

LORÁND EÖTVÖS UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Humanities
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF LINGUISTIC STUDIES
Program of Studies in Antiquity

Rubrica Strigoniensis

The Normative Texts of the Liturgy of Medieval Esztergom
(Theses)

Written by

MIKLÓS ISTVÁN FÖLDVÁRY

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION, BUDAPEST 2008

Reader

Dr. BALÁZS DÉRI
university lecturer

Theses

Nothing pervaded so deeply and so extensively the intellectual life of a medieval man than the Roman liturgy. His cities, townships, or villages were usually built around a church, and his life was centred around the reception of sacraments and sacramentals, the significant occasions and periods of the ecclesiastical year, or the daily routine of office hours and other ceremonies. The imagery he used and the anecdotes he related were set within, and inspired by, the milieu of ritualised Christianity. Indeed, the European intellectuals of the era following the age of Antiquity, at least for a millennium, spent the greater and most significant part of their lives directly involved in cultic worship.

This liturgical cult consisted primarily in reciting and singing a multifaceted and extensive set of structured texts dramatised according to space, time, and sound, appointed to various persons, and associated with definite gestures and specific material apparatus. Until about 1500, these spaces and objects provided the material for fine arts almost exclusively, and even after this period they remained the most decisive source of artistic inspiration. It was in service of these cultic occasions that instruments measuring and designating time were invented; and the history of European music originated with, and was nurtured by, the actual performance of these liturgical affairs.

The textual material itself greatly determined the beginnings of European manuscript production, and remained predominant all the way until the early age of the printing press. The number of extant liturgical books from this period far surpasses the quantity of other contemporary written material, and the proportions must have been even more favourable to liturgical texts before so many codices fell victim to the incomprehension or deliberate devastation of posterity. The catalogues of manuscript archives amply demonstrate the unparalleled significance of liturgical literature, but they also indicate that the proper research and processing of this material necessitates different preparations and demands different methods than the ones usually employed by classical philology in order to determine and interpret the original auctorial substance of sporadic texts handed down in the course of literary tradition.

Prescinding from the first recorded data concerning the Roman rite, only very rarely and in small quantity do we encounter new and original material specifically assigned to a particular author; and even when it is assimilated into liturgical practice in accordance with its proper function, it is soon divested of

any reference to the original circumstances of its composition, and becomes an integral part of the greater textual framework. For this reason, the individual sources are almost altogether secondary, and so—at least from the point of view of classical textual criticism—they are of no real consequence. According to the mentality of the age that produced them, the content of these sources was not a mere collection of independent items, but rather a carefully arranged choice selection, intended to create an individual character to the otherwise untouchable, canonical material by means of particular nuances, the deliberate winnowing and methodical interweaving of the select textual fabric.

From the very beginning, there existed certain accessory elements attached to the structure thus created, which the liturgists in time considered almost equally important, and which further developed the liturgical heritage in terms of the employment of space, the length and exact allotment of time, the ceremonial role of the participants, the use of liturgical equipment, and the musical forms inseparably bound to all these features. In the course of codification all these eventually came to form the content, which the Latin West recognised as its own liturgy, and of whose stabilization, handing down, and before all else, expansion would have been impossible without written culture. As a result, the recorded tradition transmitting the cultic textual material was supplemented with certain normative texts, which, in different ways and from various perspectives, described and regulated the practical and theoretical elements of the liturgical cult. (By “normative text” I intended to designate texts written with the specific aim of regulating liturgical practice; thus in this particular context “normative” is not meant to convey the meaning of “standard” or “model”, but rather the sense of “regulatory” or “directive”.)

The normative texts, as opposed to the liturgical books strictly speaking, contain primary textual material, and as such are more interesting from the point of view of philology, yet wherever the line of tradition can be retraced, it is evident that the experts’ task is not so much the recreation of the supposed original, but the mapping out of the history and interrelation of all the convergent textual source material. These texts are challenging also because underneath their linguistic features and homogenous appearance, one is bound to find an essentially unprocessed vocabulary and phraseology, without whose exact knowledge it is impossible to determine their documentary value, and a highly influential and extensive layer of medieval Latinity remains unexplored. Thus, in relation to the normative texts of the Roman liturgy, the philological approach is simply indispensable for the publication of the relevant sources in

a well-groomed and perspicuous manner. It is also of great assistance if—carefully following the variations in linguistic formulae—one should attempt to set forth in greater detail this most valued facet of a culture amassed in the course of more than a thousand years.

