

Miklós István Földváy
USUARIUM

USUARIUM

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF LATIN LITURGICAL USES
IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

I-II

To the Memory of Edmond Martène
and his *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*

Advanced Review Copy
Restricted Release

Written by
MIKLÓS ISTVÁN FÖLDVÁRY

Based on the work of his
Momentum Research Group of Liturgical History,
Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
Eötvös Loránd University

BUDAPEST 2023

Prepared in the framework of the LP 2018-14/2018
Momentum Programme of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Supported by the Eötvös Loránd Research Network,
Ministry of Culture and Innovation



Written by
MIKLÓS ISTVÁN FÖLDVÁRY

With the help of
Károly Gossler, Péter Paulik, Balázs Horváth, István Ézsöl, Richárd Tóth,
Katalin Kátai, Katalin Suba, Apor Kiss-Pető, Ábel Stamler, Ráhel Gloviczki,
Domonkos Csordás, Orsolya Lenyó, Botond Sütő, Nóra Valentina Tegzes,
Réka Viktória Mazán, Frigyes Paulus, Ágnes Szaszovszky, Ede Záborszky,
Csaba Frigyes Orbán OPraem, Ágnes Horváth, Benjámín Varga

Based on data retrieved from
USUARIUM.ELTE.HU

Proofreading by
NORBERT MASIR OPRAEM

Cover design by
MÁTÉ KÁROLYI-KISS

ISBN 978-615-6448-32-3ö (Usuarium)
ISBN 978-615-6448-33-0 (First Part: Preliminaries)
ISBN 978-615-6448-34-7 (Second Part: The Mass)

© Földváy Miklós István 2023

All rights reserved. This book is a private publication by the author in a limited edition for public discussion within the academic community. It is not intended for commercial use. No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any manner without written permission of the copyright owner except for the use of quotations in a review.

PRINTED IN HUNGARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	9
FIRST PART: PRELIMINARIES	13
Uses	15
Models of diocesan development – localism	17
Models of diocesan development – national centralization	19
The liturgies of Rome	23
Religious orders	25
Sources	31
Service books – their typology and structure	32
Service books – editorial concepts	36
Functionality and layers	41
A hierarchy of components	44
Beyond the mass and the office	46
Three fates – processional, pontifical, and ritual	49
Norm texts	52
History	57
Medieval liturgies – what is left of them?	59
The rise and fall of localism	62
Creation and identity	66
Authority and freedom	70
Old Latin rites	74
System	81
Texts and gestures	84
The skeleton of texts	87
Navigating ceremonies	92
The ritual code	96
Reconstructive research	98
Diversity	101
Evolving liturgies	103
Literary troping	109
Ceremonial troping	112
A hierarchy of divergence	117

A chronology of divergence	120
What makes a use?	123
Methodology	129
Selecting sources – a typological grid	131
Liturgical markers	133
Statistical methods – frequency and diversity	138
Mapping	144
A way of looking back	148
SECOND PART: THE MASS	151
The Core of the Mass	153
Introit	155
Collect	156
Lesson and prophecies	160
The interlectionary chants:	
gradual, tract, Alleluia, and sequence	161
Gospel	170
The offering of gifts: offertory and secret	172
The anaphora: preface, canon, and the Our Father	176
The partaking of the Eucharist:	
communion and postcommunion	183
The Outlines of the Cycle	187
Collating traditions	188
Advent	191
Christmastide and the season after Epiphany	193
Shrovetide and Lent	198
Eastertide and the octave of Whitsun	202
The season after Pentecost	207
The sanctoral	213
The common of saints	217
The votives	219
The Mass Propers	225
The Order of Pericopes	227
System, density, and variation	227
The compiler's perspective	233
Ways of reuse and reshaping	238

The Mass Antiphony	242
Plainchant and its transmission	242
The Gregorian core and its extension	245
Innovation and repertory	248
Innovation and assignment	252
Ways of composing new plainchant	257
Chronological outlines	260
A case study: Ember Saturday canticles	266
The Sacramentary	271
Canon and creativity	271
Rearrangement	273
Supplementation	278
Replacement	283
Dissemination, history, and attitudes	288
The Mass Ordinary	293
The Mass of the Catechumens	295
The blessing of water, sprinkling, procession	295
Examination of conscience, intention, mental preparation	298
Vesting	302
Access to the altar	307
Incensations	311
Kyriale	316
Readings, chants, and the Gospel	322
The Mass of the Faithful	329
The offering of the people and the bidding prayers	329
The offering of the priest: from gestures to texts	331
Towards a typology of offertories	338
Prefaces	342
The canon of the mass: from texts to gestures	348
Variants of the canon	353
From the Our Father to the kiss of peace	369
Communion	374
Dismissal	379
Recess from the altar and thanksgiving	382
A Farewell to Footnotes	387

PREFACE

Much scholarly attention has been paid so far to the origins of the Latin liturgy and great effort invested in the analysis of its earliest documents. This book follows a different path. Its aim is a structured description of liturgical divergence from the High Middle Ages to the Council of Trent. Although this time frame can be expanded in both directions, the principle remains the same; solid evidence, even if late, should be preferred to conjectures about an ill-documented past. In this context, the basic question is not how things evolved, but the ways they contrast with one another. Diversity is interpreted in terms of variation, not in terms of evolution. *Usuarium*, therefore, is a muster of uses: equal traditions in their own right.

With this limitation, our description tries to be comprehensive both geographically and liturgically. The geographical scope comprises all the dioceses, monasteries, religious orders, and other ecclesiastical institutions that have left written records of their ritual life. The liturgical scope extends to every component of each ceremony so that the sample is determined by the actual content of the sources and not by incidental preferences, either personal or disciplinary.

The topic is, however, confined to liturgical information in the proper sense. Changes in the reification of the textual and ceremonial directives of service books are mainly overlooked. Certainly, musical composition, architectural environment, style of vestments and utensils, tempo, aesthetics, and orchestration of ceremonies had a fundamental impact on the way worshippers perceived their activity, but even radical changes in the field of performance might have kept the liturgical core intact.

The tone of the book is deliberately essayistic. Detailed liturgical description can hardly avoid a sort of dullness, as it works with material that once exerted its true power through system-

atic recurrence and the multisensory associations it awakened; something that modern readers are seldom fortunate enough to have experienced. Hence, we intend to draw a vivid and intelligible picture from a somewhat distant perspective. This, however, is only so with the actual narration. The chapters are bound to the vast amount of information that is stored and organized in the eponymous digital library and database. Hopefully, such an alliance of digital technology and traditional handbook writing will be beneficial for both. Quantitative records may turn to qualitative results through competent interpretation, and the synthesis may be released from the burden of details without the peril of over-simplification.

The model and predecessor of this work, to the memory of whom it is dedicated, is Dom Edmond Martène with his *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* at the very end of the 17th century. We hope that the courage of baroque scholarship bold enough to comprise vast fields in a few volumes can be matched and, with due respect, even exceeded. Many of the sources consulted by Martène got lost in the French Revolution and the last wars that devastated the central area of the former Frankish realm. Still, thanks to digitizing projects throughout the world, we now have far more sources at hand than he had and, what is more important, they cover the territory of the Latin rites more evenly. While he was especially inspired by the vision of a glorious past in France, one of our motivations at least is to represent the younger churches of Eastern and Northern Europe as proud members of the Latin ecclesiastical community. Moreover, as a Benedictine monk and a priest of the well-situated Gallican Church, Martène could hardly imagine an age when the rudiments of the mass, the divine office, or the annual cycle would need an explanation. Therefore, he was more concerned with old curiosities than with the general fabric of liturgical life. Among changing circumstances, we are now obliged to adopt a more inclusive attitude even in this regard.

The handbook format of *Usuarium* is designed to consist of seven divisions, the first two of which you now hold in your hands.

(1) The first is a general foundation. It introduces the characters of the play: the communities celebrating rites in their own ways, and the media through which they handed over their traditions to posterity: the written sources. Then it turns to the historical, structural, and cultural aspects of diversity within the Roman rite. Lastly, the methodological principles of the ensuing survey follow with an overall exposition of the possible fields, patterns, and indicators of variation. (2) The second division deals with the minimum content of a missal: the changing parts or propers of the mass according to the layers of lessons, chants, and prayers; and the unchanging parts or ordinary of the mass with the preparation before and the thanksgiving after it. (3) The third part will be dedicated to the processional rites: ceremonies closely connected to the masses of specific days like the peculiarities around Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and, most of all, Holy Week. (4) The object of the fourth division will be the category of pontifical rites: ceremonies reserved for bishops like priestly ordinations, dedications of churches, coronations, formal acts concerning church discipline like holding a synod, penance, excommunication, and reconciliation, and several minor sacramentals from the consecration of a bell to that of a chalice. (5) The fifth part will comprise the usual scope of a ritual: sacraments and blessings performed by a parish priest like baptism, matrimony, anointing of the sick and funeral services, or the almost infinite range of benedictions, supplications, and processions related to health, agriculture, and social-political adversities. (6) The sixth division will contain the typical scope of a breviary, i.e. the weekly recitation of the Psalter, the propers and the ordinary of the divine office, and the special rites that are embedded in or attached to the hours like the peculiarities of matins during the three days before Easter (*Tenebrae*) or bap-

tismal vespers in its octave. (7) Finally, the seventh and last division aims to compare the state of affairs as we have learnt about it from the High Middle Ages and the early modern period to the sporadic documents of the earliest Latin liturgies available: the pre-Carolingian rite of the City of Rome, the Ambrosian rite of Milan, and the liturgical remnants of Visigothic Spain and Merovingian Gaul.

According to the model given by Martène, illustrative samples from the most characteristic primary sources are intended to follow the large-scale narratives, accompanied by annotated bibliographies of the most relevant secondary literature.

FIRST PART:
PRELIMINARIES

USES

On a large scale, liturgical history is a convergent process. As time goes on, there are not more and more but fewer and fewer liturgical variants. The final stage of this process, an almost complete unification of the Roman rite, is traditionally associated with the Council of Trent. Undoubtedly, between the closing session of the council in 1563 and the late 17th century, most of the Latin dioceses voluntarily abandoned their heritage and adopted the Roman use with minor allowances to the local calendar and the administration of sacraments and sacramentals. Ancient religious orders also conformed in some degree to Roman practice and the newly founded ones already accepted it as matter-of-course. With some statistically irrelevant outliers, the paradigm of a uniform Roman rite has prevailed until this day. Liturgical reforms have been intensifying both in number and radicality, but the concept that their driving force is the Holy See and their target is Roman Catholicism on a global level has not been questioned.

Abolishing liturgical variance was not the self-professed purpose of the council. One can meditate on the socio-cultural influence of early modern confessionalization, the emphasis on liturgical celebration shifting, or the economic impact of cheap printing promoted by papal privileges, yet neither the conciliar documents nor the official Roman service books insisted on Romanization. Truly enough, the Protestant Reformation redrew the frontiers between European identities. In a world of competing denominations, the distinctness of communities belonging to the same confession must have become less emphatic. Inside the Catholic Church, 16th-century piety was moving from the communal and ritualistic manifestations of religious life towards individual devotion, morals, and theological conviction. Even financial considerations worked against the survival

of local traditions, as printing hundreds of different books with minor differences for basically the same purpose was not worth the effort.

When Pope Pius V, himself a Dominican friar and so the adherent of a non-Roman use, promulgated the Roman Breviary of 1568, the first Tridentine service book in the proper sense, he confirmed each existing use that was older than 200 years in the introductory bull *Quod a nobis*. For modern readers, this may sound like a restriction, as if it abolished uses younger than 200 years, but such was not the case at all. The regulation was directed against recent developments like the breviary of Cardinal Quiñones and maybe suppressed the ambition for liturgical independence of wealthy cities without diocesan rank. Cathedrals or religious orders were not affected. It was little less than 200 years since the last pagan principality of Europe, Lithuania had converted to Christianity (1385), and even at that time the formative period of distinct liturgical uses had long been past. This can be demonstrated most convincingly by a statistical analysis of the liturgical book production of the early printing press.

In the 1450s, little more than a hundred years before the publication of the Tridentine breviary, Gutenberg invented book printing. From its perfecting and rapid spread in the 1470s, service books were one of the most lucrative investments for printers. The clerical consumers of the era represented a reliable spending power and bishops did not miss the opportunity to ensure the liturgical unity of their dioceses through the new medium, a much desired objective that could not be perfectly achieved in the age of manuscripts. Within a century, hundreds of institutions published thousands of editions.

It is, however, worth inquiring how the institutional network of the Latin Church related to the institutional network as reflected by printed service books, given that, on the one hand, not every diocese wanted to publish its books and, on the other, some were extremely prolific in this regard. A closer look into

the discrepancy reveals that the map of liturgical prints matches not the institutional map of the late 15th but that of the late 13th century. This means that among the uses that were widely accessible in written sources after the Council of Trent, even the youngest ones were older than 250 years.

Models of diocesan development – localism

From the perspective of liturgical prints, European territories represent two categories. In the first one, almost every diocese published its distinct service books – with some irrelevant gaps on the map. They represent a localist attitude and define the *terminus ad quem* for the creation of local uses. In the other category, only some of the dioceses published their service books, but there is usually one in a country that excels with a larger number of editions and copies. They represent a late medieval tendency of nation-wide liturgical centralization: an intermediary degree between the high medieval paradigm when each diocese had a use of its own and the modern paradigm when the Roman Church had a single one.

Localist dioceses cover the territories of present-day Germany, France, and Spain, including the historically related borderlands of Switzerland and the Netherlands. In them, almost every diocese published a missal, a breviary, a ritual, and sometimes also an ordinal with several books having more editions. A few dioceses openly share their books: those of Clermont, for instance, bear the title *Claramontense* and *Sancti Flori*, meaning that they equally represent the use of Clermont and Saint-Flour, a diocese erected in the former territory of Clermont in 1317. In Spain, the books of Calahorra bear the title *Calagurritanum et Calciatense*, referring to the diocese of La Calzada that was erected in the 13th century and soon united with Calahorra again.

That the turn of the 13th and the 14th centuries constitutes a sharp line of demarcation in terms of liturgical conduct is

marked by the lack of books in several French dioceses. In 1317, Toulouse was elevated to an archbishopric and six suffragan dioceses were founded under its jurisdiction. Still, none of them has ever published a liturgical book, which suggests that they kept the use of Toulouse up to the modern age. In the same year, the large diocese of Poitiers was split into three with the foundation of Maizellais and Luçon. Here again, the 14th-century dioceses never published a service book of their own. Undoubtedly, they continued to celebrate according to the use of Poitiers. In the 15th century, it is already self-evident that young dioceses, even of high rank and prestige, fail to appear in the field of liturgical book production. Vienna, for example, although an imperial capital and an archepiscopal see since 1469, followed the customs of Passau – a simple bishopric subordinate to Salzburg – until the adoption of the Roman use.

The Occitan diocese of Saint-Pons-de-Thomières may appear to challenge this rule. In 1317, it was founded in the territory of Narbonne, and Robert Amiet, the compiler of the most reliable catalogue of printed service books, lists a missal under its heading. A thorough analysis of the entry, however, reveals that it was not the diocese that owned the missal. No copy of the edition survives, but extensive parts of it have been transcribed into a miscellaneous manuscript of a 17th-century scribe, containing nearly a hundred pages of extracts from service books of Saint-Pons. The latter ones come from an allegedly 13th-century ordinal and a printed missal of 1533. Yet it is telling that the ordinal has the chrisms mass of Maundy Thursday as an appendix at its end, suggesting that the book was only later adapted to episcopal functions, and the printed missal bears the title *Missale ad usum religiosorum in clyti Pontiani capituli*, that is, for the use of a chapter of religious which denoted monks or friars. The title is introduced by invocations of St Pontius and St Benedict in the respective qualities of patron and father, and followed by an image of St Benedict again. Indeed, the municipality had

hosted a Benedictine abbey since the 10th century and it was the abbey that Pope John XXII raised to the rank of an episcopal see. More than 200 years later, it was still the religious chapter that boasted of a use of its own and not the cathedral which, according to the testimony of the manuscript ordinal, might have adopted the previous monastic customs with the necessary modifications.

Models of diocesan development – national centralization

In shifting stages of progress, nation-wide centralization characterized Britain, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Hungary, and, in a certain way, Italy. The clearest case is Britain where the idea of ecclesiastical centralization is rooted in the Anglo-Saxon past. None of the magnificent cathedrals that adorn the British landscape published printed service books but York and Hereford, and, in terms of editions and copies, their supply is but meagre. The printed breviary of Aberdeen is only a faithful copy of the Sarum model. In the meantime, New Sarum or Salisbury issued so many prints that the amount far surpasses the needs of a single diocese. They were destined to serve the needs of an entire kingdom. Sarum was a simple bishopric, although famous for its ceremonial splendour. The ancient archbishoprics were Canterbury and York for England and, from the 15th century, Glasgow and St. Andrews for Scotland, but none of them played a prominent role in the formation of a use for Britain. The use of Sarum was championed by secular rulers as the custom of the Royal Chapel. Yet the survival of the York and Hereford books suggests that centralization was not enforced by any authority, sacred or secular. Obstinate localists were free to resist as long as they chose to do so.

The national pattern can be recognized by two factors: first, the relatively low number of dioceses with liturgical prints as compared to their number in total and, second, the above-aver-

age number of copies and editions from one privileged diocese. In Norway, the situation is unambiguous. The only diocese with prints is Nidaros or Trondheim, the primatial see of the sole ecclesiastical province of the country, and the book titles refer to the use of the whole realm: *totius regni Norvegiae*.

Denmark, in a personal union with Norway during the period in question, is a more complex phenomenon. Several prints have survived from different dioceses: Schleswig (now Germany), Roskilde, Viborg, Aarhus, and Lund (now Sweden). Fragments testify that Ribe and Odense also had books of their own. For a country of the size of Denmark, this amount would suffice for a localist pattern. Yet suspicion arises that something else was emerging in the meantime, for it is not one of the aforementioned dioceses that most copies represent, but *Hafnia*, i.e. Copenhagen. Now, Copenhagen, although a commercial centre and later a political capital, was never a cathedral city until the 19th century. It belonged to the diocese of Roskilde, the nearby national shrine that has been the burial site of Danish kings and queens until now. The use of Copenhagen, however, has more in common with that of Lund, the primatial see of whole Denmark. Indeed, it seems that there was no such thing as a use of Copenhagen in the traditional sense. It was a replica of the use of Lund but probably with the intention of national implementation. Nonetheless, Danish centralization was less developed than its British parallel, and soon became aborted when Denmark embraced the Lutheran Reformation in 1536.

In Poland, Gniezno, Płock, Poznań, Kraków, Lubusz (now Lebus in Germany), Wrocław and even the Baltic Warmia published liturgical prints. These are, if not all of the Polish dioceses, at least their majority and the most important ones. In this regard, the situation is similar to that of Denmark. Here, too, is a parallel to the Copenhagen phenomenon, namely the *Missale Gnieznense-Cracoviense*, a missal attributed to both Gniezno and Kraków. In contrast with the missals of France or Spain

shared by two dioceses, Gniezno and Kraków are far away from each other and have never been part of one another's territory. Gniezno was the ancient ecclesiastical capital of the North in the country called Greater Poland (Wielkopolska), between Poznań, the first Polish cathedral, and Płock, the 11th-century seat of the Piast monarchs in Mazovia, near the present-day capital of Warsaw. Yet in the age of the printing press, the foremost Polish city was Kraków in the South, in the country called Lesser Poland (Małopolska). With a wealthy bourgeoisie of German descent, it possessed, among other things, printing houses and the most celebrated university of Eastern Europe. Albeit a suffragan of Gniezno, Kraków expressed its ecclesiastical aspiration in a liturgical way as well. All the 15th-century Kraków pontificals contain the ceremony of handing over the *pallium*, the archepiscopal vestment sent by the pope, to the newly consecrated archbishop of Gniezno. And who else would the person entitled to the investiture be, if not the bishop of Kraków? Indeed, the theoretically shared missal has more from Kraków than from Gniezno. It seems to be the former's attempt at the centralization of the Polish liturgy by usurping the authority of the latter. It might have achieved some temporary success, as even the missal of Płock borrows from the amalgam, but later Gniezno regained its independence. In the late 16th century, however, a common ritual appeared with the telling title of *Agenda Polonica et Alemannica*. In the long run, national tendencies prevailed.

