to Hungary from there.²⁴ The writing used for the "St Margaret" *Sacramentarium* and the *Agenda* of Győr does not fit this line as it preserves features deviating from the South German usage. From the mid-12th century examples of the slanting-oval writing can be found among charters, especially in Pannonhalma from 1137 to 1201. Of particular interest may be the charter of 1201, since at that time charters had long been copied in a different script, according to the Gothic practice.²⁵ The conclusions that can be drawn by palaeography well support the assumptions of liturgical history, namely that Hungary had ramifying ecclesiastic relations. The presence of the slanting-oval and the Rhine square type of script not discussed here warns that a decisive section of ecclesiastic books coming to Hungary arrived via Southern Germany, and it was probably their high number that underlay their considerable influence upon the development of script here.

²² On this type of writing see: B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1979, pp. 154 passim; B. Bischoff, *Kalligraphie in Bayern. Achten bis zwölftes Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden, 1981, pp. 34-36; Karin Schneider: *Gotische Schriften in deutscher Sprache von späten 12. Jh. bis um 1300*, Wiesbaden, 1987, pp. 9-24; L. Veszprémy, *A 12. századi magyar kódexírás alakulása [On Palaeography of Latin Codices in Hungary from the 12th Century]*, *Századok*, 132, 1998, 222-230.

²³ D. Kniewald, *Az esztergomi Benedictionale*, Zágráb, MR 89, *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 1941, pp. 213-231.

²⁴ J. Török, *Az esztergomi Benedictionale*, in: *Strigonium antiquum*, 2, ed. M. Beke, Budapest, 1993, pp. 69-72.

²⁵ L. Veszprémy, *Pannonhalmi oklevelek a 13-14. században [Charters from the Abbey of Pannonhalma in the 13-14th Centuries]*, in: *Mons Sacer*, 996, 1996, vol. 1, ed. K. Szóvak - I. Takács, Pannonhalma, 1996, pp. 471-480.

Sažetak

Liturgijski rukopisi 11. i 13. stoljeća kao povijesni izvori

Proces koji ovi dokumenti ocrtavaju - seobu kultova, obreda i rukopisa od Zapada prema Istoku i pojavu nezavisnih običaja na ugarskom crkvenom području - dugotrajan je i teško dokučiv, iako mu se može ući u trag početkom pokršćavanja u 10. i 11. stoljeću. Samosvijestan čin bilo je u tom procesu posvećenje Bamberške katedrale (6. svibanj 1012.) kojoj je prisustvovao, između ostalih, i ugarski nadbiskup Astric. Upućujem na taj dobro poznati događaj jer između oltara i sačuvanih relikvija mogu biti jasno razlikovane tri grupe: a) franačku grupu - čiji je dio Astric posvetio (Hilarije, Remegije, Vedastije, Amandije, Germanije, Medardije i Leodegarije), b) burgundsku grupu (Sigismund, Mauricije i pratioci, Aleksander i Eventije) i c) južno njemačku carsku grupu (Adalbert, Emmeram, Vencel, Rutbert i Erhard). Njihovo štovanje širilo se rukopisima s tih područja, na primjer, misalom iz Gniezna koji je pripisan Niederaltaichu. Crkveno-zemljopisne promjene na bavarskom području su na odgovarajući način potvrdile nazočnost rukopisa franačkog i lotarinškog porijekla širom južne Njemačke. Na tom su području rukopisi prepisivani i šireni prema Istoku, uključujući Ugarsku i zagrebačku biskupiju. Premda pokazuju neke zajedničke osobine ugarskih oblika, koji su se razvili unutar srednjovjekovnog teritorija Ugarske tijekom 11. i 12. stoljeća, vrijedno je spomenuti da ta liturgija nije bila ugarska, zapravo ona je potjecala iz franačko-rimske liturgije. Vrlo je vjerojatno da su se tijekom prve polovice ili sredinom 12. stoljeća ti običaji već razlikovali po katedralama. Tijekom tog procesa Zagreb nije izgubio svoj vlastiti, karakterističan liturgijski običaj, nego je razvio svoj vlastiti tip utemeljen na rukopisima koji su od ranije posuđeni iz ostrogonske nadbiskupije i time sačuvani kao naša zajednička kulturna baština.