In my dissertation, I proposed to situate the normative texts of Hungary's primatial see within the context of the history of European liturgical books (I.); to evaluate—insofar as it is rendered possible by the fragmentary and rather late sources—the conditions and circumstances of these texts of local origin (II.); to analyse as accurately as possible the terminology involved (III.); and to provide a summary of all that these sources tell us liturgically about the rite to which they pertain (IV.). In the appendices to this dissertation, I attached two ordinals of Esztergom extant today which designate themselves as “rubricae”, and a collection of texts containing the definitive sources of a rubrical tradition, specifically of Strigonian provenance, which is preserved in various types of liturgical books.

In the period stretching from the Carolingian reorganization to the Council of Trent, the ritual order of the great ecclesiastical centres managed to reconcile the preservation of the general European liturgical practice with the cultivation of local traditions. I hope that by recalling this fact I was able to be of some service both as regards the broader interests of the international scientific community and with reference to the more specific concerns of Hungarian medievalists.

I.

In the three chapters making up the first part of my dissertation, I suggested new approaches and methods for processing the normative texts of the Medieval Latin rite. By the application of these new perspectives, I developed a typology that is more detailed and more accurate than what has generally been used up to this time. This new typology was then refined and made more palpable by means of a thorough description of the historical process influencing the various rubrical genres.

In the first chapter, I indicated that the rubrical texts are at once the source and subject matter of liturgical philology, hence they are worthy of equal attention on the part of philology and liturgical history; and the hesitation one encounters in the relevant literature regarding their classification stems mostly

from the unwitting confusion between these two perspectives. The basic point of departure for my typology was the determination of the individuating features of the actual content, and I described the categories thus determined as the representatives of a pure genre. Having analysed the content, title, structure, age, usage, and diffusion of the concrete manifestations of these genres, I have come to the conclusion that the different types of rubrical texts correspond to definitive functions, which are closely related to the conditions of the ecclesiastical culture using these texts, as well as to the actual style of ceremonial books that have been supplemented by, or used in conjunction with, the rubrics.

In the second chapter, insofar as it was possible, I tried to prescind from the age or the occasional correlation of the individual representatives of the diverse pure genres. In addition to the rudimentary and less structured ordines, the fragmentary rubrics of liturgical books, and the ordinals and customaries that are undoubtedly collective in character, I proposed four other major genres: the catalogues of abbreviated items, liturgical exegesis, ceremonial, and directory. I applied these names as technical terms which do not correspond directly to those books that have the same title, and occasionally the same content. Thus among the enumerated eight genres, I identified four homogenous categories determined by content, and four other rubrical forms to which I dedicated separate subsections on account of their wider diffusion in space and time; and although their content is less homogenous, their structure and conditions make them easily circumscribable phenomena.

In the third chapter, I situated the various categories and the corresponding specific genres within liturgical history. I tried to answer the question: to what extent has the change of textual genres been influenced by the relationship between the written and verbally transmitted liturgical traditions, by the contemporary understanding and cultural environment of liturgical cult, and finally, by the routine ceremonial practice with special regard to the use of liturgical books. In my estimation the increasing cultic use of books, the canonisation and codification of both verbal and written elements within the liturgical tradition, and the individuation of the thus solidified symbolic terminology eventually led to the written description of the entire rite. From the literary point of view, the climax of this process was reached with the liturgical books of the XIIIth and XIVth centuries, whose typical rubrical supplement was the ordinal, unifying in itself all the four described pure genres. On the other hand, the normative texts dating from earlier or later periods provide an insight as to

the process motivating either the introduction or the eventual abandonment of the use of ordinals. For this reason, the period before the XIIIth century is characterized by the convergence of pure genres, while the era following the XIVth century witnessed the divergence of mixed forms, leading to the creation of new pure genres.