Hungary recalls the examples of both Britain and Poland. Of the ten traditional dioceses, only Esztergom, Zagreb (now Croatia), Pécs, and Eger published printed liturgical books. The book production of Esztergom is significant even in comparison with pan-European standards, while Pécs and Eger are only represented by two editions of a missal and an ordinal, respectively. They seem to be the nonconformists of Hungary, similar to York and Hereford in Britain.

Zagreb is a different phenomenon. Its books were less numerous but more uniform and more elaborate than those of Esztergom, and the adherence of the cathedral to its use can be assessed by the fact that its clergy retained it until 1788. High ranking prelates outside Zagreb possessed Zagreb books or books that combine the uses of Esztergom and Zagreb. Precious manuscripts harmonizing elements of the two traditions survived. Esztergom and Zagreb, like Gniezno and Kraków, are both geographically and culturally distant from each other, representing Hungary and Croatia, two countries of the Sacred Crown of Hungary. They were undoubtedly the two most prominent dioceses in the period of King Matthias when the printing of the books of Esztergom began under royal patronage, and the most eccentric features of the Zagreb use were abandoned under the aegis of the king's protégé, Bishop Oswald Thuz. A fusion of their liturgy had the best claim for a national use in Hungary. This, however, did not happen. Zagreb successfully opposed liturgical intervention from outside, but only on a diocesan, and later, cathedral level. Meanwhile, Esztergom expanded its influence to all other dioceses, as it is manifested by the abundance of its printed books. It preserved its primacy even after the Ottoman occupation of the city itself when the cathedral chapter moved to Nagyszombat (now Trnava, Slovakia). It was this period when the Esztergom ritual of 1560 first stated in its opening decree that the content is not only destined for the diocese but for the whole archepiscopal province.

In Italy, the whole process of centralization was over before the printing press. The Roman books had more printed editions before their Tridentine variants than any other service book. These could not have served the needs of churches north of the Alps, as the Roman use was not yet the use of Roman Catholicism but only that of the papal court and the Franciscan order. Yet Italy was a highly urbanized land with a large population and the densest network of ecclesiastical institutions in Europe.

Compared to the number of dioceses, Italy has the lowest rate of liturgical prints. The contrast between the numerous editions of Roman books and the absence of their equivalents from other dioceses can only be explained by the hypothesis that Italian dioceses, as a rule, adopted the Roman use. Such a possibility was quite natural for the large province of Rome with its suburbicarian dioceses that, albeit of great antiquity and authority, were more closely attached to the patriarchal see than suffragans of other archbishoprics. One can say that their identity was founded on their dependence on Rome. But test cases from elsewhere demonstrate that the largest Italian cities all used Roman books from the 14th century anyway, and the popes took the Roman use to Avignon as well.

The uses surviving until the printing press in Italy were simply not Italian. In the North, the liturgy of late medieval Aquileia belonged to the branch of Southern German uses, having more in common with Salzburg than with the neighbouring cities. Milan, of course, was Ambrosian. Capua preserved the remnants of the once flourishing Campanian-Beneventan region, an archaic family of uses that shares its patrimony with Rome but their exact historical relationship is obscure. Cosenza in Calabria and Messina in Sicily maintained the Norman heritage to such a degree that the title of their missals positively referred to the custom of the French, the *consuetudo Gallicorum*. Therefore, the diocesan uses of Italy are inaccessible through printed service books. The research of the homeland of Latin Christendom requires other means.

The liturgies of Rome

Still, the use of Rome represented by late prints seems to be trustworthy as the document of the Curial redaction, the papal use codified in the 13th century. And indeed, the precise identity of the use of Rome is a fundamental question of the whole

history of the Latin rites. From the earliest sources to the latest ones, a vast number of sources refer to Rome as their origin. In the meantime, they are not always identical, and several narratives circulate about liturgical reforms in Rome itself. In modern scholarship, these are traditionally associated with the process of deterioration. Pope Gregory VII already formulated the phrase of the 'Ottonian captivity' of the papacy, referring to the period when Germans took over the government of the Church. With a similar attitude, most of the researchers speak about the Frankish adaptation, the Germanization, the Curial or Franciscan revision, and, finally, about the Tridentine codification of the Roman use as an advancing project of the assimilation of a once local, urban practice to a northern mainstream.

Both historical records and comparative analysis demonstrate, however, that reformers were, as a rule, eager to restore the – in their opinion – earliest and most original form of the use of Rome. The Carolingian and Saxon emperors, the Gregorian papacy, the Franciscan experts of the late 13th century, and the humanists of the 16th century all asserted that they wanted to purify the authentic tradition from Gallic or Germanic distortions. Statistically, the Tridentine Roman books differ from the late medieval European average more than their pre-Tridentine equivalents, and the Curial-Franciscan books more than their 11th-century Gregorian or 8th–9th-century Carolingian predecessors. Without any intricate conjecture, this proves to be a process of dissimilation. It is highly possible that Roman authenticity was sometimes falsely identified with purism and austerity, or served only as a pretext for arbitrary decisions, yet one cannot deny that, on a European scale, the use of Rome as represented by printed service books belongs to a minority. At almost every point where it exhibits distinctive features, they link it to a narrow group of obsolete Mediterranean traditions and separate it from the Gallo-Germanic majority north of the Alps. Perhaps we can have equal or even more confidence in

them than in their antecedents from the first millennium. They are undoubtedly more conservative and, in contrast with the exclusively Frankish provenance of the early sources, the new ones were at least certainly compiled in Rome.

Religious orders

In the meantime, religious orders also published their service books. After a closer look at their contents, they can be classified into three groups that coincide with three attitudes and – as we shall see later – three epochs of western monasticism.

(1) The first group consists of centralized orders with uses of their own. Here belong the Cistercians, the Premonstratensians, the Carthusians, the Dominicans, and some less widespread communities like the Paulines or the Trinitarians. Some orders adopted an already existing use: the Franciscans that of the Roman Curia, the Carmelites and the Knights Hospitaller that of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, and the Teutonic Knights that of the Dominicans, but preserved and transmitted it as their own. All these uses had two features in common: they were rooted in the soil of their formation, but also were the products of considerable revision.

The first statement means that monastic uses share their chief peculiarities with the region where the foundation of the order took place or where its central institutions solidified. This is self-evident in the case of the Carmelites and some military orders who proudly embraced the liturgy of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. It is well-known, too, that the Pauline liturgy was based on the use of Esztergom in Hungary. Yet also the greatest international orders brought with them, as they spread, the liturgical features of their native country. Without knowing the Southern French uses in Burgundy and the Rhône Valley, one would incline to attribute the plainness of the Cistercian and Carthusian use to monastic austerity, but it is in perfect

accordance with nearby dioceses, Lyon or Grenoble. Similarly, Premonstratensians draw on the liturgical heritage of Upper France, Picardy, and Flanders. It is difficult to associate the Dominican use with a precise region, but its overall French style is beyond doubt. Even the Teutonic Knights displayed their German origin. Although they surely borrowed the French-type Dominican breviary and missal, they developed an original set of German-type processional rites for Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and Holy Week. Later, these exerted an apparent influence on their Baltic field of activity, e.g. in Turku and Warmia. In short, the uses of centralized orders always fit into a geographical context.

The second feature is that, nevertheless, none of the monastic uses matches a diocesan use perfectly. This is not only true for their specific saints or the omission of rites that belong to a diocesan context (e.g. large-scale processions, ceremonies concerning the baptismal font). The core of the liturgy, namely the structure of some ceremonies and the arrangement of texts, was revised as well. The revision usually happened a generation after the foundation of the order and, along with other measures, was part of a policy to organize an international society. In consequence, we can distinguish a mature monastic use from its less-developed precedents, if there survived any. Such primitive variants can be contrasted with the settled ones among the Cistercians, the Premonstratensians, or the Carmelites. Another result of uses being established only decades later than the order itself is that they typically do not reflect the secular environment of the locality where the order was founded, but rather that of the place where it consolidated. The Franciscan use mirrors Rome, not Assisi, the Dominican resembles Paris more than Toulouse.

Finally, uses of religious orders were detached from their secular origins after their codification. Both diocesan uses and their religious derivatives developed further in the following

centuries but mostly independently, each in its particular way. Hence a liturgy of monks or friars often freezes some features of its diocesan surroundings as they were in the age of the order's consolidation. The Paulines, for instance, preserved some traits of the 13th-century use of Esztergom, a period that has not left direct documents from the cathedral itself.

(2) The second group of monastic uses bears witness to intense Romanization in the age of the early printing press. Not only do unspecified Benedictine service books represent the use of the Roman Curia but the prints of such congregations as Bursfelde or Melk as well. Although the titles refer to a German abbey, the content has nothing to do with the neighbouring diocesan uses. As to the structure of the rites and their textual arrangement, it is a faithful rendering of the Roman books with slight adaptation to institutional preferences in feast ranking, the realization of the ceremonial, and some details of the mass ordinary. It seems to be a relatively late phenomenon and matches the tendencies of Benedictine reforms from the 14th century. Rivalry with the ambitious mendicant orders urged the Benedictines to reshape themselves as an international network of organizations which they had not been. As the foundation of a uniform monastic use, they adopted the Roman secular model. Even the post-Tridentine Monastic Breviary is nothing else than the reworking of the Roman Breviary, carefully modified according to the directives of the Rule of St Benedict.

The case of the Augustinian Hermits, the fourth mendicant order after the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Carmelites, is a little different. They also followed the Roman Curia, yet they might have done so since the order's foundation. The friars were united after the mid-13th century, a period when the ambition for designing distinctive uses was already declining, and came from Central Italy, a region where liturgical uniformity prevailed earlier than elsewhere.

(3) The third monastic group proves to be a remnant of more ancient conditions. Some of the Benedictines and the Augustinian Canons (who must not be confused with the Hermits) issued liturgical prints that codified uses different both from Rome and their direct secular surroundings. Relatively few documents have survived, apparently due to the lower number of copies and their narrower domain of circulation, but still plenty of records exist. Such were the monks of Saint-Pons in Occitania, Casadei (La Chaise-Dieu) in Auvergne, Marmoutier in Tours, Saint-Remi in Reims, Ainay in Lyon, San Benito el Real in Valladolid, the late books of Monte Cassino already as a member of the Paduan Congregation of Santa Guistina, Vallombrosa in Tuscany, and, first of all, Cluny; and such were the canons of Saint-Victor in Paris, Saint-Rufus in Avignon, or Montearagón near Huesca. Similar to Saint-Pons, Valladolid was raised to an episcopal see in 1595, but its prints ascribe themselves to the monks of St Benedict without exception. The situation was similar to the nationalization of diocesan uses. While the majority of the orders chose to unify their liturgical practice on an international level, some of the most prestigious houses, especially the heads of congregations administering several monasteries themselves, resisted and continued to maintain their ancient customs.

In light of this evidence, we can reconstruct three phases of monastic liturgical history. First, every monastery was independent. They worshipped according to their use, deeply rooted in the geographical landscape where the monastery was situated. There was no Benedictine or Augustinian liturgy as such. The practice of a religious house had more in common with the neighbouring cathedrals than with distant houses of the same order, albeit none of the monastic uses proved to be identical with a secular one. Second, some of the communities excelled as heads of congregations. Other monasteries accepted their spirituality, organization, and program of life. This did not necessarily imply the acceptance of their exact liturgical norms, but there

was a tendency to do so. The prime of Benedictine congregations took place in the 10th and 11th centuries when distant communities seldom adjusted to the same liturgical regulation. An Augustinian bloom characterizes the 11th and 12th centuries, when liturgical use became a primary means of expressing identity. Some of the more widespread congregations asserted a uniform use and this was the model for the highly centralized orders of the next generation. Indeed, there is little difference between the liturgical attitude of the Cluniacs, theoretically only the adherents of a congregation, and the Cistercians, members of Europe's most effective international organization at that time. The third phase has already been described: it was the formation of an international, pan-Benedictine use, regardless of the local traditions of the single abbeys, even if they functioned as heads of congregations like Bursfelde or Melk.

In the age of the early printing press, these paradigms lived side-by-side. There still were localist monasteries, there were distinct but centralized religious orders, and there were institutions that had already left their uses behind them. Hence, to understand the true nature of monastic liturgies, one must always measure them to their secular parallels, never neglecting the historical process behind either.

SOURCES

Liturgy denotes the entirety of the Christian Church's regular and official ceremonies. Ritual manifestations of unofficial devotion, both private and communal, are beyond the scope of the present overview that aims to introduce the direct sources of public worship. Contrastingly, indirect sources comprise documents that report on liturgical life but are not qualified to regulate it. If uses are the agents of worship, sources are its medium.

Practically, liturgy consists of texts, melodies, and several aspects of performance. Both for contemporaries and posterity, performance may be the most influential. One is more inclined to remember the music, the vestments, and the style of the celebration than the actual prayers that were performed. Medieval liturgy is, however, primarily documented by written sources. True, we have some information about ceremonial, more about melodies, but the most about texts. Moreover, in defining a specific tradition, medieval regulations show a clear predilection for selecting and arranging texts. Although it may be disappointing for present readers, we must accept that they attributed the utmost importance to them. First of all, they considered a liturgical tradition as a script for a complex system of uttering words. This is why we also prefer a textual approach and turn first to its primary sources, the books.

Written regulation took two basic forms. One was the selection, codification, and arrangement of sacred texts to be delivered, the other the organization of every non-verbal aspect: problems of timing, musical performance, the role of ministers, moving within the space, utensils and built environment. These two perspectives are simultaneously present in written sources but feature in different proportions. Accordingly, we can distinguish between service books, designed for actual use in a ceremonial context, and norm texts, for consultation before or during a rite.

Traditional Christian worship contains three basic types of ceremonies. The first is the Eucharistic gathering, called by Roman Catholics the mass. The second is the cycle of prayers throughout the day, dominated by psalmody in the West: the divine office, or, as they now call it, the liturgy of the hours. To the third belong all the rites outside the mass and office: administration of sacraments and sacramentals, the blessing of persons and objects, processions, mimetic-dramatic gestures, and every incidental component of public worship outside the daily recurrence of masses and office hours. Accordingly, we can distinguish between books designed for the mass, the divine office, and the rest.

In its full shape, however, the liturgy has always been an orchestration of activities involving several actors of different roles within an elaborate spatial structure. Since the majority of written sources materially take part in the ceremonial, the format of the books and the distribution of the texts often adjust to the ministers and their position. They can occur in one book or be split into more; the size, structure, and decoration can conform to the placement of the volume and the needs of the actual minister; there can be more or fewer rubrics (ceremonial directives) and musical notation. Accordingly, the material way in which a book as a real object is used, i.e. its function, defines the third aspect of classification.

Service books – their typology and structure

Without entering into details, some cover terms may prove useful for systematization. Sacraments, sacramentals, and processions do not occur daily, but are mobile from a topographical point of view. Thus, their script is typically recorded in a single volume of a smaller format. As for the mass and the divine office, we can differentiate between comprehensive books, containing the total text material of the rite, and books assigned to specific

sites and ministers within the liturgical choir, which we will call choir books. The three main types of liturgical texts conform to the latter aspect. They are the prayers in the strict sense of the word, the chants, and the lessons. Prayers are recorded in the books of the celebrant on the altar or at his seat, chants in the books of the singers on the stand, and lessons in the books of the readers on the ambo or the lectern. One must equally take into account that oral transmission and knowing many texts by heart played a prominent role in the Middle Ages. Certainly, not each worshipper owned a book, and it is not sure that everything was read from a written source, nor that every extant volume was applied in the actual liturgy.

Norm texts can be classified into pure, homogeneous writings that consistently control and comment on one specific aspect of the celebration. Such is the selection and ordering of the texts; the origin, theology, and symbolic interpretation of the rites; the solution of calendrical problems; and the direction or *mise-en-scène*: tasks of the ministers, their moving, utensils, verbal and musical performance. Yet mixed, heterogeneous norm texts are more numerous. Answering the needs of different historical circumstances, they combine the former aspects in various proportions.

Liturgical books had no unanimous terminology for self-description in the Middle Ages and sometimes even in the early modern period. Moreover, both the assignment of content types to book types and the structure of each book type changed over time. Still, several governing principles remain to orientate us in the intricate world of liturgical book production. In the following paragraphs, we borrow the nomenclature of the modern era yet extend the ideas lying behind the genres to past ages. They might have applied different terms but meant similar things.

After closing the Council of Trent, the popes promulgated the Roman liturgy in four service books: the breviary (1568), the missal (1570), the pontifical (1595), and the ritual (1614). They

comprised the full textual content. Two types of norm texts were added: the ceremonial (1600) for the orchestration of the non-verbal aspects, especially under the most solemn circumstances, and directories, issued several times, for solving the problems that each year caused with its ever-varying constellations of weeks and dates. Of course, a huge amount of liturgical excerpts, additional manuals, modifications, and supplements were published later, but they only contained, rearranged and detailed the same set of information. None of them was indispensable. Four volumes were enough to hold the Roman rite.

Certainly, all four were comprehensive books. They contained the texts of the concerning ceremonies regardless of the person who is responsible for delivering them or the place within the church where they ought to be delivered. From a different perspective, the books were designed for private needs: low masses at a side-altar and lonely recitation of the daily office. It does not mean that such were the dominant forms of early modern worshipping, yet it was the logical outcome of the economics of printed book production. Publishers have always preferred high print runs, and one could still have comprehensive books in solemn circumstances while choir books were unfit for private use. This resulted in the slow decline of choir books in the modern age, except for musically notated ones that continued to be manually copied where plainchant-singing communities existed.

The early modern distribution of liturgical content into service books corresponded by and large with the late medieval situation as represented by the early printing press. Missals for the mass and breviaries for the office absolutely prevailed. The ambiguities can be summarized in three points: (1) the placing of the rest, (2) the transitory rites, and (3) the norm texts.

The Tridentine paradigm relegated ceremonies outside of the mass and the office to the pontifical and the ritual. Obviously, the fundament of the division is if the rite can be performed by a bishop exclusively or if it is accessible to an ordinary parish

priest. The structure of the books followed rather abstract principles. The pontifical had three divisions according to the Institutes of Gaius and Justinian in the Roman law: persons, things, and actions. The first part consisted of confirmation, priestly ordinations, and the administration of blessings for monastic and secular dignitaries. The second part contained primarily the dedication of churches and their accessories but equally the blessings of the instruments of pilgrimage and soldiering. The third part went through the bishop's peculiar functions in the annual cycle (e.g. public penance, the consecration of holy oils), and lastly turned to the rites of ecclesiastical government and discipline (e.g. synod, excommunication, visitation).

The ritual had three divisions alike. The first treated the five sacraments delegated to parish priests: baptism, confession, communion, the anointing of the sick (along with rites around the dying, funeral), and matrimony. The second part contained the blessings of different objects. The third dealt with processions from regular, annual celebrations like Candlemas and Corpus Christi to occasional ones like those in case of adverse weather, famine, epidemic, or war. Already in the first editions, supplements and appendices augmented both the pontifical and the ritual without changing their fundamental structure.

The last category reveals a problem of redaction. The processions of Candlemas and Palm Sunday are duplicates: they figure both in the missal and the ritual. Those of the Litanies (the Greater on 25 April and the Lesser, also known as Rogation Days, before Ascension) and Corpus Christi are only in the ritual although there would be no obstacle to placing them in the missal as recurrent rites of the annual cycle. Similarly, the publication of moving feasts on Epiphany, the rites of public penance on Ash Wednesday and Maundy Thursday, and the consecration of holy oils on the same date are in the pontifical albeit they interrupt or immediately precede the mass of the day and so interfere with the contents of the missal. Such a conflict

of editorial principles highlights the problem of transitory rites: public celebrations that occur yearly and are closely linked to the mass or the office but differ from them structurally.

Service books – editorial concepts

Like most of the late 16th-century missals, the Tridentine edition adopted an inclusive approach. It incorporated almost everything that fitted into the ecclesiastical year and was bound up with the mass: the special ceremonies of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Holy Week, and the Vigil of Whitsun. Only the explicitly pontifical rites were left out and the aforementioned processions of the Litanies and Corpus Christi, perhaps because churches were not individually responsible for their organization. The faithful of one settlement took part in a single procession in both cases.

This modestly inclusive approach, however, was not predominant in the period. Extremities existed in either direction. Missals of Southern Germany tended to be rather exclusive. They contained only the mass propers and referred all the other rites to the ritual, mainly termed *agenda* or *obsequiale*. The rationale of the procedure might have been the theoretical consideration that such rites are, in fact, not part of the mass, and a practical one that the priest does not celebrate them from the altar. He could use a lighter, smaller book more comfortably when passing in a procession or consecrating the baptismal font. Yet in most places, the missal kept the symbolic role of codifying the local use which favoured the inclusive attitude against the exclusive one. This resulted in the duplication of transitory rites: they were recorded both in the missal and the ritual, a typical option of late medieval service books. Moreover, rituals from the west of Europe, mainly termed *manuale*, frequently borrow the function of an itinerary missal. Many of them contain a selection of the prominent Sundays and feasts with a series of

votive masses. Such rituals may include a mass ordinary, too, or at least the preparation before and the thanksgiving after the mass, recited outside of the sanctuary. In short, rituals before Trent are more comprehensive sources than one would estimate according to their descendants.

Still, the ritual is a relatively modern genre that only reached the peak of its career in the printing press period. On the opposite side, there are plenty of missals that incorporate the full scale of occasional rites: not merely those linked to masses of the year but baptism, wedding, burial, and many blessings as well. Some of them had a traditional position in the structure: baptism, for example, had long been transmitted as part of Holy Saturday, wedding self-evidently introduced the nuptial mass, and the blessing of a ship had a natural placement before or after a votive mass for men at sea. In inclusive missals, however, similar rites tend to be separate from the main body of the texts as if an independent ritual were appended to the original book. This means that in the late Middle Ages we must always consult the ritual of a given tradition to form a competent picture of the annual cycle and, vice versa, its missal to learn completely how the occasional rites were performed.

As with rubrics, the post-Tridentine editors proved similarly inclusive. They introduced the books with lengthy chapters on the calendar and the ranking of the feasts, the possible defects that may emerge before or during the mass, and provided detailed ceremonial instructions for the mass in general and the specific rites in the appropriate part of the year. After the late 16th century, this practice became the norm. Missals typically started with an introduction over 50 pages and continued with long and detailed rubrics where further clarification was required. In consequence, the number and importance of independent norm texts decreased and even those left became non-essential.

Until that time, not every printed missal contained introductory chapters. At least before the mid-16th century, most of them

were pure collections of texts, only preceded by a calendar and interrupted by rubrics in the mass ordinary and in the extraordinary rites that departed from the habitual way of celebration. In return, a ceremonial and a directory did not suffice to regulate the whole affair. Missing information was recorded in ordinals, norm texts comprising an abbreviated list of items for the entire year, directives for varying constellations of the calendar, and the ceremonial prescriptions for extraordinary days. Accordingly, the evidence that a modern reader expects to find in the rubrics of a service book often happens to appear in an ordinal: again, a genre indispensable to understanding medieval liturgy.

The ordinary of the mass with its rubrics poses a special problem, first, because it is not sufficiently documented and, second, because it lies hidden in obscure sources. The clergy was familiar with the task it had to accomplish. They were accustomed to the rites already as children and previous generations of priests raised them as youths. They knew the texts by heart and performed the gestures almost automatically. Of some exclusivist Southern German missals, one may have the impression that there was no mass ordinary at all beyond the offertory, the canon, the Lord's Prayer, and the communion, yet auxiliary sources of the same traditions prove that it was not so. Not only rituals but also breviaries and especially pontificals have detailed mass ordinaries, parallel with those that we find in missals of a more inclusive conception. Hence, we come to the conclusion that setting down well-known facts needed extra motivation: emphasizing neglected components, reforming the tradition, or maintaining it under unfavourable circumstances.

Indeed, pontificals excel as prominent sources of the mass ordinary. Theoretically, even in the modern age, the solemn pontifical mass was the default form of celebration. This is characterized by the fact that the preparation and thanksgiving, frequently omitted by ordinary priests, were mandatory for the bishop if he celebrated publicly. Besides, he recited the non-sac-

rificial parts at his seat, not in front of the altar, and thus owned a distinct volume for the mass ordinary, the *canon episcopalis*, in addition to the missal. When the offertory began, the ministers carried the same volume to the altar and the bishop read it instead of the usual altar cards. Certainly, we must not extend a modern practice to the Middle Ages, but it sheds some light on the problem of why mass ordinaries are sometimes defective in missals and why they consistently turn up in pontificals.

In sum, liturgical content still oscillated between books in the 15th–16th centuries. Thematically, the scope of pre-Tridentine missals covered everything linked to the mass and the annual cycle, the pontifical and the ritual shared the rest according to the person of the celebrant, and ordinals were responsible for more detailed regulation. Actual sources, however, combined aspects of prestige, practicality, and tradition. Missals could grow uncomfortably monumental, ordinals be replaced by rubrics, and pontificals preserve archaic functions.

Our account seems to have forgotten about the divine office, but the breviary developed in the same way as the missal: both were comprehensive books of an annual cycle. The inclusion of introductory chapters and rubrics was parallel. The only difference is that the divine office is more distinct. Fewer transitory rites surround it and even those are limited to the dates when everything else intermingles: Christmas Eve, the Paschal Triduum, and Easter week. At these times, matins and vespers collide with the mass, and processions split the regular structure of office hours. As a result, office hours or parts of them may appear in missals, rituals, or pontificals alike, and ordinals can tell us more about the details. The foremost conclusion is that already before Trent, four books were representative of the whole liturgy, even if they distributed their material on different principles and in varying proportions.

The distribution of liturgical content to genres of books solidified in the 13th–14th century. This was the period when the

creative wave of designing uses expired and, as a consequence, liturgical traditions started to gain lasting and representative forms. The familiar layout of printed service books written in two columns, furnished with musical notes, and adorned with miniatures evolved at the same time. Musically notated choir books grew gigantic. After centuries of relatively casual book culture, the high aesthetic standards of the Carolingian and Ottonian ages returned. The spectacular shift in distribution and layout may disguise the continuity of the liturgical practice behind the books. While the medium was changing, it broadcast the same message. Diocesan and monastic uses were in full strength, and the liturgical system was universally established. It was the success of comprehensive service books that made the difference.

Missals and breviaries were representative but unpractical, at least in solemn circumstances. Historians usually explain their rise with the spreading of private celebration and the tendency that the celebrant became personally responsible for reciting each text, even those that the singers sang or the readers read, but the lavish decoration and the complete musical notation which frequently accompanies the new generation of books suggest something more. Priests have never sung the propers from an altar missal or their private breviary. A body of singers assisted at high masses and public offices, while low masses and lonely recitation happened in prose. It seems that there is a conflict between the supposed privatization of the liturgy, and its books becoming more and more costly. Simpler liturgies could well have been served by simpler books, but we find the contrary: comprehensive books of this age far outdo the aesthetic standard of their standalone counterparts. Though the factor of private worship surely made itself felt, comprehensive service books belonged to the epoch's great achievements and monumental self-representations like scholastic compendia or Gothic cathedrals. That is the main reason why they are, along

with their printed heirs, not only reliable witnesses of the uses at hand, but their representative summaries.

There is nothing in the perplexing book culture of the earlier period that does not have its equivalent in the volumes uniting particular contents. The scale of ceremonies and the typology of textual genres did not widen anymore, only some new feasts were introduced and, in a limited circle of assignments, new texts and melodies were composed. The driving forces behind this variation are twofold: functionality and esteem; yet they reveal far more about the development of medieval worship and the attitudes of worshippers than a sterile catalogue of manuscript types.

Functionality and layers

Functionality means that different servers needed different texts. Choir books compare to comprehensive books like instrumental scores of an orchestra to the full score of the conductor. Both in the mass and the office, propers can be divided into three layers according to the performer's person and the place he occupies. The first comprises the corpus of prayers, recited by the celebrating priest. He chiefly stays in the sanctuary at the altar, or, if he is a bishop, at his throne. When presiding at an office hour, he sits in a prominent seat of the choir. In consequence, he has a personal book, resting on a cushion on the altar or on a stand in front of his seat. The former is the sacramentary with the orations and the prefaces of the mass, the latter the collectary or capitulary with the orations and chapters (*capitulum*) recited during the office. Together they make up the priestly layer of the script. As a rule, the oration of the office hours borrows the text of the collect (first oration of the daily mass) and, in addition, ancient sacramentaries offer an extensive list of morning and evening prayers, probably for weekday offices, the way the printed Breviary of Constance still treats them. Thus, the term

sacramentary in a broad sense adequately denotes this priestly layer with its sources.

The second layer consists of readings or lessons (*lectio*). It is a less homogenous category than the prayers since both the ministers and the sites diverge. Under solemn circumstances, a deacon recited the gospel of the mass, in Italy and some early Romanesque basilicas from the gospel ambo, later from the top of the choir screen, or any other platform designed for that purpose. The gospel-reading within the office was even more dignified: in monastic matins, it was recited by the abbot. Epistles constituted the next level, read by a subdeacon from the epistle ambo or some other lectern or pulpit. Prophecies on certain days were reserved for lectors, a lower rank of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The lessons of the matins were themselves manifold: biblical passages, hagiographical works, patristic sermons and homilies. Theoretically, all these needed separate volumes according to the different performers and places, but were often united in mixed collections, as lessons were delivered one at a time, so a reader could hand the book over to his colleague once finished. Variety notwithstanding, the term lectionary justly describes a coherent layer of sacred texts.

The third layer contains the chants, sung by the psalmist, the schola or the choir. Their typical place was in the middle of the choir at a lectern, later banished to an out-of-the-way part of the sanctuary or the loft. In the Roman rite, the mass and the office had two separate chant books, the gradual and the antiphonal. The first had long been termed antiphonal or antiphonary, too, and in the Ambrosian rite, the antiphonal truly means a combined chant book for both the mass and the office. Similarly to lectionaries, chant books could not only join, but separate material as well. In the first millennium, genres sung by a soloist were sometimes set apart from others sung by an entire group of singers. Such were the chants between the lessons, the gradual and the tract, recorded in the *cantatorium*. Some sur-

living documents distinguish even between parts of the same item, putting the main part of a gradual in the mass antiphony and its verse in the cantatory. Yet the method soon went out of fashion, and must not obscure the fact that, functionally, chants belong together and form a distinct layer of the liturgy's textual composition.

The distinction has historical significance as well. The three layers evolved independently and differ in many respects. Structurally, the ancient Roman selection of prayers and lessons begins with Christmas Eve, while chants start with Advent. Ordinary Wednesdays and Fridays are provided with lessons, but not with prayers and chants. All the three cycles are coherent within themselves, yet their interrelationship is insignificant. Composite service books had long existed before the first missals, but they simply juxtaposed a sacramentary, a lectionary, and a gradual, or sometimes just a sacramentary with one of the two. The idea of corresponding propers (*concordia officiorum*) only emerged in a time when the three layers were equally solid and viewed from a historical perspective. Establishing a thematic connection between different categories of texts was a challenge for authors that inspired ingenious commentaries but this was exegesis, and not history. We admit that in the divine office there are complete cycles of interconnected chants and lessons. Responsories recall readings from the Old Testament, canticle-antiphons quote sentences of the daily gospel, sporadically legends, sermons, and even orations serve as lyrics. Yet all these are relatively late developments, preceded by earlier repertoires of chants that primarily draw on the text of the Psalms.

Hence, the continuous propers as found in a missal or a breviary are easy-to-use but misleading from a historical perspective. What is more, they obscure the different attitudes of worshippers to the different layers. Doubtless, the tendency of amalgamation, witnessed by the evolution of service books, can be grasped in reception history, too. Medieval clerics and faithful

were less and less conscious of the distinction, yet the structure and the layout of their books preserved its vestiges for a long time. Printers, for instance, typeset chants with smaller font size yet equal line spacing. The method originated in the first millennium tradition of adiastematic (without exact pitch) musical notation, when more space above the text facilitated the insertion of neumes, but was only abandoned in the 18th century.

A hierarchy of components

Structure and layout turn our attention to the other aspect of differentiation: esteem. Franks, Britons, Germans and all the people north of the Alps who regarded the rite of Rome as their model highly appreciated the Roman collections of prayers, lessons, and chants. Urban textbooks and lists of items were faithfully copied and transmitted. They did not, however, contain proper items for every function, nor did they assign every item to a proper function within the year. Even involuntarily, some playing field was left open for future composition and rearrangement. Still, the authority of the Roman models was long hindering the inclusion of new items to the original setting or the implementation of more specified assignments. The Romans themselves caused some trouble. They continued to produce liturgical texts and melodies after the first encounters with the northerners, and were less scrupulous in revising their books. Thus, the urban practice of an earlier and a later generation might have differed. Northern delegates were in vain inquiring about an authoritative original where there was none. They were only confused when confronting written sources of a past generation with present informants and their books.

The situation is manifest in the appendices. The earliest extant graduals already have a separate series of Alleluias after the normal course of the year, and a loose collection of processional antiphons ascribed either to Palm Sunday or the Litanies. It in-

dicates that these were relatively recent additions to the original repertory and, indeed, both Alleluias and processional chants provided a field for creative composition after other genres had been fixed and left intact. Appendices are a fortiori telling about the rank and variability of genres that were not part of the traditional Roman heritage. Until the Tridentine editions, hymns and sequences often figure in an appendix to the psalter of a breviary or at the end of a missal, although they were established components of each service. Earlier scribes typically copied sequences along with tropes, processional antiphons, or liturgical plays in a separate volume. The reason was not the function, since chants were used apart from one another at a definite point of certain ceremonies, and it would have been more comfortable to place them into their liturgical context. Such codices testify about the lower prestige or, in positive terms, the higher flexibility of their content. Appendices and separate volumes sometimes record the historical process of enlargement. Manuscripts are not electronic files: they can only be supplemented at the end. The more recent something is the later it follows in the volume, and this is often true for modern feasts and devotional additions as well. Copies or printed redactions do not always change this order, and may preserve the structure over a long period.

There is another extreme of the hierarchy. Texts of the highest prestige tend to resist adaptation. Gospel books characteristically maintain the biblical texts and do not break them into liturgical divisions. The order of the 150 psalms in a service book is continuous and does not accommodate itself to the transposition of appointed psalms in the real office. Canticles sound in the same manner as the psalms and are sung among them but only follow in an appendix. Normative lists that are not in actual use can freeze outdated information for surprisingly long. Calendars often deviate from the feasts in the body of a service book due to their adherence to ancient martyrologies. Tables of liturgical lessons (*comes* or *capitulare*) provide for a surplus series

of winter Sundays as remnants of a period when the pre-Lenten season of Shrovetide (*Septuagesima*) was not yet introduced and even Lent started later, a state of affairs that preceded the first surviving monuments.

In ancient Roman books, the seasons with the Sundays of the year and the feasts of the saints followed continuously, regardless of their actual sequence that slightly varied according to the dates of Easter and Christmas. The texts of a saint's feast were therefore more personalized, not necessarily by hinting at biographical details but because they had been composed for the very feast. In this sense, Felix in Pincis in January became a prototype for many male saints, Prisca for females. So far, there existed no common of saints (*commune*) as a formulary according to abstract categories of saints. The approach grew uncomfortable as more and more local saints were added to the Roman core. New saints typically borrowed the items of older ones, but the texts in full were anchored to their original assignments. They were difficult to find yet their master remained recognizable: of the three different introits for confessor popes, all beginning with the word *Sacerdotes*, it was clear that Sylvester on 31 December possessed *Sacerdotes tui*, Gregory on 12 March *Sacerdotes Dei*, and Felix on 29 July *Sacerdotes eius*. The commune solved the practical problem by introducing the abstract category of confessor popes while it obscured the origin of the single items. Revisiting the ancient arrangement sheds light on the question of why some saints stay loyal to the same items, while others choose randomly from options equally fitting to their category.

Beyond the mass and the office

Occasional rites outside the mass and the office (including those that precede or interrupt masses and offices) belong to a more flexible and sometimes less prestigious group. Neither the struc-

ture nor the repertory is so authoritative as in the mass and the office. Among the textual layers, prayers absolutely prevail: both lessons and chants are secondary ornaments, and even those are mostly reused from elsewhere. Very few and relatively late pieces have been directly composed for the rites. Thus the generic distinction loses some of its importance. Here, it is no more interesting if a chant was originally an antiphon, a responsory, or a part of the mass propers. The sacramentary layer, in contrast, becomes more nuanced. Besides the overwhelming majority of orations, other euchological genres (exorcism, preface, invitation, prex, formula, allocution) gain significance.

Rites do not naturally form a coherent series. For them, there is no such superstructure as the annual cycle which places each mass and office hour into a larger system. From a practical perspective, they are mobile. Processions form a prominent part of them, and even inside the church, they use the space more abundantly. Some rites start before the entrance of the church or in the nave, outside of the choir screen, others visit sites remote from the sanctuary like the sepulchre, the baptismal font, the refectory, or the cemetery. All these factors predestine rites to be recorded in tiny, isolated booklets (*ordo*, *libellus*). Extremely thin books were, however, vulnerable and uneconomical from a copyist's and binder's point of view. To this contributed the ambition of monumentalizing either a tradition in its entirety or the person of the book's possessor. Therefore, ordines containing the text of a rite and describing the way how it should be performed tended to gather in collections or were incorporated into sacramentaries.

The first extant rites appear as supplements to sacramentaries either at the end of the volume's main divisions or embedded into the ecclesiastical year at an appropriate point: penance and baptismal preparation in Lent, blessings of victuals on Easter Sunday, expiatory processions after the Litanies. This editorial policy survived until the early modern era, as it is many times

witnessed by inclusive missals. The other strategy was to collect the liturgical extras into distinct book types. In general terms, pontificals, processional, and rituals covered the field. None of them was, however, treated as a clear-cut frame for well-defined content. Early pontificals usually contain more than what was necessary for a bishop: chants of processions and parish services like betrothal or anointing of the sick regularly appear in them. Two tendencies, however, are recognizable. One is a fluctuation between isolating and accumulating the material. Many codices prove to be haphazard collections of ordines without any intention to be exhaustive. Yet many aspire to gather and systematize all the information that has been left out from the books of the mass and the office. The other tendency is a functional distribution according to the person of the minister. Either the chanted pieces are separated from the recited ones, resulting in a distinction between processional and the rest, or the bishop's ceremonies from the priest's ones, resulting in pontificals as opposed to rituals. The most typical medieval book genre is, however, the pontifical in an extended sense: a book that collects some amount of extra ordines both sung and said, episcopal and sacerdotal.

As witnesses of enduring local traditions, the reliability of such books is sometimes disputable. First, many of the occasional rites happened only seldom. Even a funeral was a naturally unexpected ceremony. Still less did a bishop dedicate churches or crown kings on an annual basis. Ceremonies of this sort were, therefore, less habitual. The participants needed intense preparation and rehearsal, and so every actual rite was a single performance in its own right. Due to the lack of routine, possible innovation met less resistance, and creative individuals felt free to rework entire services. Second, regular services of the same church were grounded on the cooperation of well-integrated groups: chapters of canons or religious convents. Rare but solemn ceremonies, in contrast, demanded the coordination of

persons and staffs of different backgrounds: bishops of distant dioceses, selected ministers, and singers. They were to well-integrated groups what the members of a national team are to a club. This factor also contributed to the uniqueness of occasional rites. Third, even if the rites were unchanged, their books were not always in such a direct connection with the actual practice as those of the regular ceremonies. A book containing prayers, lessons, and chants for a single service could not be used simultaneously by everyone in charge. Indeed, books of such rites more frequently give the impression of being theoretical works, master copies, aids for consultation, or status symbols. Some survived in monastic libraries and were of an uncomfortably large format with small characters, others celebrated the owning bishop with expensive material and lavish decoration, but remained intact of actual use.

Three fates – processional, pontifical, and ritual

Yet we can harmonize the codicological experiment with the above reservations about information value. Occasional rites can be fruitfully classified into three groups which approximately match the genres of processional, pontifical, and ritual. In this sense, processional is an abstract term for the extraordinary but recurrent rites of the annual cycle: Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Holy Week, Easter, the Litanies, the Vigil of Whitsun, and, later, Corpus Christi. They are the products of well-integrated groups and, due to their yearly occurrence, leave their imprint on their collective memory. They were not restricted to cathedrals: each church or at least each municipality performed them. Such rites have a greater chance of preserving local features over a long period, thus they are more closely linked to liturgical uses. Even if recorded in pontificals as well, those were not the typical resources of texts during their celebration: missals, rituals, and processionals are more reliable in cases where the evidence disagrees.