My conclusions—*vis-à-vis* the works of former scholars, such as Anton Hänggi, Aimé-Georges Martimort, Edward B. Foley, Cyrille Vogel, and Eric Palazzo—may be summarised as follows. I treated the totality of normative texts without imposing on them the medieval and modern genres, and so it became possible to derive the basic definitions from the source material itself, and subsequently to organize the sources into different categories. One way to categorize the sources was setting up pure genres according to their content, but I also made allowances for those texts which represent long-standing and composite sources that are—from a structural and historical perspective—nevertheless homogenous, and constitutive of one specific genre. The authors who treat of the typology and history of liturgical books do not talk about all of the genres I consider independent types (generally they mention the ordinal, the ceremonial, or perhaps the customary). Some of the genres—for example, the *ordo*—they analyse from a limited perspective, that is, only as historical and not as philological phenomena; others they consider in separation from their rubrical milieu (for it is usually in a different context that one encounters catalogues of abbreviated items and liturgical exegesis). Few have paid attention to the relative independence of ceremonial rubrics from the main text, and only those authors attribute any significance to the existence of directories in the medieval sense who, in same way, have been directly involved with their preparations for modern editions.

As I was pondering the titles given to the different textual genres, it became clear to me that they do not intensify the confusion regarding terminology, but they rather bring us closer to the definition of more accurate categories. In this sense, one may deem the breviary as a typical example, but even the terms “*consuetudo*”, “*cerimonia*”, “*ordo*” or “*directorium*” (together with all their derivatives) refer to certain themes and methods of structuring or using texts, which prove to be of great assistance in defining the most important categories of rubricism. The validity, however, of individual designations is set in terms of space and time, thus they can only be applied if the ambiance employing them is well known. It is also necessary to call to mind that some of the books may be designated with rather detailed or quite unique titles, and that these

titles may be retained even after the structure or content has undergone significant changes.

From the closer scrutiny of normative texts it has also come to light that there is no strict line of division between rubrical and ceremonial books, and so their systematic investigation and description is only feasible if the entirety of liturgical literature is taken into account. With no antecedent scholarly output and, consequently, with special concentration did I treat the question of catalogues of abbreviated items, which represent the most conspicuous point of convergence between the rubrical and strictly liturgical type of texts. Albeit this genre may be the least intriguing for the modern reader, these catalogues are steadily present throughout every epoch of medieval literature, they make up the largest part of the most wide-spread rubrical genres, and thus they are the best sources of those liturgical and literary customs that we see as farthest removed from our modern practices. The role these catalogues played in a cult using ceremonial books, whose content was once only orally transmitted and then recorded in standardised and functionally orientated books, allows one to answer a great deal of questions relating other normative texts and ceremonial books of the particular era.

Apart from the duly emphatic evaluation of the catalogues of abbreviated items, I wished to contribute to the better understanding of the history of liturgical books by defining its different periods not according to some perfunctory chronology or simply following the chronological scheme of secular historiography, but by tracing the significant changes in the textual or literary usage. Within the context of each historical period, I derived the most influential literary factors from the written and material sources of medieval liturgy. Similarly to the chapter on typology, I did not wish here to compose subsections that are homogenous both in content and structure. The different genres of rubricism may, in fact, be tied to particular periods within liturgical history, yet with regard to questions relating to the orally transmitted material, the differentiated use of books, the dilemma of centralization and decentralization, or the interpretative aspect of cultic elements, I had to adopt a more diversified approach, treating them separately and on several occasions.

Since in the first part of my dissertation I felt compelled to establish the criterion for rubrical genres of not containing significant portions of liturgical texts, in the final place I treated the ordinals, after which I did not have the opportunity to examine with due thoroughness the likewise complex philological and liturgical status of the ritual or, most especially, of the pontifical. Such

an inquiry, however, would have taken me into the sphere of proper liturgical books, and in the end would have necessitated a monographic assessment of liturgical literary culture. That being the case, I am still of the opinion that without a proper analysis of especially the ritual and pontifical according to the same criteria, our grasp of the typology and history of normative texts remains somewhat incomplete. Even so, I am confident that I have been able to paint the necessary background against which the colours and contours of the fragmentary tradition of rubrical texts of Hungarian provenance can emerge with greater clarity and precision. From the beginning I was aware that the real test of my first and mostly theoretical chapters will be whether their content can actually be applied appositely and successfully to the extant normative texts of the particular Hungarian tradition.