The term 'pontifical' can be understood as a collective term for large-scale services presided by bishops. Cathedrals hosted a part of them, typically those that belonged to the cycle of the year but required the presence of the local bishop like the expulsion of penitents on Ash Wednesday, their reconciliation and the chrisom mass on Maundy Thursday, or the ordinations on Ember Saturdays. These already involved participants who did not count among the resident assembly of the church, but they recurred periodically, moved on familiar ground, and remained under the direction of the cathedral clergy. The other part consisted of visiting ceremonies like the dedication of churches, the consecration of virgins, or the inauguration of monastic dignitaries. Those depended more on the resources of the recipient institution, must have been realized according to changing circumstances, and lacked an annual routine. There existed also mixtures of the two categories: synods and coronations, for instance, happened mostly in cathedrals, but only occasionally.

Such factors worked against the stability of the concerning rites and, indeed, we can observe a higher degree of independence and innovation on the pontifical level. In the very same tradition, new items, arrangements, and ceremonial elements may emerge in subsequent sources. Musicologists often register freshly composed melodies for well-known texts in notated pontificals which is in harsh contrast with the melodic steadiness of regular ceremonies.

There is an opposite tendency, too, resulting in the consolidation of pontifical rites. Notwithstanding innovation, pontifical ceremonies prove to be much more alike within a larger sample than processional rites, not to mention rituals discussed below. One can and must dispute the theories about the origins and the uniformity of the so-called Romano-Germanic Pontifical or the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman pontificals in the 10–11th centuries, yet no one can deny that related texts and structures

connect several institutions of wide regions over a long period. The phenomenon repeats itself with the relative success of the Curial Pontificals beginning with the 12th century and the triumphal march of the Pontifical of William Durandus beginning in the 14th century. While processional rites vary from diocese to diocese, in some respect even from church to church, pontifical rites can be easily classified into a few groups. Obstinate exceptions always remain, but the majority of the evidence conforms to previous categories and this is what we prefer to label as the tendency for internationalizing pontifical rites.

Most probably, a medieval bishop's career is the key to the situation. Although, theoretically, he was lifelong wedded to a single diocese and therefore the first to display and guarantee its integrity, in reality, he moved from see to see or paid more interest to national or international affairs. Early medieval bishops had still been criticized for their long absence from the diocese; for their late medieval colleagues, it was considered the ordinary course of things. Accordingly, the actual guardian of a local tradition was no more the bishop but the cathedral chapter or any other corporation that resided and worshipped there permanently. In contrast, pontificals increasingly satisfied the demands of a mobile ecclesiastical elite.

Lastly, the abstract notion of ritual covers a parish priest's functions that occur repeatedly in a year, do not necessarily involve other ministers, and suppose a close contact with the laity like baptism, matrimony, private penance, sickness, or death. The frequency of such rites contributes to their fixedness and the conservative expectations of the liturgically untrained faithful endorse the same. Laymen were, however, rarely occupied with the precise text. Instead, they observed the ceremonial, paying little attention to the accompanying Latin prayers. It is true from a clerical perspective that a liturgical tradition meant a complex system of uttering words, yet from a lay perspective it was what it now is: a performance of memorable gestures. This

left more freedom on the textual level, especially since the sacramental efficacy of the rites rested on a small number of short formulas. With the ritual, a parish priest escaped the control of his fellow clergymen, too. None of the aforementioned rites was accompanied by elaborate chant and none required the presence of more than an altar boy. As the burden of pastoral care moved from cathedrals to parish churches, there was a tendency for the privatization of sacerdotal rites. Harmonizing the multifaceted tasks of a team works for stability, while individual affairs are more exposed to change. And indeed, no rite is so diverse in its textual details as matrimony or burial albeit the overall process of their ceremonial remains remarkably stable throughout the Middle Ages and ever after.

Norm texts

Finally, we must add a few remarks on the earlier history of norm texts. As it has been said, they dissolved into the introducing chapters and detailed rubrics of early modern missals and breviaries. Directorial information, i.e. clarification about calendrical occurrences and concurrences ended up in directories, ceremonial information, i.e. the choreography of solemn and especially complex services in ceremonials. Still, clever priests were able to work out the content of the directories from the rubrics and the current calendar, and at most, only professional masters of ceremonies consulted the ceremonial. Nevertheless, the crystallizing of the two pure genres highlights two important aspects of liturgical regulation.

Before Trent, ordinals were the predominant genre of norm texts. Ordinals have a special significance concerning uses, as they were the first to articulate the concept of enduring local traditions, long before it appeared in the titles of service books. It is ordinals again that reveal how medieval clerics primarily identified such a tradition with the selection and arrangement

of texts. Although ordinals are a rich source of information about the details of medieval worship, only a small percentage of their real content discloses anything about performance. It mostly matches the category that we summed up with the term processional. Everything else is a rather tiresome list of abbreviated items for the entire year's offices and masses, supplemented with directorial remarks for dubious cases. The ordinal's original goal was simply to synchronize and codify texts split into distinct choir books. It is no wonder that they declined in proportion to the emergence of comprehensive service books with extensive rubrics.

Thus, the momentum that ordinals added to the directorial and ceremonial information was an abbreviated list of items according to their actual performance. This method of liturgical codification far predates ordinals. Lists of the opening and closing words of pericopes (biblical lessons) belong to the earliest sources of the Roman rite and have survived in surprisingly many copies. Later, some collectaries (the celebrant's books for the office) were extended with the abbreviation of the rest of the items, sung by the choir, parallel to the sacramentaries that incorporated chants, lessons, or both. It is not unlikely that the more recent term 'breviary' had originally denoted a list of abbreviations, and went from being a term for supplemented collectaries to the full, comprehensive books of the office. In Germany, ordinals were still called breviaries in the 16th century.

In a monastic environment, customaries (*consuetudo, constitutio, custumarium*) played the part of an ordinal. Worship and everyday life were less separated there, and thus customaries usually provide more information than ordinals, their secular parallels. They equally contain the textual skeleton of the annual liturgy, completed with ceremonial and directorial information, but dwell upon the organization of the tasks and the convent's extra-liturgical activities as well. Since many of the religious houses had abandoned their distinctive uses at the time when

secular churches were still retaining them, such sources are of the utmost importance when trying to reconstruct lost monastic traditions.

Canon law, history, theology, and practical liturgy were less distinct in the Middle Ages than one would expect today. Rites of ecclesiastical discipline figured in canonical works, historical remarks were interspersed with exegesis, and all could appear in service books. Some Danish printed missals introduced the introits of Easter week with spiritual explanations even in the late 15th century. Ordinals regularly quoted from the works of renowned liturgical scholars like Amalarius, Bernold of Constance, John Beleth, or William Durandus. On the other side, authors of liturgical commentaries did not limit themselves to symbolic or moral interpretation. They were no less interested in the practicalities of selecting formulas and regulating gestures so that their texts rank among the most valuable sources of liturgical history. The corpus is not homogenous: it varies over a wide range in its scope, style, and authority. Some authors mainly comment on texts, others on ceremonial; some are elevated, others technical; some make absolute statements, and others have a much more permissive attitude towards diversity. Such texts, however, once intermingled with information as found in service books and norm texts, are justly regarded as primary sources of the medieval liturgy. In contrast with pious meditation and merely descriptive historical records, they were often written and consulted as influential sources of reorganizing or correcting the actual way of worshipping.

A group of relatively short and heterogeneous treatises known as the *Ordines Romani* is the oldest type of norm texts and, for some rites, the earliest extant document. Albeit exclusively preserved in Frankish collections, they claim to be of Roman descent and frequently refer to urban institutions. They attracted much attention both in the Early Middle Ages when excerpts of them found their way into service books and in

modern scholarship which made every effort to judge their age, origin, and Roman authenticity. From our perspective, it is more important to assess the measure of their practical relevance. It is beyond doubt that anyone interested in the urban liturgy as it was celebrated before the first surviving service books has invaluable evidence offered by the *Ordines Romani*. Yet much of the evidence is contradictory, representing different stages of development or the practice of different institutions in Rome itself, and was outdated or at least hardly adaptable already in the Carolingian period. Neither contradiction nor obsolescence worked against the transmission of the corpus. Similarly to archaic lists of pericopes, Frankish scribes faithfully copied and sometimes interpolated them out of respect or the purpose of legitimizing current practice, but, after being partly absorbed by the monumental pontificals of the 11th century, they ceased to exert significant impact on the newly awakening Western uses.

The history and typology of liturgical norm texts, therefore, delineate reciprocal tendencies of convergence and divergence. The basic components are the ceremonial, the directorial coordination, the lists of texts, and theorizing. The ways to combine them manifest themselves in the early ordines, the high medieval ordinals and customaries, and the introductory and inserted rubrics of the service books. Both accumulation and separation have their advantages, hence neither of the editorial policies will finally prevail. The fabric of the liturgy that they regulate, however, proves to be remarkably constant.

HISTORY

For a comparative analysis of uses, the century between the beginning of liturgical printing and the first Tridentine service books defines an axial age. In that period, the localist parts of Europe, representing the majority of uses, provide a full and reliable picture. Territories with a tendency to national centralization also provide reliable information, although not comprehensively. Printed evidence from Salisbury, Copenhagen, Kraków, Esztergom, or Rome is confirmed by the testimony of manuscript sources centuries earlier but, unlike in localist territories, several dioceses in their neighbourhood remain undocumented. Hence, a snapshot of liturgical variation between the 1470s and 1568 offers a synchronic overview of the continent with some blind spots in the East and the North, and more in Britain and Italy.

As to the diachronic validity of this snapshot, the problem of continuity emerges. One must pose the question if the features distinguishing one use from another in the axial age of early printing can be detected in the previous or in the ensuing periods and, if so, with what time limits.

First, we examine the retrospective value of the printed records. These can routinely be traced back to the early 14th century, the earliest era when most of the uses had liturgical manuscripts of a more or less certain origin. On solid methodological grounds that will be detailed later, plenty of markers can be isolated from the liturgical prints for each use, i.e. distinctive features that consistently characterize a given use but are missing from others. The presence of a marker in an earlier, handwritten service book is a double argument. On the one hand, it demonstrates that the handwritten source belongs to the same tradition as the printed one. As manuscripts only rarely have a title, a colophon, or any other direct reference to their origin,

such an indicator can be extremely valuable. On the other hand, the presence of a marker in an earlier source proves that the concerning tradition was already in existence before the date when the actual book was copied. The time span between the earliest and the latest representatives of a marker determines the minimum lifetime of a given use.

Albeit the bulk of evidence goes back to the 14th century, well-documented uses have deeper roots. Especially in Northern France where a great number of early manuscripts have survived and been competently classified according to their origins, 13th-century books already produce markers that we can follow up to their printed successors. Sporadically, even 11th- and rarely 10th-century books show unmistakable continuity with their late descendants. As we have seen, the geographical pattern that arises from the distribution of printed service books in the 15th and 16th centuries points to the same period. It seems that no new use was established after the end of the 13th century. Consequently, uses that we do find in the late medieval period must have been established during the previous centuries. The challenge that remains is how to account for the findings that signal discontinuity. Before that, however, we turn to the other end of the timeline.

Philologists have always had a predilection for the earliest sources and have been inclined to neglect later ones, although they theoretically acknowledge that even late copies can represent lost but trustworthy lines of transmission. For the same reason, the information value of liturgical prints has long been underestimated, not to mention those that come from the period after the Council of Trent. Yet a closer survey of them reveals the latest time limit for distinguishable uses.

Neither the decrees of the council, nor the bulls introducing the revised Roman breviary or missal enforced Romanization. It happened in most cases anyway, but not immediately. In large territories of Europe, in Britain, parts of the Netherlands, Scan-

dinavia, and North-East Germany, the Protestant Reformation prevented the continuation of Latin service book production. Many of the Catholic areas also ceased to care for their specific uses. The rest of the post-Tridentine dioceses, however, can be examined as to their adherence to ancient customs or adoption of Roman models by the same means of liturgical markers. Late books are carefully compiled according to modern standards with titles and colophons self-evidently referring to their origins. The most important conclusion that can be drawn from them is their attitude towards their past.

Medieval liturgies – what is left of them?

Late 16th- and early 17th-century missals show remarkable continuity with their medieval predecessors. They are often even more reliable as they are more detailed and carefully edited. Most of them come from France and the western dioceses of Germany. In Sens (1575), Metz (1597), Paris (1602), Trier (1608), or Aosta (1617) these are the best sources of the corresponding uses. In Lyon, the missal of 1688 is still intact of early modern intervention. Nevertheless, the contents must be compared with the earlier witnesses, as the 16th century was especially susceptible to reforms. In Braga, for example, the missal suffered fundamental changes between its 1538 and 1558 editions and the outcome was fatal in a certain sense. In 1924, the use of Braga was restored with the explicit support of the Holy See. It was the only diocesan tradition that gained such a degree of recognition in recent times. The restored missal, however, was based on the revised edition of 1558. Except for this one, any other Bragan missal from the second half of the 16th century would have provided authentic medieval practice.

At the same time, Romanization also gained ground. Orléans adopted the use of Rome as soon as 1600 and the fact is positively expressed in the titles of its new service books. Many

other dioceses and religious orders abdicated their ancient use and decided for the Roman one in the first decades of the 17th century. In France, another tendency appeared in the 1680s. In connection with the Neo-Gallican movement, a school that stressed the ecclesiastical independence of France within the Catholic Church, service books came out with titles referring to particular dioceses but with radically revised content. Outside of France, only a few dioceses published liturgical books in the 17th–18th centuries, and several of them openly conformed to Rome like Constance or Regensburg. In France, however, the production of Neo-Gallican missals, breviaries, and rituals continued until the 1840s when the contrary movement of Dom Prosper Guéranger discredited Neo-Gallicanism and attuned French ecclesiastical mentality to a more favourable attitude towards Rome and the Middle Ages.

Neo-Gallicanism was essentially a product of the early modern era and its puritanical, rationalistic religiosity. Its ideologists were dedicated to a less ritualistic and more didactic utilization of texts. In their view, dull repetition was unwanted. Liturgical books served rather as colourful and instructive chrestomathies of biblical passages. The established structure of the Roman rite, however, remained untouched. Only the textual items were changed within an unchanged framework.

Concerning their relationship with the earlier uses, two Neo-Gallican characteristics are worth noting. In the first period of the movement, some scholars paid particular attention to forgotten or just declining medieval customs. They regarded them as part of French national heritage, and this was a central motivation of liturgical scholarship at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries. Accordingly, Neo-Gallican innovation, Romanization, and restored medieval elements figure side-by-side in the service books of the age. From the mid-18th century, however, such mixtures surrendered to pure Neo-Gallicanism everywhere.

The other characteristic is the misleading Neo-Gallican approach to localism. The titles of the books refer to dioceses, yet the liturgical content cannot be arranged according to geographical patterns. Certain collections of texts appear at different locations of France while rival collections appear at others. Many books are so similar in their layout that one has the impression that only the title pages have been substituted. They do not contain uses in the medieval sense but literary initiatives that can be adopted by several institutions simultaneously. Even within this pattern, dioceses are not faithful to a special collection but replace them from one edition to the other. Hence, their titles notwithstanding, diocesan books after the mid-17th century can seldom be trusted as authoritative sources of diocesan uses.

Calendars and rituals were the last media to preserve local practices. Albeit they abandoned their uses, dioceses were keen to maintain their venerated saints on their particular dates. Sometimes, they even made it a condition of adopting the Roman use. Therefore, calendars and propers of saints, both for the Mass and the office, were issued up to the 20th century and appended to the Roman missals and breviaries. Indeed, the cult of specific saints on specific dates often perpetuates medieval practice, however, this cannot be said of their propers.

The Roman ritual after the Council of Trent was not promulgated as a proposition for the universal Church, and rituals continued to be published on a diocesan basis. Possibly, lay faithful were less inclined to ritual change in the fields in which they were most interested: the rites accompanying birth, matrimony, and death, or the solemn processions in which they participated more actively than in the mass or the office. Nevertheless, the comparison of modern books with their early predecessors is usually disappointing from a medievalist's perspective. Sure, some memorable components recall medieval precedents, but they are more the vestiges of continuity than continuity itself. In general, ceremonies were radically abbreviated and deeply

modified under Roman influence. This is, however, not a judgement of their absolute value. From an unbiased perspective, they communicate the ritual conduct and the preferences of a certain period and society. And, although with due caution, their medieval remains deserve attention as well.

The rise and fall of localism

Uses derive from a localist paradigm, yet – as nation-wide centralization, Romanization, and Neo-Gallicanism equally demonstrated – localism is not self-evident in liturgical history. The problem of continuity evokes a more essential problem: that of identity. In this respect, localism means a paradigm in which the identity of an ecclesiastical community is primarily determined by its geographical situation. The identity is expressed by the means of an enduring and coherent cluster of liturgical peculiarities that are associated with the centre of the locality (the cathedral) and extend over the territory under its jurisdiction (the diocese). Both the identity and the use are clearly distinguished from other identities and uses, disregarding their geographical proximity. Uses are not liturgical dialects in the sense that they form a natural continuum of practices that slowly fade into one another. Their diversity is intentional, designed, frequently even stressed; yet without a touch of hostility or rivalry. Uses are parts of a structured whole, as dioceses are parts of provinces, and provinces are parts of the universal Church. Without one another, their diversity becomes meaningless.

When focusing on the interaction of identities and uses, two aspects of the question must be discussed: the historical limits of the localist paradigm and the process that led to its formation. As to the first, the safest method is to look for coeval testimonies of the localist attitude. Handwritten service books that have titles or colophons consistently referring to the use (*usus*), order (*ordo*), rite (*ritus*), or custom (*consuetudo*) of a specific diocese

first appear in Southern France and Catalonia in the 14th century. Compared to the relative lack of such references in other parts of Europe, their presence in missals from Bordeaux, Urgell, Carcassone, Narbonne, Béziers, Maguelone, Aix, Toulon, and Gap does not seem a mere coincidence. The region, however, is only first in its explicit display of a *fait accompli*; distinct uses existed long before elsewhere too, and, although not so regularly, similar titles occurred as well.

Perhaps the Avignon papacy had something to do with the fact that it was its direct region of influence where the consciousness of uses was first accentuated. Avignon, Albi, and Rodez already adopted the Roman use in the 14th century. The titles of the neighbouring dioceses' missals probably laid emphasis on the fact that they did not. The chief theoretician and the prominent pope of the age, William Durandus the Elder and John XXII, were both born in Southern France. Durandus wrote the most voluminous liturgical commentary of the Middle Ages, the *Rationale*, summarizing the tradition of the genre in a typical scholastic *summa*. In the meantime, he compiled a service book for bishops, his famous pontifical that enjoyed the support of John XXII, and gradually replaced other types of pontificals in the next two centuries. It served as the basis of the first printed edition of the Roman Pontifical in 1485 and its Tridentine redaction in 1596. Yet the Pontifical of Durandus was not Roman in the proper sense. Primarily, it was an unprecedented compilation by the author. Its ceremonies, however, rely heavily on the liturgical heritage of Languedoc and Spain. Durandus might have not meant to compile a book for the whole Latin Church, but he was surely a proud representative of his native lands. When supporting the product of his fellow countryman, even Pope John XXII was aware of disseminating non-Roman customs in the position of the Roman Pontiff. In the preface to his *Rationale*, the same Durandus favourably comments on the diversity of local practices; a theme that runs through his treatise.

tises on different ceremonies. His attitude is in sharp contrast with the ideals of uniformity and Roman authenticity for which both popes and liturgical theoreticians pressed two centuries before, in the wake of the Gregorian movement.