II.

In the three chapters making up the second part of my dissertation, I wrote about the extant Strigonian representatives of the rubrical genres identified in the typological section; especially from a philological perspective, not touching upon questions relating to a strictly speaking linguistic and liturgical analysis. Taking into account the fragmentary nature of the material, I did not treat of the historical documents in a chronological order, but rather I took my departure from the more complete and assuredly central sources. Then I proceeded to the sources which are harder to identify or categorize, so that the contingent data and features of the latter could be placed in a wider context, and thus they could be more correctly interpreted. I tried to facilitate the same by considering the surviving material of probable Strigonian origin a part of a greater literary legacy I had already identified on the basis of the known European parallels.

In the first chapter, I considered four Hungarian representatives of the ordinals, which was the most typical rubrical genre of the Middle Ages after the first millennium. Next I evaluated the written records about other Hungarian rubrical books which are mentioned either in catalogues or scholarly literature. In the beginning of each subsection I described the particular source in accordance with its own self-description, content, structure, and origin (age and user), and then I tried to determine if any typological or historical conclusion may be drawn from them as regards the entirety of the medieval Hungarian rubrical material. All along I based my approach on the assumption that the books bearing witness

to the last hundred years or so of Hungarian liturgical history yield information not only about their own period and liturgical usage, but—if interpreted correctly—they also prove to be the end-result of a long-standing tradition. That being the case, these sources are in necessary correlation with each other, and they assist the expert reader in recognising and identifying the different textual layers of earlier ages leading up to the eventual composition of the text at hand. These layers do, in fact, trace us back at least to the XIVth century.

In the second chapter I wrote about those rubrical genres that were in use between 1000 and 1600 in other churches of the Latin ritual territory, and so one may reasonably suppose that they were also known in medieval Hungary. Based on specific details of liturgical exegesis sporadically featured in our ordinals, I came to the conclusion that similar notes may have been present in greater quantity in our local rubricism, and that being familiar with the foreign classics of the genre, certain members of the Hungarian clergy may also have applied this method. In the following, I made an attempt to clarify the relationship of the *Micrologus*, the only liturgical exegesis demonstrably present in local sources, to the so-called *Codex Pray*, and through it, to the liturgical history of Esztergom. In the second subdivision I felt compelled to conclude that the normative books of the late Middle Ages, that is, the directory and the ceremonial made an appearance in Hungary only very late (if at all). In comparison with other, more fortunate regions of Europe, the ecclesiastical life in Hungary was considerably retarded and isolated by the Ottoman-Moslem invasion and the rapid expansion of the Reformation; and the eventual restoration of Catholic life was concomitant with the abandonment of the local ritual usage, and accordingly of all the local rubrical books. The real function of directories used in Hungary since the XVIIth century is to serve the convenience of the clergy, and not to preserve the local liturgical traditions, now confined to a small number of proper feasts.

In the third chapter, my goal was to identify and describe a Hungarian collection of ordines from the XI–XIVth centuries, which was reconstructed by the systematic comparison of rubrical material taken from various Strigonian ceremonial books. First, I described those six books which I used in the reconstruction of such a source material, and then I also tried to justify why I considered these particular ceremonial books to be characteristic of the liturgical history of Esztergom. Next, from the point of view of their relationship with the later form of the Strigonian rite, I analysed the liturgical content of some of the ordines which have been preserved in a single variant of the so-called

Agenda of Hartwick, the first serious Hungarian rubrical source. In the third subsection, I evaluated the relevant details of the synoptic table of rubrics I compiled, and I managed to draw certain conclusions concerning the editorial aspects of the sources sustaining the ordines. Finally, I identified a supposed “proto-Pontifical” of Esztergom as the carrier of the reconstructed basic normative text. In my opinion, this book was compiled in the XIth century, in the immediate milieu of the arch-cathedral, as part of the first codification of the Strigonian rite. While the process of compilation followed the standard genre of the Romano-Germanic Pontifical, it also took into account the textual choices of the latest Roman practice. In addition to the antiphonal and the sacramentary, this book must have been the chief normative text for the central liturgical standards of Hungary until the XIVth century.