Still, there is a further group of sources demonstrating that localism was already in effect in the 12th and 13th centuries. Albeit service books only rarely refer to their origins, ordinals were written with the explicit purpose of codifying the tradition of a specific institution. The genre flourished from the 12th century and lasted until the age of the printing press. Not infrequently, ordinals are introduced by philosophical paragraphs that recall the formulaic language of medieval charters. One characteristic theme is permanence: earthly things change and memory can lapse, hence tradition must be written down to avoid uncertainty and disagreement. The other theme is unity: uncontrolled variation conflicts with divine order and beauty, hence the members must adjust to the head, i.e. the churches of a diocese to their mother, the cathedral. Such thoughts already reveal anxiety for centralization, but it is the centre of a diocese and not of the entire Church that emerges as the point of reference. In the same 12–13th centuries, we have the first positive records of strict centralizing measures inside the City of Rome itself.

Before the first ordinals, direct evidence about local uses disappears. Nevertheless, conclusions can be drawn from the fact that many of the most characteristic uses are associated with institutions that were founded or re-established in the 11th century. As we have seen, dioceses erected after 1300 adopted the uses of the predecessors from which their territories were carved out or to which they traced back their ancestry. Dioceses (and religious orders) of the 12th and 13th centuries that are contemporary with the bloom of ordinals self-evidently possess uses of their own. Remarkably, so do the dioceses of Hungary and Poland that entered the European theatre in the 11th century: an era when neither service books with titles nor ordinals were yet usual.

In the same period, the western and southern borderlands of Europe underwent a radical transformation. In the West, the Normans conquered and reshaped Anglo-Saxon Britain and pushed forward to the South: Sicily, Southern Italy, and the Holy Land. The uses of dioceses that once belonged to this Anglo-Norman realm shared many characteristic traits until the dawn of the Anglican Reformation. They absorbed several texts, gestures, and structural features that had been exclusive to the Anglo-Saxon liturgy, so that the Anglo-Norman amalgam as represented by later uses cannot be earlier than the start of the conquest of Britain (1066). Yet they are present also in Sicily, so that they cannot be later than the 12th-century loss of the island by the Norman dynasty.

In Spain, the last quarter of the 11th century saw a wave of the reconquista that penetrated deeply into the centre of the peninsula, its ancient capital, Toledo. Both the war and the ensuing re-establishment of the dioceses enjoyed intensive support from Pope Gregory VII and his French allies, particularly the Abbey of Cluny. They insisted on the abolition of the Old Spanish (Visigothic or Mozarabic) rite that had survived under Arabic rule. In return for the papal assistance, local rulers mainly consented and stood for the adoption of the Roman rite. The characteristic uses of Spain, however, as we know them from the High Middle Ages and the early modern period, are not Roman in the strict sense. While conforming to the overall structure of the Roman rite, they differ in details both from one another and from the use of Rome. Nor do they preserve considerable remnants of the Old Spanish past. Such a formula suggests that – similarly to the Anglo-Norman case – new uses were designed from the late 11th century. It comes as no surprise that, in contrast, both the Hieronymites, a religious order founded in late 14th-century Spain, and Granada, re-conquered only in 1492, adopted the use of Rome.

Creation and identity

The indirect testimony of uses born in the 11th century leads on to the other aspect of the question, that of liturgical creation. Diversity in itself is not a symptom of diverse identities; it may evolve unintentionally, too. On the other hand, even unintentional diversity may be reinterpreted as an expression of identity. Between the two lies the option whereby diversity is not only acknowledged, but deliberately created. In this regard, western liturgical history can be understood according to the changing relationship between the factors of creativity and identification.

No one can deny that 17th–18th-century French service books were creative in a certain sense. Within a traditional structure, they selected new, often really inspiring texts, and devised their new, often thought-provoking constellations. Yet, disregarding the titles they carry, the liturgical output of the Neo-Gallican wave of creativity was only loosely associated with local pride. Many dioceses shared the same texts and rituals, or modified their own practice with considerable ease. In short, creation could flourish without any tendency of long-term identity-building.

As we have seen, ecclesiastical identities were expressed by liturgical uses as late as the age of post-Tridentine service books. Moreover, the printing press gave an unexpected aid to the realization of the desire formerly expressed in the prefaces of manuscript ordinals: now every use could be effectively codified and disseminated in a given diocese. That even an early modern cosmopolitan was deeply attached to his native use is demonstrated by Iodocus Clichtoveus, a Flemish humanist and author of the *Elucidatorium*, a magnificent liturgical commentary of renaissance scholarship. Clichtoveus composed the first edition of his work under the patronage of János Gosztonyi, the bishop of Győr, Hungary, and took Hungarian service books as a basis. The enlarged edition of 1521, however, was his private enterprise.

In that, he included some rites that had been missing from the 1516 edition, among them Palm Sunday. The exact variant he considered represents the use of Th erouanne. Indeed, the author was born in Nieuwpoort, a municipality of that diocese (in present-day Belgium), but left it at a young age for more prestigious places in Flanders and France where he became a well-beneficiated cleric and a renowned scholar. The homage of such a personage to his rural descent at the apex of his career in a liturgical treatise that was conceived for an international audience proves a vital connection between uses and identities even for the 16th century.

There is a difference, however, between maintenance and creation. The late Middle Ages gave proof of a keen interest in liturgical self-identification, but without a deeper interest in liturgical production. In fact, a number of contemporary texts and melodies were composed, but they formed only a negligible percentage of the whole and did not reach a universal audience. Intervention in liturgical affairs was limited to nuances of rubrical regulation or small-scale reforms that ranged between already existing options. New texts (at least for the established parts of the annual cycle), new arrangements, or new rites were not designed anymore. Uses were the settled products of an almost immemorial past, not a field of current activity. Their antiquity and their resistance to change, however, highly contributed to their authority and their potential for uniting all ranks of living and deceased of a locality.

Hence, the end of the 13th century seemed to put an end to the productive period in many respects. The geographical distribution of uses that survived until the age of the printing press and the attitude articulated by titles and prefaces of service books point in this same direction. Spanish cathedrals re-conquered in the late 13th century consistently have their use that is not Mozarabic but equally distinct from that of Rome. The cathedral of Prague developed one of the most exuberant uses

of the Roman rite just before being elevated into an archepiscopal see and the centre of the Holy Roman Empire in the 14th century. In addition, the above-mentioned pontifical of William Durandus, written at the end of the 1200s, was the last creative achievement of western liturgy-making. Its rites bear the mark of original design and its benedictional – the collection of triple pontifical blessings for the whole year – was probably composed by Durandus himself. Yet, unlike the Neo-Gallican books, it was deeply rooted in local soil. No matter how widespread it gradually became, it met the needs of an Occitan bishop who, similarly to Clichtoveus more than two centuries later, was devoted to his origins, his international career notwithstanding.

The starting point of the localist paradigm is more difficult to assess. Liturgical creation and local identity intermingled the most in the Gothic period. It is marked by the parallel emergence of a pan-European ethos on a higher, and a self-confident local or institutional ethos on a lower level. The forerunners of modern nation-states, regional loyalties, dynastic alliances, religious orders, lay confraternities, free cities, guilds, universities all attest to a pattern of organized diversity within a well-defined frame. Also, by a process of elimination, there is no other possible time-frame when the uses that we know from later sources could have evolved.

In-depth analysis of certain ceremonies sometimes verifies the continuity between even 10th- or 11th-century records and their 15th–16th-century equivalents from the same location. Yet it is less certain that such early characteristics were already intended to be the representatives of local identity. While the 11th century is the earliest plausible date for the formation of Polish, Hungarian, Norman, and Spanish uses, it is also the latest for a rather different behaviour that can be observed in the central territories of Europe. Its empirical mark is the presence of the same service books, or at least of precisely the same liturgical arrangements, in geographically distant places. It seems that

certain book types and certain rites were popularized in a quasi-official manner. A normative approach manifests itself with preferences that do not change according to locations but claim to be exclusive or at least optimal.

The end of the 11th century is marked by discord between the papacy and the empire. Both authorities had universal aspirations and this is reflected by their liturgical agenda. As to the papal side, the liturgical mouthpiece of Pope Gregory VII, Bernold of Constance measured the worship of his age against Roman authenticity in his *Micrologus*. It was not a mere theoretical work; until the end of the Middle Ages, some service books often followed the directives of Bernold word for word. As to the imperial side, its typical product was the Romano-Germanic Pontifical, compiled in the early 11th century when popes and emperors still cooperated in harmony. It comprised everything available beyond the regular masses and offices of the annual cycle, i.e. the ceremonies that are commonly recorded in pontificals, rituals, and processions. In contrast with the more or less puritanical emphasis laid on Roman authenticity, the Romano-Germanic Pontifical is an abundant collection of texts, rubrics, and commentaries. The method of its compilation is aptly described as spoliation: the treasures of different traditions have been brought together to meet the needs of an envisaged German imperial elite. The book was a success; it spread throughout the continent and determined the liturgical practice in Central Europe, especially in Bavaria, until the 16th century.

The exclusivist search for authenticity and the inclusivist method of spoliation have one thing in common: they both strive after a uniform practice over a large territory. Regardless of the person of the actual sovereign, Gregorian popes and German emperors equally represented an imperial approach that differed from the localist attitude of the High Middle Ages. Perhaps their mutual failure in subduing Latin Christendom totally and unconditionally contributed to the pluralism of the subsequent epoch.

Authority and freedom

The preceding epoch, however, had passed under the aegis of imperialism. Two phases can be distinguished within, associated with the Carolingian and the Ottonian dynasties. Meticulous interest in Roman practice characterized the Franks of the 8th and 9th centuries. Leaving aside the problem of whether the Frankish manuscripts are trustworthy, the typical service books of the age explicitly appeal to the authority of Rome. The early sacramentaries, the antiphoners of the mass and the office, the *Ordines Romani*, the lists of lessons (*comes*) and Gospels (*capitulare*) often have titles that refer to the urban tradition, or mention typically Roman places and institutions. Indeed, there is a fundamental layer of the Roman rite that is ubiquitous in its derivatives and endures until the present day. The impact of a station system that was – in its actual form – obsolete already in the High Middle Ages or the omnipresence of scantily identifiable Italian martyrs point to a once faithful adoption. Historical documents also support that, at least in the age of Charlemagne, the aim was a peremptory unification of the Empire's liturgical life according to Roman standards. Theoretically, no variance was tolerated. Even in the next generation, scholars like Amalarius of Metz made careful inquiries about the Roman customs when any ambiguity emerged, and prestigious ecclesiastical institutions competed with one another in preserving the allegedly authentic Roman tradition.

Perfect unity, however, could not be achieved. Technically, the undivided Carolingian Empire did not last long enough to secure it efficiently within the circumstances of oral transmission and manuscript book culture. But there were other, more substantial obstacles, too. During the age of the reforms, the liturgy of Rome itself varied both horizontally and vertically. By horizontal, i.e. synchronic variation, we mean that the city comprised several churches that belonged to different types of

institutions, each with a respectable past of its own. It is not at all obvious that the Lateran, St Peter's, other papal basilicas, cemeteries outside of the walls, parish-like *tituli*, monasteries (either independent or attached to the major basilicas) celebrated a minutely identical liturgy. Even in the same category, different *tituli* could reasonably adhere to their distinctive heritage and books. Or, even if not, they could hardly avoid some inconsistency due to the copying process.

By vertical, i.e. diachronic variation, we mean that the age of the Carolingians – and already the 7th century – was a turbulent period of liturgical activity in Rome itself. Jerusalem fell to the Muslims and left the role of the Christian world's symbolic centre to Rome. The papal ceremonial was reorganized under Byzantine influence. The City's self-awareness was probably raised by the esteem exhibited by the Franks, too. Abandoned shrines were rediscovered, new institutions inaugurated, texts and chants composed, existing items reordered. The liturgy of Rome did not remain static, intact, and unproductive. Reforms and initiatives were underway while the memories and written witnesses of earlier stages were still available. Now, which was the Rome the Carolingians were keen to follow?

Primarily, books and informants representing different stages of different Roman institutions may be responsible for the difference shown by the Carolingian sources that all equally refer to Rome. The process was thoroughly demonstrated by earlier scholarship in the context of orations, chants, and lessons.

Secondarily, liturgical practice is not something that can be finished once and for all. New feasts and new rites could always have been invented, but, also in the already established order, there were several gaps to fill. Aliturgical days without propers gradually became liturgical, loosely arranged texts and chants became assigned to definite points of a fixed structure, duplicates were eliminated, and existing rites enhanced. The process is indirectly documented by the increasing diversity that one

encounters in different layers of the same Roman rite. As there is a fundamental layer that agrees everywhere, there is also a second layer that suffers modest variation. It typically consists of days, texts, and ceremonies that were introduced still in Rome but already at a historically identifiable date like the singing of the *Agnus Dei* in the 7th or the Thursdays of Lent in the early 8th century. The third layer includes all the blank spaces that were left when the Roman rite definitely parted from the City of Rome. With this, we come to the Ottonian phase of the imperial paradigm.

When comparing liturgical phenomena that solidified after the Carolingian period, one is struck by the relative convergence of the eastern, Germanic material, in contrast with the divergence of the western, Gallic material. The selection of lessons for weekday masses, the ceremonies of extraordinary days like Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and Holy Week, as well as the pontifical rites like ordinations or the dedication of churches, are telling examples. The German uses draw on the same set of textual and ceremonial options while the French ones differ both from the German ones and each other. It is unlikely that such a pattern comes from a period when Gaul was a well-organized realm and Germany an underdeveloped borderland. Instead, it matches a strong and centralized Germany, and a France divided by local principalities. The declining Rome of the 10th century could no longer provide a liturgical model for the Empire, but it is simply untrue that a Germanic liturgy would have been imported to Rome in the Ottonian period. The use of Rome has always differed remarkably from its Germanic counterparts in its every manifestation.

The Germanic features are no more vestiges of a Roman divergence. They are the products of an antiquarian curiosity for ancient texts and rituals, involving local creativity, similarly to the liturgy-making of the Norman, Iberian, eastern and northern churches in the 11th–12th centuries. The latter ones were, how-

ever, destined to be local, i.e. diocesan uses. In 10th-century Germany, on the contrary, we have the impression that an imperial use was being designed and promoted that deliberately displayed a joint identity of Rome and its German heirs. The grandiose experiment of the Romano-Germanic Pontifical was only the consummation after a century of liturgical spoliation, already manifest in 10th-century sacramentaries. Nevertheless, it could serve as an example for the methodically parallel but less large-scale endeavours of the ensuing localist epoch. Beyond debate, the most spoliative of them was that of Prague, a bishopric that in its brightest days envisaged itself as the head of both Germany and the marches.

Components of the Germanic liturgy of the 10th–11th centuries can be found throughout the territory that once belonged to the Empire and its marches. In the earlier sources, they come up in quite a capricious way. Enduring local features that can be isolated within the common Germanic material are exceptional, although some bishoprics like Augsburg, Regensburg, or Würzburg exhibit such already in their early period. Yet, as a group, Germanic uses can be clearly distinguished from others; not only from their western companions but also from their eastern or Nordic neighbours. This consistency is not exclusively connected to an imperial attitude: German dioceses were more susceptible to the unifying policy of the Gregorian era as well. While Gaul and the Iberian peninsula remained practically intact, Germany collaborated in the Gregorian issues of regulating the Ember Days or harmonizing the Mass orations with the parallel systems of chants and pericopes in an orderly manner.

At the latest from the 14th century, however, German liturgies also start to behave like local uses. Their means of self-expression are not new: they come from the pan-Germanic heritage of the previous centuries but become reconsidered in localist terms. The phenomenon deserves special attention as it reveals another way of making local uses. In the case of the newly composed

uses of the 11th century, we encountered a situation where creation and identification went hand in hand. New or renewed identities were expressed by new liturgical solutions. In Germany, we can find almost nothing of the sort. There, the uses of the High Middle Ages rely on a range of instruments already accessible around the millennium; only that specific selections and arrangements became fixed and attributed to specific institutions. Thus, a transition from the imperial paradigm to the localist one can happen through the reinterpretation of already existing features as well.

Most probably, the same thing occurred in the most ancient uses of Italy and France, where continuous liturgical life went back to a Christian antiquity. Differences caused by the adoption of different Roman models, by the shortcomings of memory and written transmission, or by the cautious creativity of some ancestors in filling the gaps of an authoritative tradition grew into markers of individuality. Henceforth, diversity was not something that should be eliminated but something that was well-received, preserved, emphasized, and sometimes deliberately invented. From the central Middle Ages, bishoprics founded before the Constantinian shift, like Limoges or Reims, had uses of their own, not any less than the newcomers of Western Christianity outside the former frontiers of the Roman Empire. The Carolingian and Ottonian attempt to establish a Europe with a uniform liturgy failed. In the unfolding Europe of colourful uses, what makes a difference is if the uses were primarily shaped by creation, spoliation, or reinterpretation.

Old Latin rites

Because of the scarcity of written records, the pre-Carolingian period is covered by pre-historic darkness. Still, with due caution, some features of it can be highlighted that, compared to their better-documented afterlife, may acquire significance in a

broader historical context. Regional character marks the epoch. As Visigothic Spain, Merovingian Gaul, and Insular Britain have their respective scripts in palaeography, they are supposed to have their respective liturgies. Between the two Empires, the Roman and the Carolingian, the rite of Rome itself is alleged to have belonged to this circle, with the reservation that it did not extend – and did not mean to extend – over the City's direct sphere of influence. Thus, the epoch is called the age of regional, or – more properly – of Old Latin rites.

The concept, however, must be weighed against the limited evidence that survived. There are only two Old Latin rites that lasted until the age of the printing press and can be celebrated up to the present day: the Ambrosian rite of Milan and the Mozarabic rite of Spain. Both possess a full series of service books for offering mass, reciting the divine office, and administering sacraments or sacramentals. Moreover, their liturgical chant is also accessible via legible musical notation. Yet only one of them, the Ambrosian, has an uninterrupted past. The Mozarabic tradition, as we know it today, is the fruit of a 15th–16th-century restoration. Even if we overlook the doubts of those who dispute the authenticity of the texts and melodies promulgated by the Toletan archbishop, Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, we cannot securely answer the question of whom, i.e. which locality or institution, this rite actually represents.

In the Renaissance period, the Mozarabic rite was conceived as a prestigious monument of the Spanish nation. Cardinal Cisneros not only published the necessary books, but also erected and sponsored chapels in Toledo, Salamanca, and Valladolid to celebrate according to them regularly. Later, the Mozarabic rite spread further to Latin America: obviously, it was not limited to Toledo, the centre of the Hispanic church. Nor was Toledo associated with the Mozarabic rite. Although a Mozarabic chapel ran within the cathedral, the clergy at the main altar, at the side-altars, and indeed in the whole diocese continued to

celebrate according to the Roman-type use of Toledo. Cardinal Cisneros himself did so. His surviving luxury missal in seven illuminated volumes follows the use of Toledo and several printed editions of Toletan service books were published under his reign.

This means that the restorers interpreted the Mozarabic rite according to the concept of the national uses that were just replacing the local uses in some European countries. Such a reinterpretation of earlier information in a national pattern can answer for the inconsistencies between the Cisneros editions and the handwritten evidence coming from earlier centuries. The editors expected – and, in the end, forged – unity where there was none. Why should we assume that a single, undivided Mozarabic tradition existed in a time when there were no national uses anywhere else and even Rome had several parallel traditions?

Three fundamental problems follow from the Mozarabic case. First, we must be wary of applying modern narratives to ancient phenomena. Second, we must define in which sense diversity, change, and creation should be understood. The third task, clarifying what is meant by the categories of rite and use, points beyond historical considerations and will lead to the problems of structure.

Traditionally, five non-Roman traditions are listed as Old Latin: besides the aforementioned Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites, the Gallican, the Beneventan, and the Celtic rite. There are a few extant codices and many fragments that truly witness the presence of a non-Roman type of worship in pre-Carolingian Gaul. Some of their features are shared by the sources, many others are not. Moreover, it is difficult to assess a line of division between Gallican and Mozarabic features. Those linking the Gallican sources together often also figure in Mozarabic sources, while the differences that set Gallican and Mozarabic sources apart come forth within the Gallican group as well. The Hispano-Gallic documents form a varying continuum without

discernible boundaries between France and Spain. Yet, it was exactly the idea of France and Spain that contributed to their grouping into two distinctive Old Latin rites, one for each country. In this context, the Gallican rite as such is a reinterpretation of diverse historical evidence in national terms and, indeed, the concept's popularity reached its peak in the Ancien Régime.