My contributions in comparison with the works of those scholars who previously researched these sources (especially József Dankó, Károly Kniewald, László Mezey, Polikárp Radó, Janka Szendrei, László Dobszay, József Török, and Edit Madas) are partly in the area of exploring some primary sources; and they are also the collateral proceeds of a consistently applied methodology.

To my knowledge, I was the first one to try to view the extant corpus of the normative texts of the Strigonian rite in the greater and wider context of coherence. In my own edition, I analyzed the ordinals of Esztergom and Szepes, I called attention to the significance of the hitherto neglected ordinal of Nicholas Telegdi, and I suggested some pointers for further research on the ordinal of Eger. I clarified, according to our best knowledge today, to what extent and in what manner could the literature of liturgical exegesis be present in medieval Hungary, and if we can expect new discoveries from the investigation of more modern sources. Finally, also on the basis of my own edition, I demonstrated the existence of the since lost “proto-Pontifical” of Esztergom; I identified the type of its genre, described its characteristics, and explained in a detailed fashion the philological conclusions drawn from the series of ordines which relate to the cycle of the liturgical year, and are still extant from this document.

One collateral result of this study is the firm theoretical justification of the use of late medieval rubrical books as retrospective sources. Another, and probably even more significant result may be seen in the fact that this dissertation enriched with new and well-founded discoveries the research of the most valued representatives of Hungarian manuscript literature, namely, the Agenda of Hartwick and the Codex Pray.

Even if one or another of my conclusions may eventually be in need of modification or refinement, and at times the work accomplished has proved to be insufficient for passing a final judgment on particular questions, I am certain that the comparative philological analysis of rubrical texts is a fecund method, which other scholars may successfully apply to additional sources of Hungarian or foreign origin.

III.

In the chapters making up the third part of my dissertation, I introduced and examined the linguistic character of the Hungarian rubrical sources. The foundation of this analysis consisted of the normative texts of Esztergom, although at times I took into consideration other Hungarian sources or certain foreign parallels as well. Among the linguistic phenomena I distinguished the peculiarities of word-choice, morphology, syntax, and lettering.

In the first chapter, I first explained the principles of compilation for a glossary I plan to publish following this dissertation. The glossary will certainly yield important results but I think it is important to underline that the study of word-choice requires the verification of material, historical, and stylistic principles, for the set of expressions assists not only the comprehension of the texts, but it can also become an important source for the history of rubrical texts, and through it, for liturgical history as well. This is what I wished to illustrate by dividing the rubrical vocabulary according to the sources, as seen in the second subsection of the chapter. Owing to the scarcity of source material, and especially due to its insufficient processing, the statements I made here do not so much represent final and complete solutions, as they indicate the possible directions for further research on the topic. At any rate, it can be demonstrated that the rubrical terminology in the Middle Ages is dependent upon, or conditioned by, ritual usage and historical period. This discovery exposes yet another instrument and deposit of the individuation of older liturgical traditions, on the other hand, it serves as an additional reliable guide for orientation in processing the available source material. The main conclusion of the historical section at the end of the chapter is that the rubrical vocabulary used in Hungary may be divided into two major historical strata. The terminology of the early sources draws upon the post-Carolingian application of the "old Roman" normative texts, and it does not constitute an independent, specifically rubri-

cistical language. Even though one can trace certain expressions that already foreshadow the verbal usage of later ages, and the sources after the XIIth century do, in fact, forsake the “outdated” phrasing of former times, this language is, by and large, still characterised by the sort of liturgical exegesis that was generally considered to be a part of homiletics, and it does not endeavour to be either elaborate or accurate. The actual, less stylised rubrical vocabulary in Hungary only begins to take shape in the XIVth century, but by the XVth century it is fully developed, and until the all-out unfolding of Catholic Restoration beginning with the second half of the XVIth century, it displays a high level of uniformity.