As to the Beneventan rite, it is a blurred collective of many different phenomena. Sure, there exists a peculiar script and a related musical notation in Southern Italy and the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic Sea, but not infrequently they are applied to record Roman-type liturgies. On the other hand, some really peculiar liturgical features in the same region are not always recorded with Beneventan script and notation: this is the reason why earlier scholarship introduced the adjective Campanian to denote essentially the same phenomena. In addition, Beneventan liturgical specialities seldom transgress the limits of variation that is acceptable within the Roman rite, and when they do, especially in Holy Week, they come close to the Ambrosian rite to which they are attached through a common Lombardic descent. The attribute 'Beneventan' is more fit for a characteristic group of Roman uses than for an independent rite.

Even less can be said about the Celtic rite. The few fragments interpreted as its documents are either Roman or Hispano-Gallic. No matter how magnificent an ecclesiastical culture the British Isles once had, and how great an impact they once exercised on the continent, what we really know of their ancient liturgy is close to nothing. Historical evidence about the cooperation between Roman and British clergymen predates even the first known service books of either side. Therefore, the endeavour to reconstruct a pre-Roman rite for the Celts remains an heroic initiative of Romantic nationalism.

In sum, the assumed category of Old Latin rites consists of rather disparate phenomena. Old Latin sources are neither close enough to one another to build up a coherent cluster, nor

separate enough from one another to be classified into distinct groups. What holds for them is that their divergence exceeds the measure of variation observed between the Roman-type uses of the post-Carolingian period. The symptom of greater divergence within a smaller sample of sources redirects us to our starting point, namely that liturgical history, on a large scale, is a convergent process. Yet to understand archaic multiplicity more deeply, we must turn to the problem of liturgical variation.

The 20th century was burdened by a series of liturgical reforms that cited past reforms as their model or reference. Accordingly, there was a tendency to interpret any liturgical difference in the past as consisting of representatives of an earlier and a later stage of the same thing and any liturgical change in the past as the outcome of official intervention. This was the imaginative theatre where native Romans, ambitious popes, Gallic and Germanic folk, and Frankish monarchs played their parts. Still, ritual has always been surrounded by an air of immutability. Accordingly, difference and change were assumed to involve already existing traditions. It was a contest of urban, papal, and Old Latin rivals from which the established liturgies of the historical epoch emerged. Such an approach leaves fairly little space for creativity. It is, however, self-evident that what can be transmitted must have been created first and that a rich and complex structure like Christian worship could not have evolved from nothing in the twinkling of an eye.

As in the first extant service books we can already observe a fully developed liturgy, its formation must have happened in the pre-Carolingian dark age. Certainly, many fields were left open for creativity even afterwards, but the basic tools and frames had become fixed and unchangeable. Hence, when speaking of creativity thus far, it meant choices between ambiguities within an inherited tradition, rearrangements of items within a settled repertory, enrichments of existing rites, or, at the very most, introducing new items and new ceremonies where there had been

none. The room for this sort of creativity ever tightened as more and more fields became minutely elaborated. This might be the natural reason for the loss of interest in liturgy-making that can be experienced in the late 13th century. From then on, creativity shifted from the nucleus of the liturgy (its texts, melodies, gestures, and structure) to its shell (polyphonic and instrumental re-composition, up-to-date visual arts and architectural environment).

In the dark age, we are faced with a different sort of creativity. Liturgy has no authoritative source from elsewhere, as the Franks adopted it from Rome. Instead, it is made on the spot. Popes, bishops, and scholars who were soon to be proudly talked of as authors or compilers of service books still lived in the 6th–8th centuries: St Benedict, Isidore of Seville, St Gregory the Great, Bede the Venerable, Alcuin, Paul the Deacon. They were all empowered and felt free to intervene in liturgical matters and to compose liturgical texts. From the 4th–5th century, several historical records survive about bishops doing so. Liturgical improvisation, so often misunderstood in recent times, most probably refers to the literary activity of skilled orators in a liturgical context, either extempore or prepared in writing. Councils of that time only bothered about the theological correctness of the texts, not their precise formulation.

Indeed, in an epoch when Latin was still a spoken language and understood by the educated faithful, liturgical creation primarily meant rhetorical activity. Church Fathers were engaged in meaningfully highlighting and re-contextualizing biblical passages in the intertextual network of pericope systems and chant books, or in composing impressive orations of a deep theological message and high literary value. Such texts equally appear in the Old Roman and the Old Latin material. Roman simplicity notwithstanding, the abridgement of the prayers and the growing emphasis on music and visual arts in the successive period may be a consequence of declining Latinity, at least from

the side of the possible target audience. When, however, rhetoric still flourished, liturgical divergence might have resulted from the simple fact that each local bishop was authorized to pray his personal compositions. Nonetheless, they borrowed from each other, too, and some compositions might have grown more popular than others. In this process, local usages interacted and lasting textual traditions evolved. Not even rites were strictly separated: Roman euchological material started to penetrate Gaul spontaneously, long before the Carolingian reforms.

SYSTEM

The unity of the Roman rite is based on two factors: its structure and its repertory. It is a system that consists of a limited set of functions: the ceremonies. Each ceremony comprises a definitive arrangement of activities with their respective topography, personnel, and instrumental environment, and texts with their respective melodies. Both the activities and the texts draw on a relatively restricted cluster of options that comes from a common past. Newly invented gestures and fresh compositions form an insignificant minority as compared to the whole of the system. Variation unfolds within these confines: every local use is classified as Roman if it fits into the Roman structure and applies the Roman repertory.

The omnipresence of the Roman rite is, however, atypical. It was not made on the spot, but spread as a consequence of imperial decisions. Although some of its texts were well-received already before the official adoption, in its entirety it would never have become the rite of Western Christendom without the Carolingians. Thus, the transplantation of the urban Roman structure and repertory to so many different lands within so short a period is virtually unparalleled, which throws some doubt on structure and repertory as the universal constituents of liturgical rites.

The diffusion of the Old Latin rites was less arbitrary. By analyzing the documents of the Hispano-Gallic liturgies, we find that they have a recurrent set of ceremonies, a recognizable outline for the ecclesiastical year, and a characteristic nomenclature for the liturgical genres of the texts. Within the same type of ceremony (the mass is the best-documented), the arrangement, dimensions, and phrasing of the texts regularly recur. It is not haphazard in which order they follow one another, how long they are, whether they are directed to God or

the congregation. The precise texts are far less stable. Sure, there are some items that figure in the same function in more sources but – in contrast with the Roman rite – such items belong to a minority. A large percentage of the surviving texts are unique in their position. Textual patterns and generic regularity can be grasped without determining the actual content. In short, there is structure without repertory.

In religious studies in general, the term ritual denotes a loose complex of phenomena. Certain types of human conduct, certain activities in a religious context, certain modalities of performing things may simultaneously count as ritualistic. In the ancient Christian tradition, some types of activities crystallize as the basic components of the ritual life of the Church: the Eucharist, the consecration of the day by regular prayer, the administration of sacraments, minor blessings of persons and objects, dramatic representations of major events from the history of salvation, and so on. What actually happens varies from place to place: the commonalities concern the function, not its realization. It is this range of functions that link traditional Christian liturgies together, not the way these functions were fulfilled.

When at a specific point of space and time the functions materialize in an enduring structure, we can speak of a rite. The category of a rite can contain subdivisions in different senses. A rite can be monolithic and indivisible, unintended variants can evolve within it, it may allow personal or local creativity, and encourage the evolution of uses. A use is, accordingly, a subcategory of the rite, but not every variance within a rite is justly interpreted as a use. To speak of uses, the variance must be intentional, enduring, communal, and associated with identity. Unintended divergence may be reinterpreted as the marker of a use but with this same gesture of reinterpretation it is rendered intentional. One-time ideas or personal initiatives may be incorporated into a use, but only if repeated and accepted by

many. Liturgical variants may converge and last long, but they can only be called uses if they characterize a specific locality or institution.

Except for isolated monastic communities, uses are kept by more than one assembly. As they are subdivisions of rites, uses can also have their subdivisions. The more assemblies a use involves, the more probable it is that some of them will deviate. In a world where liturgical divergence is a means of self-expression, one can hardly prescribe who is justified to express himself by this means. Authorized or not, prestigious collegiate chapters or wealthy parish churches will push the liturgical boundaries imposed on them by their superior bishoprics. This third level of deviation is aptly labelled as custom. As uses adjust themselves to the conditions of their rite, customs stay among the limits determined by their use.

Yet the transition from rite to use and from use to custom is not always clear. The measure to which divergence is tolerated and acquires significance changes according to types of ceremonies, layers of texts, and ages of consolidation. In consequence, a comprehensive liturgical taxonomy and reliable methodological principles are needed before comparing and evaluating historical evidence.

Thus, the aim of this chapter is to move towards a comprehensive system of describing liturgical information, a somewhat ambitious project, alluding to Carl von Linné's classical work, the *Systema Naturae*. Such a taxonomy will enable a large-scale comparative analysis of western liturgical sources and serve as a basis for the description of rituals in other cultural contexts as well.

Theoretically, the basis of this approach is a certain distance taken from the written evidence, and an emphasis on liturgical activities instead of liturgical books. It is not sources that we place in the scope of our research, but ceremonies as reflected by written means. Without considering the problem of descrip-

tion versus prescription, it suffices to emphasize that all written sources are only selections, and, therefore, only inform us fragmentarily about the practice they were designed for. As we have already demonstrated, their genres are selected according to ministers, e.g. choir books do not contain the parts of the celebrant, and, vice versa, according to service types, e.g. books of the divine office are usually different from those of the mass. They can be published in multiple volumes, one of which might have been lost. Furthermore, the amount of musical notation, illustrations or rubrics varies within each genre, and this variation results in a highly different proportion of various kinds of information.

In sum, there is not a privileged type of service books which would especially fit the purpose. Not even the most comprehensive ones (e.g. ordinals) are to be preferred from a scholarly point of view than any other type of sources, neither must the method of processing data rest upon a typology of sources. On the contrary, a typology of information should organize the variety of extant source material.

Texts and gestures

The first and most significant distinction lies between the textual and the non-textual levels of the ritual. Christian liturgy is pre-eminently textual. It means that the ritual process can be primarily described as an uninterrupted sequence of texts. All the melodies and ceremonial gestures are attached to texts, and even those gestures that are relatively autonomous are accompanied by texts, e.g. the sprinkling of holy water or incensation.

The most important feature of the textual level is that it consists of a huge, yet limited store of texts. They are what we call liturgical items: coherent utterances defined by their wording and their genre. Of course, each of them varies philologically and musically to a high degree, and may be assigned to various

liturgical times and functions; still they are clearly identifiable, prefabricated units of the structure. Taking philological or melodic variants into account would only interfere with a large-scale analysis, similarly to the haphazard peculiarities of the specimens within a biological taxonomy of genera and species.

Therefore, the first thing we need is a standardized nomenclature of genres and items. This is the common basis of all attempts that represent liturgical information in tables or sheets by genres and opening words, from the volumes of Dom Hesbert, comparing the first extant graduals and antiphonals, to the latest databases. The use of incipits – already preferred by medieval normative texts – suggests that textual items of the same genre and the same opening words in the same context are basically the same, regardless of their exact wording or melody which varies throughout the Latin rite. Standardization in this case is not a loss in terms of precision, but a desirable approach that prefers the type to the individual, the species to the specimen. In consequence, the analysis of the textual layer is most efficiently facilitated by the entering of the information into sheets with standardized values.

Although textuality is a universal feature of Christian worship, it does not play an equally important role in every single case. It is a common impression of liturgical experience that in some situations gestures are subordinated to texts, as inclination accompanies each doxology after psalms or hymns, while in others texts are subordinated to gestures, as in the case of making the sign of the cross and saying *In nomine Patris* (“In the name of the Father” etc.), or administering some sacrament by means of physical gestures (anointing, laying on of hands, pouring water) and uttering the related formulas. In more general terms, there are services governed by a rich and fixed series of textual items with a limited and conventional series of gestures, while, on the other hand, there are services governed by a well-defined series of ceremonial gestures with a less strictly arranged series

of texts. The first category is represented by the divine office and the Mass, especially by the bulk of their textual components, called *propers*. The utmost percentage of breviaries and missals repeats a recurrent structure of genres with changing items, e.g. vespers consist of five antiphons, chapter, hymn, versicle, and so on, a mass consists of introit, collect, epistle, gradual, etc.

The second category includes all the other rites, as well as the ordinary of the mass and the office. For instance, baptism always comprises the gestures of breathing in the face of the infant, placing salt on the tongue, introducing him or her into the church, anointing the chest and the shoulders with oil, but the accompanying texts are relatively few, and their order and selection is loose. Regarding the ordinary parts of the former category, the preparation for mass is not determined by its texts but by its gestures: the prayers for mental aptitude, donning of each piece of vestment, departing from the sacristy, kissing the altar and its utensils, etc.

The two concepts may be synthesized in the notion of the liturgical deed, a basic element of the ritual structure. The uttering of a text can be an event within a ceremony, and the performance of a gesture alike. There are some memorable events that are equivalent with the related texts, e.g. the *Exsultet* on Holy Saturday or – in a Jewish context – the *Kol Nidre* on the Day of Atonement. Again, there are memorable events that are physical gestures, like the prostrations before the Holy Cross on Good Friday, or – in the Byzantine matrimonial rite – the coronation of the newlywed couple. The two can be combined in a single process: in the conferral of major priestly orders the first event is a text, the solemn consecratory prayer, including the laying on of hands, which is then followed by gestures: the donning of priestly vestments (*investitio*) and the handing over of sacred instruments (*traditio instrumentorum*).

According to the different roles of textuality, ceremonies – and the parallel methods of comparative analysis – can be di-

vided into two groups. In hard-structured rites, the guideline is secured by a recurrent pattern of texts, while in soft-structured rites, the guideline is a special pattern of gestures. The two categories raise different questions.

The skeleton of texts

Hard-structured rites are not numerous, hence no in-depth research or complex typology is needed to describe them. They are the propers of the mass and the seven plus one hours of the office with their clear-cut sequence of genres. The only misleading phenomenon is that not only one mass or hour can belong to a liturgical day. Office hours are not so problematic in this context, as additional hours are of a commemorative or votive nature, and thematically differ from the dominant hour of the day. Different masses, however, can be celebrated on the very same day. The three masses of Christmas are a traditional example of this, but there are other cases when the morning mass and the high mass of the same day have different propers (e.g. St John the Apostle, St John the Baptist, St Lawrence). Therefore, in a liturgical taxonomy, masses must be differentiated by numbers one to three.

Inside the simple macrostructure, there is a compound microstructure: the intrinsic logic of changing items within a strict generic grid. The monotony of the structure is counterbalanced by the variety of the contents. The challenge is – structurally speaking – to lay down the rules according to which the elements of the semantics (the items) are assigned to certain points of the syntax (the genres embedded into each ceremony). One might spontaneously associate these rules with the ecclesiastical year, but we recommend a more general term, the liturgical topic, out of both historical and practical considerations.

Propers are always organized around central topics. Of course, the most elaborate way of doing so is to follow the monumental

cycle of the calendar, but the year does not prove to be the most ancient thematic principle, neither does it exhaust the range of possible themes. In the oldest surviving service books of the Latin rite, we find surprisingly many masses which in later periods would be labelled as votives. In the meantime, we realize that in the same books, a fully developed form of the yearly cycle does not yet exist. Time after Pentecost – just like Eastertide – has a randomly accumulated list of items even in the Gregorian Sacramentaries, and in Lent the Old Gallican sources provide several masses under the undifferentiated title of *Missa ieiunalis*. One can also conclude based on practical common sense that such a tantalizing achievement as furnishing each liturgical function with a different text and melody – as James McKinnon put it, the “Advent Project” – demands a long and coordinated effort of creative individuals: a condition not necessarily given in a primordial state of affairs. It means that the first liturgical propers might have been centred on general or occasional topics, similarly to the votive parts of the later service books. Indeed, liturgical history and spirituality should re-evaluate that forgotten and often despised category of propers, the votive part.

The same is true for the commune and the sanctoral, even if they are embedded into the calendrical system. Textually, the feast of a saint is independent of the date of the feast, and fully depends on the type of the saint and his or her character and biography. Dates are often anticipated or transposed because of coincidence with other dates. The propers of one saint can be adapted to another, and each saint can be commemorated in several feasts, octaves, or outside the feasts in a votive context. What counts is the topic of the celebration, which can be more or less strongly linked with a special day. Therefore, one can conclude that only the temporal propers are fundamentally determined by their position within the year. Moreover, some later developments of the temporal and the sanctoral had originally been votive topics that were later assigned to fixed dates like

Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi, All Soul's Day, not to mention such curiosities as the Tunic of the Lord or the Seven Sorrows of Mary.

Hence, from a descriptive point of view, topics and dates must be separated, and two standard lists are required: one for the topics and another for the timing. The thematic nomenclature must contain all those topics that are ambiguously related to a single date, not merely typical votive themes, categories of the commune, or feasts of the sanctoral, but also some traditional feasts that share the same date (e.g. Christmas with Anastasia) or feasts that can occur on different dates (e.g. Trinity Sunday on the first or the last Sunday of the summer season).

Besides the topics, the other standard must be a comprehensive and unmistakable system to describe the days of the ecclesiastical year. Basically, two kinds of dates exist: those defined by a day (Sunday, Monday, Tuesday etc.) of a week in a season, that is, an Easter- and Sunday-governed system, and those defined by a date (1st, 2nd, 3rd etc.) in a month, a system based on the ancient Roman Calendar. The first is traditionally called the temporal, the second the sanctoral. However, there are some overlaps, as the main feasts from Christmastide to Epiphany structurally belong to the sanctoral as being defined by a date in a month, yet they constitute a preparatory and a festive season, both defined by Sundays and subsequent weeks. Even some lesser feasts have the potential of constituting minor seasons. Candlemas, falling either into Epiphanytide or Shrovetide, closes the prolonged Christmas season. Ascension Day divides Eastertide into two, generating a sort of Ascensontide. Meanwhile, there are vestiges of a merged system, defined by months, on the one hand, and days of the week, on the other. The autumn Ember Days are celebrated on the Wednesday, Friday and Saturday of the third week of September, and the new histories (biblical lessons and their accompanying responsories) of matins start on certain Sundays of given months. This means that an exact liturgical

timing has to make use of four types of information: season, month, week, and day.

So the traditional divisions of the liturgical books, temporal, sanctoral, common, and votive parts, are definitely not inherent in the liturgical structure. Nevertheless, they are useful categories for organizing extensive evidence. From the perspective of a taxonomy, it means that data must be classified only according to dates and topics, and nothing else. The allocation of a piece of information to any of the four traditional categories depends on the logic of timing. Dates defined by season, week, and day automatically belong to the temporal; dates defined by month and date belong to the sanctoral. It is not to be neglected, however, that Christmas and Epiphany are traditionally ranked among the temporal feasts. Furthermore, there are many traditional feasts shared by the ecclesiastical year and the votive parts, not only Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi or All Saints, but also such feasts – now mostly sunk into oblivion – as that of the Lance and Nails of the Lord, celebrated on the 2nd Friday of Eastertide in Germany, or of the Guardian Angel of a place, celebrated on various, yet fixed dates in Spain.

The solution of the problem is that topics may belong to more than one of the traditional categories. Logically, the categories are not prior to the topics, but are only added to them as aids of classification. The affiliation can be given according to the way of timing, on the one hand, and the habitual classification, on the other. By doing so, Christmas will be listed both under the temporal and the sanctoral, Ember Days under the temporal, the Lance and Nails of the Lord both under the temporal and the votive part, the dedication of a church practically under all of the four categories.

In soft-structured rites, all types of ceremonies are structurally autonomous. They do not provide a common, well-defined, recurrent pattern of texts, and the typical series of gestures varies from one rite to the other. As a matter of fact, there exist some

recurrent textual patterns, as the frequent triad of an antiphon, a versicle, and an oration, or some recurrent patterns of activities, as the blessing of objects by exorcism, orations, consecratory prayer, their sprinkling and distribution. These, however, are never strictly the same; they do not comprise the ceremony as a whole, and are only characteristic of a limited group of rites.