In the second chapter, with the help of numerous examples I systematically arranged the morphological and syntactical irregularities of the extant rubrical texts, especially of the ordinals containing linguistic peculiarities. Taking into account the great number of historical and stylistic layers within medieval and ecclesiastical Latinity, I indicated all those characteristics that seemed incorrect from the point of view of classical descriptive grammar. As a result of trying to interpret the observed phenomena, I had to conclude that the fully developed rubrical language in Hungary had preserved some “Merovingian” peculiarities that were not characteristic of the Middle-Latin literature of the period. In light of the ecclesiastical culture of the XVth and XVIth centuries, this must be the bequest of the incipient European rubricism of the VI–VIIIth centuries. Most of the peculiarities of the proper syntax of the ordinals can be understood from the way of their transmission, from the continuous modifications and copying; and finally, the rest of the irregularities may rightly be deduced from the spoken Latin of the communities using these books.

In the third chapter I explained and justified those principles of orthography which I followed in the course of editing the rubrical texts. Next I made reference to those ways of lettering that I did not follow in the process of editing, although they are worthy of mention. First, I systematically arranged the graphical peculiarities that are inconsistently applied and only pertain to particular words of the contemporary liturgical sources. I concluded that the contemporary lettering was hardly regulated, yet it was rather uniform, since it deflects from the standard orthography mainly in consistently indicating certain features of medieval pronunciation. The smaller portion of particular features is made up of “hypercorrect” word forms, which are less characteristic of the earlier than the later sources, and they manifest themselves predominantly in the adopted vocabulary of Hebrew or Greek origin, or in the spelling

of proper names. In addition to describing some phonetic phenomena, I briefly dealt with the spelling of Greek loan-words, which at times followed the written tradition; other times conformed to the Byzantine pronunciation. In the second subsection, I spoke about the interpunctuation of liturgical sources, which is even more consistent than the spelling, and in my estimation, serves as an excellent indication of the linguistic and syntactical sensibilities of the medieval scholars in charge of the liturgy. I believe that it would be worthwhile to follow the original interpunctuation both in this applied form and in critical editions. In preparing modern editions, it would also be useful to take into consideration the make-up and page-setting of medieval rubrical books.

As far as I know, no one has ever studied similar sources from a linguistic point of view, and so the third part of my dissertation approached the theme from an entirely new angle (although I often had recourse to the works of especially Peter Stotz and József Herman, and I learned much from the suggestions of Balázs Déri). Due especially to the lack of antecedent scholarship, the processed material may be supplemented with further sources, and consequently my conclusions may eventually be in need of nuancing or modifications. It is even more important, however, that the rubrical language of Hungarian provenance is only a small segment of the linguistic culture represented by the vocabulary, syntax, and lettering of European liturgical texts. The work commenced in my dissertation can only be made complete if it is complemented with a similar analysis of the foreign source material. On the one hand, this would assist the more accurate understanding of the normative texts of the Roman rite, and on the other, it would shed light on the uniformity and diversity of the technical terminology employed in the different periods or regions, as well as on the details of the historical or institutional relationship between their rubricism.

IV.

In the fourth and last part of my dissertation, I summarised from the point of view of liturgical history the ordinal of Esztergom and the content—assuredly pertaining to the arch-cathedral—of the so-called ordinal of Szepes (which is an excerpt from an older, and now lost, Strigonian version). The earlier rubrical sources say very little about the particular Strigonian practices, and for this reason, I decided to dispense with their analysis. Taking into consideration the

main emphases in the content of the ordinals, I extracted all the data pertaining to the hierarchical relationship between feasts, the assignment of liturgical functions, contemporary liturgical music, and the use of sacred space. The information thus accumulated was not always sufficient for drawing new and significant conclusions, but it generally managed to facilitate the use of the given sources for scholars of related scientific disciplines. This was made possible by the thorough collection and perspicuous arrangement of the details that only appear in isolation during the continuous reading of the sources; and—wherever it was possible—I also tried to demonstrate their inner coherence.

In the first chapter, I explained the actual subject matter of the ordinals, that is, the calendar arrangement. After the theoretical and institutional foundations of the tradition behind the rubrics, I treated the various types of liturgical days. In each case, I made mention of the transitional degrees between them and the slight differences within the same categories, which at the time impeded the regulation of the liturgical calendar according to general principles. After this, I considered what may be called the periphery of the canonical stratum of Strigonian liturgical life, that is, the essentially votive, yet obligatory ceremonies.