Therefore, a list of ceremonies is first required that allows us to identify the actual rite within the wide range of possible liturgical activities. Such a list can be compiled on empirical grounds: hundreds of service books of different genres must be consulted in order to define what sort of activities were considered to be liturgical in the relevant period and geographical domain. Of course, the result will be puzzlingly heterogeneous, and will resist attempts of solid classification by extrinsic categories, e.g. sacraments, sacramentals, blessings, processions. In return, it will be instrumental in organizing the contents of extant sources that inform us about the real liturgical activities of ages past.

It is worth mentioning that both the mass and the divine office rank among the possible ceremonies. The difference lies in the fact that, concerning other rites, the taxonomical challenge emerges above the level of the ceremony; in other words, the greatest problem is to define the broader range of functions to which an actual ceremony belongs. As for hard-structured rites, the taxonomical challenge lies beneath the level of the ceremony, that is, in defining the range of items and assignments according to which the inner content of each is organized. It also means that topics and timing are only relevant in the latter category. Obviously, there are many soft-structured rites which are deeply rooted in the yearly cycle, for instance, the blessing of candles on Candlemas, the procession on Palm Sunday, and the reconciliation of penitents on Maundy Thursday. Still, none of them can be compared with a parallel on another date. It makes no sense to speak of a Palm Sunday procession on Candlemas, while it is sensible to compare the two vespers of these feasts.

Navigating ceremonies

Since soft-structured rites are mostly governed by gestures, after having defined their type, more will depend on the *dromena*, the activities, than on the *legomena*, their accompanying words. Rubrics are indispensable in understanding the function of the texts and in identifying the series of facts that determine the deep structure of each ceremony. As recurrent textual patterns cannot be detected and mechanically juxtaposed, analysis and comparison are only enabled by an interpretive approach which can point to the analogies between literarily different structures. While comparing two different ways of dedicating a church, it will not be a particular antiphon that is analogue with another, but all the chants sung during the respective processions with the relics will be analogous with one another, regardless of their genres, sequence and exact number.

Typical gestures and movements constitute modules within a rite. A module is a unit larger than the item but smaller than the ceremony. As a rule, the module is the longest sequence of items that can be meaningfully analogized with a parallel sequence of a different source. It is unproductive to survey the first text that appears in the preparation for mass because it can equally be a psalm, an oration, or a versicle. Moreover, the whole preparation can equally start with psalmody, a penitential act, or the donning of vestments. What really matters is the same function and the same generic pattern: psalmody compared to psalmody, confession to confession, vesting to vesting; and even in details: psalm to psalm, oration to oration, versicle to versicle. Consequently, the numbering of the items must not be mechanical. In a mass or an office hour, some textual genres do not multiply at all: there can be only one introit per mass, only one hymn per hour. Others multiply in a regular way: Ember Saturdays have five prophecies, solemn matins nine (or twelve) responsories. In soft-structured modules, the number of items within

the same genre is not so defined. The number of psalms in the preparation for mass, of processional chants on Palm Sunday or Rogation Days, of prayers for the reconciliation of penitents may vary over a wide range. In similar cases, not the parallel position of the items is decisive but the analogies between the series. While comparing two lists of processional chants, texts in the same order will be analogous even if one list contains some extra chants. Certainly, a numeric definition will not suffice to identify such parallel points.

To differentiate between textual and non-textual components, we have labelled the latter category as the ceremonial layer. Nonetheless, it is worth recalling that non-textual information is not at all restricted to ceremonial (gestures, topography, utensils, performance etc.). Rubrics and normative texts contribute much to the solution of calendrical problems, a topic that we preferred to call directorial, as well as to remarks and commentaries on symbolism, theology, moral issues, canon law, or church discipline.

Without underestimating them, it can be admitted that they are not indispensable for the practical realization of a rite, save the directorial instructions that assign texts and ceremonies to liturgical timing on a conditional basis, and therefore belong to the grammar and not to the vocabulary. Text and ceremony are the objectives which are regulated, directory is the regulation itself. Theoretically, it is already a directorial rule that certain texts are to be recited and certain gestures performed on a certain day of the year, but – in fact – the term is reserved for the changing constellations of the temporal and the sanctoral.

From a descriptive point of view, the utmost difference between text and ceremony is that the textual layer is more apt for distant reading and large-scale comparison, since it can be standardized as a limited list of valid values: the liturgical items that were ever sung or recited, the genres they may belong to, the possible activities of the liturgical tradition under our scope, or

the store of topics and assignments to special days of the annual cycle. All this information can be entered in a table format, thus comfortably searched, filtered, and arranged according to the current survey's interest.

On the contrary, rubrics or normative texts with ceremonial contents, e.g. ordinals and customaries, may put forth their information in different words, even if the practice they were designed for, i.e. the liturgical message, is the same. The way to celebrate Candlemas according to the use of Prague may be worded differently by the coeval missal, ritual, and ordinal, and again, differently by manuscripts from the 13th century to the prints of the 16th century, albeit the celebration they describe may remain essentially the same. Thus, in the context of normative texts, the challenge consists in the problem of large-scale comparison. How can one compare data that are semantically related but morphologically incomparable?

Practically, the solution lies in text encoding. While the most effective means of processing the textual layer is probably the table format, the ceremonial layer fits an encoded text better. Analogous but differently worded data can be identified and compared, if they are marked by standardized tags. The novelty is not the technique itself, which is well-known in digital humanities, neither its use in a liturgical context, which is expertly accomplished in online editions, but the need of a distinct markup language for ceremonial information.

Before going into further detail, let us recall our opening considerations about the desirable distance from written sources. It seems that the distinction between editions in a table format and editions in encoded texts is parallel with the distinction between service books and normative books. An antiphonal or a missal is susceptible to be entered into rows and columns, an ordinal into a plain text file with tags.

Instead of this genre-based typology, we recommend a content-based typology. Regardless of the original genre, informa-

tion should be processed according to its nature: the textual layer in tables, the ceremonial layer in encoded texts. It is obvious that the highest percentage of an ordinal consists of incipits listed along with their genres and liturgical assignments. In this respect, the ordinal is nothing else than a condensed service book, and must be treated as such. Service books, however, often contain an impressive amount of rubrics. In this respect ordinal-like normative texts could be extracted from them. The generic difference can be reduced to a question of proportion: service books have more text and less ceremonial, normative books have more ceremonial and less text. The former provide more items in full and less in an abbreviated form, the latter contain almost everything in abbreviated form, but there are certain exceptions. In sum, the ideal method should combine the two ways of presenting one and the same source.

The first step towards a markup language of ceremonial information is similar to the compilation of the aforementioned lists of items, genres, topics, assignments, and ceremonies. A statistically relevant amount of historically and geographically diverse books has to be read through, the information they provide has to be noted and standardized, until we come to a level where no new types of information emerge any more. The result will be a comprehensive list of possible ceremonial themes which can and must be classified in terms of typology (the different fields of ceremonial categories, e.g. vestments and postures) and of hierarchy (divisions and subdivisions in each field, e.g. genuflection and bowing within postures, bowing of the head or a profound bow within bowing).

The difference between the empirical research of textual and non-textual elements is that the textual elements are already marked in the primary sources. One can easily identify the typology of texts by their layout: they start with initial letters, open new paragraphs, or are distinguished by changing font size. Genres and titles are written or at least are highlighted with red

ink; the red category self-evidently splits into titles of genres, services and days. The terminology within the same tradition is more or less uniform, even the inexperienced are able to orient themselves among the recurring expressions. The identification of special feasts and ceremonies requires more expertise, still the structure of the sources (chapters, titles, tables of contents) and the formulation of the titles (the terms *ordo*, the preposition *de*) helps a great deal.

It is not so with normative texts. The homogeneous layout of lengthy rubrics does not help to recognize the variety and the depth of ceremonial themes. It means permanent filtering; making the decision that one thing is important, and another unimportant. If the filtering of the native community is not reflected by the manner of laying the information down in writing, how can we avoid overdetailing, oversimplification, or false categorization centuries later?

The ritual code

The problem is not only technical. It also sheds some light on the cognitive process by which the human mind conceives ritual. Physically, the signs we use to express ourselves are embedded in an environment of similar stimuli and form a continuum in themselves. For instance, both human speech and music consist of sounds, and there are always other incidental sounds while we are listening to a conversation or a song. We automatically make a difference between the meaningful and the meaningless when we filter out the speech or the music and disregard all other as noise.

Even inside the speaking voice or sounding music, a limited series of meaningful values are selected: the phonemes and the pitches. We positively do not realize the exact pronunciation or frequency, but approach them to an ideal central value to which meaning is attributed. If the difference between the perception

and the ideal is disturbing, we default to a speech defect or a false note, but as a rule, we unconsciously revise the exact input.

The same is true for other cultural codes. A dress code may define the type and the colour of a suit, a shirt, and a tie, but leaves alone the underwear and, within certain limits, the hairstyle and the spectacle frame, as well. As a culturally conditioned code, liturgical semantics consist of the valid values of meaningful fields. Similar to the complex but structured frame of genres and assignments, there is a finite set of non-verbal fields by which the liturgical message is communicated, and similar to the large but limited list of items, there is a finite scale of gestures within each field. In the traditional Roman practice, only three levels of uttering words is allowed: singing aloud, speaking in a distinct but low voice, and whispering in silence. No matter how loud or how silent the celebrant personally is, his way of uttering words will be clearly interpreted as one of the three. There is only a limited sequence of liturgical colours, though the exact number varies according to ages and traditions. No matter how faded the red or what shade the green is, they will be interpreted as belonging to a given valid domain on the same scale.

In her classical analysis of ritual, *Natural Symbols*, the anthropologist Mary Douglas made use of Basil Bernstein's linguistic concept of the restricted code. Indeed, liturgy as a whole can also be described as a restricted code both textually and ceremonially. In spite of the accidental realizations of each rite, it is always a restricted series of pre-defined categories and pre-defined values in a pre-defined frame that can be used. Therefore, liturgy is self-evidently appropriate for standardization, including its non-textual level. With ceremonial information under scope, the last question is how an exact and comprehensive list of possible gestures can be defined.

The best primary source of information is usually the native informant, the person who is totally involved in the related cul-

ture. As for medieval ceremonial practice, contemporaries rather relied on direct transmission from person to person. Unsurprisingly, as even today, in an age when communal culture, oral transmission, and interaction between master and pupil is far less dominant, nonverbal skills like sports or dances are hardly transmitted verbally. Nobody learns to tie shoelaces from books, and building instructions prefer illustrations to descriptions.

Still, a growing inclination to written codification and maybe an anxiety about losing traditions induced some intellectuals in the early modern period to compile detailed and systematic books on such matters. In their pure form as independent normative genres they bore the title *caeremoniale*. The foremost representative became the above-cited Tridentine *Caeremoniale episcoporum* of 1600. Complete ceremonials were not many, but the tendency from the 15th century is unmistakable. Much more frequent were prefaces and appendices which accompany late medieval and early modern ordinals or directories, reflecting the same attitude as the ceremonials. In them, ceremonial information is not organized according to the actual points of the ecclesiastical year, as formerly in the ordinals. Instead, separate chapters deal with each type of information for the whole year: the rules for vestments and liturgical colours, the use of incense, the roles of the ministers, etc. Especially for the role of the ministers and for the behaviour of the clergy in choir, this approach of codification had been anticipated by the monastic customaries of earlier ages.

Reconstructive research

All these coeval data help us in understanding the categories and values of which the natives were already aware. Nevertheless, the system that can be extracted from their heritage is far from being complete. As usual, the most self-evident things often remain hidden from the eyes of those who are too much accustomed to

them. Therefore, the other way to describe the restricted code of ceremonial activities is reconstruction.

Celebrating Christian services according to medieval sources may seem a folly or at least queer and anachronistic for some people, while others find it a pledge of continuity and an appropriate means to discovering and expressing their identity. Anyhow, reconstruction can be very instrumental for archaeologists to check their hypotheses: how to brew beer in a trough from the Iron Age, or cross the Pacific Ocean with a raft. In a Latin liturgical context, reconstruction enables us to check if the information known from service books is sufficient for realizing an actual celebration. If no ambiguities emerge, we can be relatively sure that the information at hand covers all the fields that build up the code. When questions do arise, they will point to missing fields or their missing values. The situation is more fortunate than in archaeology, since lacking information can be supplemented by auxiliary written sources, illustrations and also – rarely – by vestiges of living tradition.

The other advantage is the experience of consistency. Ancient liturgical practice must have been comprehensive and coherent in many respects. It covered the whole timetable, the whole staff and the whole space of a church and its environment, and could be realized without practical contradictions. Defects and inconsistencies may peacefully coexist in written sources and scientific proceedings, but they are immediately exposed in practice where only one statement can actually be true at a time.

Haphazardly selected showcases will always mislead comparative efforts. Instead, we should rely on well-defined sets of analogies. Establishing a liturgical taxonomy requires both precision and a good grasp of the overall picture; intimate knowledge of many sources and expertise in the practice they communicate. Yet it can be accomplished, and it is the only way to assess the character and degree of historical and geographic variation. This, however, is only the technical condition of our work. Knowing

the syntax and having a dictionary do not suffice for understanding a language, still less enjoying a literary work. It needs familiarity with the style, recognizing intertextual relations, and knowing the cultural background. Liturgical analysis, therefore, cannot spare the interpretation of why, how, and exactly which thing varies.

DIVERSITY

Modern thought has a tendency for setting variance against uniformity, and conservatism against innovation. Liturgical field experience, however, and even closer insight into almost any human institution, reveals that they are not necessarily conflicting ideas. As things naturally change, total invariance is rare, and often the outcome of plain neglect. From a different perspective, non-intervention does not save anything from alteration, for neglected things are more vulnerable to oblivion and decay. Sustaining institutions means activity, commitment, and reaction to the outside world. Rigidity and centralizing measures might sometimes accompany efforts to preserve a tradition, especially when those responsible for preservation feel that the tradition is endangered. Truly, the content of Roman service books was quite uniform and changed little between the 17th and the early 20th century, but few would characterize the period with genuine liturgical interest, even if its achievements in the field are sometimes unjustly undervalued.

This was certainly not the case in the Middle Ages when liturgical life was still an unchallenged experience of Christian societies. Controversies happened, but none of them questioned the legitimacy and the principles of ritual life, indeed they only highlighted the utmost importance attached to it. Under such circumstances, similar impulses worked behind diversity and coordination, creativity and traditionalism. Diverse traditions derived their value from being recognizable, and lasting patterns as compared to others, not random constellations of fluctuating ingredients. There was no real conflict between modernity and antiquity: contemporary products adorned an ancient heritage and were legitimized by it, similarly to buildings erected on holy ground and incorporating the basement of their antecede-

ents. The holier the site had been the more energy was invested in its renewal.

Of course, such an over-optimistic vision of medieval harmony may seem suspicious, and we admit that in-depth analysis sometimes uncovers facts that obstinately resist interpretation. Yet in the following paragraphs, we aim to argue that change and diversity conform to intelligible categories which can be safely unfolded wherever enough evidence survives.

If regarded as a system and its constituents, liturgy resembles a world that must first be created and then furnished, similarly to other cultural frames like music, arts, sports, or games that first establish a field of activity with rules, valid values, and a set of instruments and then set about conquering its inherent possibilities. Ancient Christian liturgies agree on having the Eucharist and a daily office, both arranged according to an elaborate calendar, and occasional rites. They share their reckoning of days and weeks, prominent feasts and seasons, and they all spend more time with and devote more energy to regular rites than to occasional ones. Every Christian ritual is carried out in a well-defined, relatively dense interval of time, rests on a massive body of texts, has some sort of plainchant, and applies related gestures and materials like the bowing of the head, the lighting of candles, or anointing with oil. Such commonalities only gain significance when contrasted with the religious attitudes and ceremonial styles of different cultures.

Within Christianity, structural precision demarcates the lines between rites or families of rites. There are recurrent sequences of textual genres in the Eucharist and the office, characteristic distinctions between changing and unchanging parts, and looser but still identifiable features that constitute the coherence between occasional services. The existence of such structures is not self-evident. It presupposes the productive work of individuals and positive reception from a broad audience over a considerable period. Christian rites already diverge on this level. This

means that, albeit the structure did not belong to the heritage of an apostolic past, it solidified by the time of the first accessible service books. Therefore, we can consider the establishment of the frame as the first step towards a distinct tradition and, consequently, as the first degree of divergence.

The next step is filling up the frame. Plenty of texts and melodies must be composed to match each genre of each service in the annual cycle. Theoretically, an almost infinite number of pieces could arise, but this is counterbalanced by the slowness of production, the prestige of earlier established items, and the role of repetition in human cognition and especially in ritual dynamics. Liturgical context does not prevent production from being literary and musical activity and it does not require less skill, time, and pain than any other sort of artistic work. The immense oeuvre we encounter already in the first sources was surely not the fruit of a mass-production campaign. Traditional parts of the repertory might have soon enjoyed a certain eminence, as they did in the historical period: they were not easily replaced even if new compositions were at hand. And, though the drive for creating new things and avoiding boredom may be strong impulses, the desire for familiarity and recurrence is not less influential. Repetition is probably the chief feature connecting the bewildering complex of phenomena that we label ritualistic.

Evolving liturgies

At first, the number of items was smaller than the number of functions, thus they must have been repeated in a circular manner or supply deficiencies. In the Roman rite, each Sunday after Pentecost has its introit, while the number of *ingressas*, the analogous genre of the Ambrosian rite, is defective for the season: their cycle must start over after coming to the end of the series. Other chants of the mass, e.g. *graduals* and *offertories* are re-

cycled in the Roman rite as well because their repertory does not suffice to serve each Sunday and privileged weekday of the year. In other cases, the repertory may outgrow the number of available functions. New, more fashionable items are made, but the old, respectful ones are not easily discarded. To maintain the old and keep the new requires rules of distribution. In many places, there are two sets of antiphons and hymns for ordinary Sundays, one ancient and another – in a medieval context – modern. The first is typically applied in winter after Epiphany, the second in summer after Trinity. The same is universally true for the weekly cycles of responsories: the ancient series, based on psalm texts, serves the short winter season, and the modern one, based on excerpts from the Old Testament readings, summer and autumn. Filling up the frame and adjusting it to the repertory, therefore, is a prolonged project without a definitive endpoint. The actual history of the Latin rites, however, divides into particular areas and phases.

Development can eventuate on several levels. One can introduce new seasons, days, and feasts, new genres, new items, or new rites. They can be simpler, provided with only a limited number of proper texts and gestures, and can expand into sophisticated structures with a rich store of items. The scope of expansion may differ from region to region and from period to period. Establishing new liturgical days does not necessarily induce the composition of new items, and, vice versa, new items can comfortably occupy existing positions. Literary and musical activity does not suppose a keen interest in ceremonial, while newly designed ceremonies can lack newly composed pieces. Even the strategy of making new pieces may considerably vary. Some produce more prayers and fewer chants, others on the contrary; pre-existent texts get new melodies, and new texts are set to pre-existent music, called *contrafacts*.

As we have seen, Old Latin service books make frequent use of indefinite texts for general occasions, something that resem-

bles the votive category of later sources, or of loosely defined texts for entire seasons. It is conspicuous that, even in the established state of the Roman rite, the weeks after Easter and Whitsun have octaves with proper masses for each day, while Christmas, Epiphany, and Ascension Day, although similarly provided with octaves, have no changing masses, and already the Sundays within their octaves are thematically independent from the preceding feast. Settling in the structure was still unfinished as late as the 20th century.

Of course, such incompleteness does not come from impotence. Hundreds of feasts were introduced with thousands of propers and still, the octaves of the greatest feasts were left intact. It seems that up to a certain point neither the conquest of the year nor the composition of new items met any obstacles. After that point, however, the existing material froze and creativity shifted to areas that were not considered canonical so far. We can model the dynamics with the two complementary tendencies of assignation and properization, and canonicity as their counterbalance. Assignation is the process of allotting each item of an existing liturgical repertory to definite points of the system. As the number of items does not coincide with the number of functions, some prove superfluous and others insufficient. There existed chants and prayers already at an early date but were only assigned to a precise genre on a precise day later. Antiphons for the Gospel canticles or responsories for the Old Testament readings were more numerous than what was needed in the actual office. Even genres in themselves do not always form homogeneous clusters: their style and dimensions can vary so that they give the impression of being assembled from pieces of different ages and origins. As the year expanded and the generic grid of masses and offices crystallized, it fixed the place of what was available and demanded completion or further composition. More recent liturgical artefacts, e.g. offices of saints composed in the numeric order of Gregorian modes

(*series tonorum*) already fit into a firm structure: they form a coherent cycle and count neither more nor less than the number required by the hour.