In the second chapter, I systematically organized the available data regarding the liturgical assistants and their attire. On the basis of the comparable ceremonies and of the rank, number, and attire of the ceremonial participants, I attempted to draw the contours of the contemporary ritual practice. According to my inference, the number and attire of the cantors (choratores) and celebrant were in service of the nuanced differentiation between the rank and dignity of liturgical days. On the other hand, the designation of the assistants was hierarchically determined only on prominent occasions: other times it was motivated by the division of labour within the liturgical community and the practical training of young assistants. The compilation about the liturgical role of individual members of the cathedral choir and about the specific liturgical functions themselves is hardly sufficient for providing us with a complete picture regarding the practices of the chapter, adjunct clergy, and cathedral school of Esztergom. If, however, it is complemented by other sources as well, it could become a very helpful witness to the life and practices of the medieval cathedral.

The third chapter examined the two most important kinds of musical data, namely, the melodic references and the rubrics regulating chant performance.

After presenting the hypothetical notated items of antecedent manuscript evidence, I analyzed the liturgical use of the melodic variations of such items as the *Benedicamus*, hymns with invariable texts, *Kyrie*, and *Sanctus*. In my conclusion, the choice of melodies for the items of the ordinary was a further means for indicating the proper nature and diversified rank of particular liturgical occasions, even in those cases, when it is impossible to identify any other method of differentiation. In the subsection on the style of performance, I explained the references to the system of duplicating the antiphons, which was much more complicated than in later times. Next, in addition to interpreting some less significant data, I wrote about the various cases in which the pipe organ was used. As a result, it became clear that at that time the pipe organ was not so much a solo or accompanying instrument, as it was used to indicate greater solemnity, while its practical role was primarily the substitution of certain sung texts during processions and in *alternatim* singing. The summary of individual items was intended to describe the method employed in the performance of some special chants of the liturgical year.

In the fourth chapter, I approached the ordinal of Esztergom as the most important medieval contemporary source for describing the since completely ruined arch-cathedral of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Saint Adalbert. With the help of some sporadic references to particular locations and furnishing, the inspection of verbs indicating movement, and the description of larger processions involving the entire church, I identified as the four floor-levels of the edifice: the surface of the sanctuary, pre-sanctuary, choir, and nave. I inferred the existence of an ample pre-sanctuary, and identified the location of the altars of the Holy Cross, Blessed Virgin Mary, and Saints Fabian and Sebastian. I also described the probable location of the baptismal font, and I tried to prove that there was an additional, secondary choir attached to the altar of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Furthermore, I argued that the choir screen (*jube*) had two gates, with the altar of the Holy Cross in between them, which was either attached to the choir screen or immediately underneath it. All the other suggestions I made will have to be submitted to further study and research, either to confirm or to confute them.

In light of the specific subject matter and methodology of these chapters, it is not possible to compare my conclusions with the works of those scholars who studied these issues before me. To my knowledge, László Dobszay was the only one until now who attempted a similar study of Hungarian sources, in his commentary to the Hungarian translation of the ordinal of Eger, and in the

ceremonial details of his summary on the Strigonian rite (also to a great extent dependent upon the ordinal of Eger). I must also make mention of Jacques Pycke in relation to foreign examples, and of Ernő Marosi in connection with the last chapter of my dissertation. Since the textual edition of the sources I studied was either not available to scholars, or only in very poorly done transcription, and the all-inclusive analysis of the original printed or manuscript material is practically impossible, I had no choice but to work without the help of antecedent scholarship. The majority of my conclusions do, however, have parallels in the research history of other disciplines, while some of my subsections are—as I have already explained in the introduction—intended to be detailed and rather explicit indications, rather than exhaustive treatises proposing definitive conclusions. All the results I may have reached in the course of this dissertation, with confidence and diligence, I now commit to the benevolence of my readers.

* * *

The entire dissertation is available in the Office of Doctoral Studies and Organisation of Scientific Research at the Faculty of Humanities of the Loránd Eötvös University, and the János Harmatta Library of the said faculty's Institute of Studies in Antiquity, as well as online at the following address: http://latin.elte.hu/munkatarsak/FM_files/disszertacio.shtml. The author cordially invites the reader to forward any comments, critical remarks, or questions to the following e-mail address: foldvaremiklos@hotmail.com