To sum up, assignation describes the process from the repertory's point of view. As soon as the structure consolidates, liturgical items seek to find their enduring place within it. From the structure's perspective, every assignment is a chance for being filled with unique items. The process of providing them with one is aptly termed properization, as if a frame, originally containing a meagre, thematically general, and often recurring set of elements, were gradually filled up with new and more customized items that only occur in particular functions. Saints can be perfectly celebrated with the commune of their broader type as apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins etc. but have always inspired masses and offices of their own. It happened by degrees. Almost every saint had proper orations in the mass and lessons in the office. Fewer held proper Alleluias and antiphons for the Gospel canticles. Even fewer were in possession of epistles, Gospels, and homilies, read only once a year, exclusively on their feasts. The fewest were those who had complete cycles of proper chants either for mass or office.

Properization, nevertheless, is not limited to the saints. As the temporal cycle of the ecclesiastical year evolves, newly introduced days strive after being furnished with proper items instead of recycled ones. Characteristic instances are the Sundays after Ember seasons, called vacant Sundays, or the Lenten Thursdays. In each case, the most conservative arrangement repeats items of previous dates and there is no doubt that it was the primordial solution. Yet in plenty of uses, such duplicates have been replaced by propers explicitly composed for the day concerned. We can observe similar tendencies in the system of weekday lessons. In the simplest form, the lessons of the preceding Sunday must be repeated on the ferias of the following week. Then some weekdays acquire proper lessons:

Wednesdays and Fridays first, Saturdays next. Lastly, Mondays and every remaining feria will be provided with lessons of their own. Votive masses behave alike. Their majority reuses a selection of items already assigned to specific days of the year but in a special arrangement, drawn from the intention for which the mass is offered. Yet some received propers of their own, similarly to saints with unique compositions.

Logically, the complementary processes of assignation and properization would lead to an ever-expanding structure and an ever-increasing repertory. The situation seems to suggest a sort of hierarchy, as if the higher degree of properization meant superiority by definition and attributed higher rank to a feast, day, or mass. Both statements perfectly apply to the early phase of development, associated with authoritative sources from Rome the content of which is ubiquitous in Latin Europe. Surely, there was a productive period of establishing the structure and filling it up which attained considerable success already before the methodical dissemination of the Roman texts and chants beyond the urban confines. This unvarying layer constitutes the common heritage of every western use and it documents an advanced stage of conquering the annual cycle where feasts of higher rank are indeed marked by more propers.

At this point, however, canonicity comes into action. The tendency of assignation and properization continued after the universal adoption of the Roman rite on local or regional levels, yet pieces of the older repertory usually enjoyed greater prestige. Major feasts of the same saint retained traditional items while their minor feasts, vigils, octaves, or votive commemorations were more open to novelties. Solid parts of the year remained untouched, but new feasts and especially votives proved to be a field of contemporary initiatives. In such an atmosphere, new compositions breathed an air of charming frivolousness in contrast to the gravity of the old ones. Late 16th-century statutes declare that poetic offices are permitted in private prayer, but

the cathedral choir should recite the commune. It is no surprise that the sterner spirit of the Tridentine reforms ultimately suppressed liturgical poetry.

Hence canonicity has always worked as a check on innovation. If there were periods when it prevailed, blocking all creativity in the liturgical field, there were also periods when it totally lost control, like in the Neo-Gallican environment that kept the structure but replaced the whole repertory. In this respect, an attitude change manifests itself in the shifting policy of providing new feasts with propers. By comparing the masses of the subsequently introduced feasts of Corpus Christi (1264), the Visitation (1389), and the Transfiguration (1456), we can register a growing percentage of new compositions. It is worth remarking that all three theological themes were celebrated as local feasts before their universal adoption or as votive masses. The tendency is the same everywhere. Older local or votive variants tend to use traditional materials. New compositions occur with greater probability in a votive context when the annual feast is contrasted to its devotional equivalents but gradually invade the official domain. With the 14th-century feast of the Visitation, western territories are obviously bolder in applying them, while eastern territories prove to be more conservative. Yet with the 15th-century feast of the Transfiguration, even the latter ones give up their restraints and accept an entirely new series.

So, the sternness of the Counter-Reformation period was preceded by a liberal attitude towards new compositions which partly endured with the early modern enlargements of the Roman books. Compromises were also possible between innovation and canonicity. The favourite method of early modern liturgical composition was the ancient technique of centonizing, that is, repurposing purely biblical passages that gain fresh and special significance in the new context. With such a disguise, liturgical creativity could have its way without risking a single word of doubtful origin. Contrafacts and paraphrases equally

used traditional material to legitimize recent additions. A new text with traditional music was not a completely new piece, and a text behind which the skeleton of a traditional precedent could be recognized was not even a completely new text. The common feature of all these strategies is reconciling conservatism and innovation: something that leads us to more substantial interventions in the order of worship.

All that has been said until now pertains to ceremonies of hard structure: mass and office propers. Though the introduction of new dates and the composition of new items continued uninterrupted, the foundations had been laid down before the first extant service books. Both the basic structure of the ecclesiastical year and the generic skeleton of mass and office propers were firmly established already in the 7th and 8th centuries, thus historians of their evolution can only guess at the processes that led to this well-known result. They are more fortunate with the developments of the subsequent ages, already documented by written evidence.

Literary troping

These developments again combine bold initiatives with respect for tradition. The proven method is to find something unquestionably respectful to which the novelty can adhere, a procedure that experts of plainchant call troping. A trope in the strict sense of the word denotes an emotionally expressive or explicatory text with its melody that introduces, interrupts, or accompanies a chant of authority. The phenomenon, however, applies in a more general sense to every liturgical composition that shyly pretends to be a mere interpolation. Not infrequently, this shyness proves to be mock modesty: many tropes are considerably longer and more characteristic than farced chants, not to speak about sequences that were traditionally interpreted as appendices to the Alleluia or liturgical dramas that originated from the extension

of the last responsory of matins. We can rightly compare the relationship between a liturgical item and its trope to that of a host animal and its symbiote: the relationship is intricate, sometimes harmful to the host, but can be mutually advantageous. According to its declared purpose, a trope only adorns and accentuates the original but may also abuse it as a pretext.

The first wave of troping, understood in the more literal sense, affected the hard structured ceremonies by thickening their range with new genres. Poetic texts with contemporary melodies joined parts of the mass ordinary or the propers of both the mass and the office in the 8–9th centuries. Almost none of them endured as an integral part of the structure. They withdrew into enclaves like those accompanying the Kyrie, or survived as fossils like the *Gregorius praesul*, introducing the first introit of the mass-antiphony on the 1st Sunday of Advent, and the Easter Play, also known as *Quem quaeritis* or *Visitatio sepulcri*. One branch of troping, however, infiltrated the official liturgy and became a lasting part of it. It was the sequence, a poem sung between the Alleluia and the Gospel that was truly regarded as one of the mass propers even if it enjoyed – along with the preceding Alleluia – more freedom in its choice and replacement.

In the office, the hymn is a parallel phenomenon. It was never considered a trope, yet it was a non-Biblical song that introduced the Gospel canticles in lauds, vespers, and compline. Both sequences and hymns appear in separate volumes or in appendices of service books, suggesting a less canonical status, are missing from the most conservative offices of the year, and have a more ample and variable repertory as compared to other propers. The position of the hymn in the major office hours defined a soft section between the psalmody and the Gospel canticle: in the Easter octave, graduals, Alleluias, and even sequences could appear there, borrowed from the day's mass; on Sundays and feasts, responsories figured before or instead of the

hymn, mostly borrowed from matins, yet many of them were later compositions, directly designed for vespers.

Other office hours, matins and the lesser ones used the hymn as an introduction to the psalmody, defining another soft section before the actual service. The phenomenon is analogous to the singing of processional chants before high masses. In the Middle Ages, every important church held processions before the solemn masses of Sundays and feasts. The custom was already present in the urban liturgy of Rome where specific days like Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Easter Sunday, or the Major Litany were distinguished by extra chants before the introit. Other, more common processions were accompanied by litanies. Yet the explosive upsurge of processional chant composition was coeval with the first wave of troping, and the motivation was similar: to find free surfaces where creative energies can safely proliferate in the shadow of traditional structures. On days with remarkable processions like Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Easter Sunday, or the Litanies, the Carolingian period already saw a sudden growth of the repertory, but production continued and, albeit habitual processions often relied on hymns and responsories from the office, it expanded to feasts and Sundays that had not been formerly provided with any processional chants.

Not only chants multiplied in the loose domains. Long series of versicles, termed *preces*, were inserted before the closing oration of the office hours, and commemorations and additional votive offices followed. Apologies fostered the devotion of the celebrating priest before the most sacred moments of the mass, the Gospel, the offertory, and the communion. The preparation before and the thanksgiving after the mass developed into almost autonomous rites. In some uses, supplications were said for all sorts of intentions (peace, the king, the liberation of the Holy Land) during the offertory or after the Lord's Prayer. The triple blessing, already attested in the early sources of the Gallican

and the Mozarabic rite, became a solid part of the Roman rite in pontifical masses after the Lord's Prayer, inspiring a distinct genre with hundreds of new compositions for each day of the annual cycle.

Tropes, sequences, processional chants, and pontifical blessings shared at least two peculiarities. They were included in service books and universally acknowledged as parts of the annual cycle, thus emulating the role of traditional propers. Still, they did not achieve the same esteem so that they could be more freely omitted or substituted by more fashionable items of recent trends. Tradition did not safeguard their liturgical position. Most of the tropes and many of the early sequences fell into oblivion by the end of the Middle Ages. Only a very limited selection of sequences and processional chants and none of the pontifical blessings survived the Tridentine reforms. Already in the medieval period, they showed a higher degree of diversity both between different uses and throughout the lifespan of the same use. Yet even within this second generation of propers, there is a hierarchy of variance according to the intensity of the item's performance and the age of its consolidation. Frequent or memorable performance and great antiquity provided a better chance for survival and so we can establish some kind of core repertory in contrast with its peripheries. Essentially, the delicate balance between innovation and canonicity repeats itself here on a secondary level. The core and periphery of new genres compare to one another as the whole body of new genres to that of the old ones.

Ceremonial troping

The 9th-century emergence of the book type that posterity termed the pontifical is often associated with the factors of the bishops' increasing authority and their interest in pastoral care. Relevant as they are, they do not explain two important features

of the genre. One is the fusion of three different kinds of ceremonies, namely the extraordinary rites of the year (processional), the sacraments and sacramentals administered by a parish priest (ritual), and the bishop's exclusive functions (pontifical proper). The other is the problem of actual use, namely that some of the manuscripts look more like academic works than practical service books and share some of their typical texts with treatises on liturgy and canon law.

It seems that the centuries after the Carolingian period had a deep theoretical interest in such rites. In contrast with the solidifying body of mass and office propers, the number of eucharistical texts (i.e. prayers and formulas of the celebrant) for occasional rites ever grew, even new rites were introduced, and the existing ones became longer and more nuanced. Different versions of the same ceremony were copied one after the other in the same books, and some rites even raise the suspicion of never having been celebrated as they are described. In some cases, the codices themselves are free from any trace of practical use, and the concerned ceremonies stand as isolated records. In one late 11th-century pontifical, we encounter a minutely elaborated order of degrading and reconciling each rank of the ecclesiastical hierarchy or a monumental blessing of water under Byzantine inspiration, having neither precedents nor descendants even in the book's direct textual tradition. In others, the content far exceeds the needs of any conceivable person or institution as in a benedictional that counts more than 700 solemn pontifical blessings for the year: it not only covers each date of the temporal and the sanctoral but provides them with at least 3–4 options. To use such a wealth of material, the bishop must have personally celebrated a solemn pontifical service once a day and systematically change the texts over about a decade. Even in the late 13th-century pontifical of Durandus, the reconciliation of the penitents on Maundy Thursday is so sophisticated as compared both to the previous and the subsequent records of

the rite that it gives the impression of a literary work instead of a real ceremonial guide.

Such extremities notwithstanding, most of the pontifical rites were regularly celebrated as witnessed by the fingerprints, marginal notes, and successive modifications of the carrying codices. Bishops conducting rites were depicted in paintings and illuminations, and historical documents or diplomatic evidence also report on their performance. Going beyond practicality is not primarily important because it may question the historicity of the rites but because it emphasizes the intellectual effort dedicated to them. Rites indeed were designed, improved, and further developed approximately at the same time when creative energies turned towards troping. As within the mass and the office, the canonical skeleton of genres has been interpolated with contemporary compositions, so, within the macrostructure of the entire liturgical life, this skeleton started to be interpolated with occasional rites. This, however, happened through the tried and trusted method of troping.

New rites were not born from nothing. Basic gestures and materials for administering sacraments like the immersion into water or the laying on of hands go back to Christian antiquity and sometimes to biblical narratives. Already the first sacramentaries contained prayers for almost every purpose that later evolved into distinct ceremonies. By inventing a rite, we do not mean the invention of the institution that serves as its basis but the process of liturgization: the discovery and exploitation of the inherent possibility that it can develop into an act of performance.

Even today, no one doubts that the Catholic form of confessing sins is a liturgical act. It has material and form, a theological concept and its legal conditions, surrounded with words and gestures, some of which are obligatory for the sacramental effect and some only recommended by habit and discipline. The core is the sincere repentance and confession of mortal sins

by the sinner and the formal absolution by an ordained priest. The confessional, kneeling, crossing oneself, the fixed formulas, wearing a surplice and a stole, or stretching the priest's palm over the head of the penitent are not indispensable for effectiveness. Yet even if they are all properly performed, we do not expect confession to be instructive or spectacular. It is a matter of efficiency, not of performance. A mass or an office hour, however, we usually expect to be beautiful. There are rhetoric, music, and visual arts, all orchestrated as a concerted action within a definite frame of time, at least under ideal circumstances. Inventing a new rite means a shift from efficiency to performance.

Ordination, for instance, started as a straightforward sacramental act. Its first sources already contained the basic gestures and consecratory formulas without much ambition for impressiveness. In the next few centuries, however, they became gradually farced with additional gestures and formulas, ceremonial, and music. Already in the first sacramentaries, there are voluminous, rhetorical, and functionally different texts, conforming to the euchological genres of invitation to prayer, preparatory oration, and consecratory prex. Successively, auxiliary gestures like anointing with chrism, handing over the rank's proper books or utensils, and donning its proper vestments completed the basic gesture of laying on the bishop's hands, all accompanied by newly composed formulas. Other texts acceded like the calling forth of the candidates by the archdeacon or the instruction about the concerning rank's duties by the bishop. These were formal, liturgical texts, not spontaneous manifestations. Movements like the procession of the candidates and their kneeling in a semicircle around the seat of the bishop with burning candles in their right hand and their future vestments on their left have been choreographed in time and space. Chants have been introduced to cover the silent parts of the ceremony and to interpret them through scriptural references. The whole ceremonial has been minutely coordinated with the Ember Saturday mass inside which it regularly took place.

We can observe the same tendencies when surveying the history of almost any occasional rite. An ancient and respectful core has been troped in an extended sense: introduced, interrupted, or accompanied by recent compositions. In this regard, and characteristically in this regard, rites of the processional, the ritual, and the pontifical underwent a similar fate. The cultural backgrounds of the two ways of troping, the composition of new items and the invention of new rites, were similar. On the one hand, there was a sacred heritage of canonical status, on the other, a desire to create something original. Areas still left intact of canonicity provided free surfaces, a sort of playing field in the noblest sense, for both. As the frame filled up, creativity drew away from the core to more and more peripheral fields. Tropes in the strict sense flourished somewhat earlier and were more typical in French territories. Until the end of the Middle Ages, Western Europe was more innovative with the composition of new chants. The grand epoch for the pontifical arrived later. The clerics of Ottonian Germany, Saxon and Norman England, and the Romanized churches of Southern France and Spain showed increasing interest in them and proved more productive than their colleagues in Gaul.

The process reached its climax at the end of the 13th century with the pontifical of Durandus. After that, occasional rites did not alter significantly. They consolidated as integral parts of distinct traditions. As it has been said, this primarily applies to the processional. Its rites are among the best indicators of liturgical uses while the pontifical has a tendency for internationalization and the ritual for being simplified in texts and ceremonial but supplemented with pastoral and canonical issues. It means change indeed, but no more in terms of liturgy-making as a field of creativity. The age of troping, therefore, and especially that of inventing rites coincides with the age when the self-esteem of uses was strengthening. Local initiatives of properization, completion, and rearrangement provided raw material for

divergence. The results turned out to be symbols of identities to such a degree that, with the context reinterpreted, even earlier, spontaneous divergence appeared as deliberate, worth preserving, and an object of local pride. New items were still composed after the interest in new rites had faded. Properization kept its full power, resulting in several texts and melodies composed after the turn of the 13th and 14th centuries, but they only affected the peripheries of the liturgical fabric and were no more considered the distinctive features of uses. They compared to the settled repertory as a newly introduced feast or a newly added votive mass to the immemorial milestones of the annual cycle.

A hierarchy of divergence

Statistically, nevertheless, all variants behave alike. A mechanical comparison of sources cannot distinguish between strong and weak variants, these identifying uses, and those only ephemeral. What we need is an interpretation of diversity in order to establish a hierarchy of variants. Certainly, it will rest on the historical and structural considerations that we expounded above, but it ultimately derives from the close examination of different generations of service books from different regions of Europe. Hence our first task is to summarize the phases of historical and geographic expansion that lead to the Roman rite's late medieval condition. The second is to explain the modular nature of the liturgy, that is, to demonstrate that it consists of many fields, layers, and repertories obeying different laws of transmission and, consequently, enjoying different freedom and forms of variability.

Except for Milan, all medieval western uses of cathedrals, monasteries, and religious orders belong to the Roman rite. It is only natural that their common features go back to the stage of development of the Roman heritage as it stood when adopted by churches north of the Alps around the turn of the 8th and

9th centuries. Yet going into details raises problems already on this level.

The liturgy of Rome had considerable prestige already before its official adoption. Its texts could be found in Italy, Merovingian Gaul, and Visigothic Spain already before Pepin the Short or Charlemagne. At that time, the essence of a rite consisted in its structure and not yet in its repertory. The Ambrosian rite has many texts in common with the Roman, perfectly assimilated to its generic skeleton. Early Gallican and Mozarabic sources usually contain mass formularies with the title 'Romensis', i.e. Roman, and some Gallican sources draw parts of their content from the Roman repertory, yet with the Gallican arrangement and terminology for the genres.

On the other side, Roman books were open to texts from other rites. As stated above, the pontifical blessing had been a Hispano-Gallic invention, though its actual repertories from the 9th century were typically fresh compositions. We may encounter a *contestatio*, the Gallican equivalent of the Roman preface, in a Gregorian sacramentary. Some scholars think that the dramatic offertories in the autumn section of the time after Pentecost, alien from the standard Roman repertory that is based on psalm texts, stem from Old Spanish origins. From beyond the Latin realm, translations of Byzantine chants served as the office antiphons of the octave of Epiphany. Even the *Missa Graeca* was popular in Latin Europe, a Greek translation of the Roman mass ordinary with musical notes, in which, however, the genuine cherubic hymn could play the part of the offertory. All this means that we must first assume an unsystematic exchange of liturgical items between rites and, consequently, a partial infiltration of the Roman repertory into the transalpine regions. This could already happen with a different consistency; borrowed pieces within the structure of another rite characterize the first level, and fully adopted formularies in their Roman arrangement the second.

The next problem was the above-detailed diversity inside Rome, even in the time of systematic adoption. Both the Gelasian and the Gregorian Sacramentary claimed to be compiled by Roman Pontiffs, while their contents differed not only in repertory but structurally as well. Reconciling them must have been a real headache to the Franks. Authentic sources might have represented different institutions or stages of development. The first ordinances on the office lectionary, for example, known as the 13th and the 14th *Ordo Romanus*, are associated with St Peter's and the Lateran, but feature subsequent stages of the same system, one based on the recurrence of seasons and months, the other – at least partly – on the well-established temporal cycle. There is no ground for questioning the authenticity of Roman capitularies listing unique lessons for Lenten Thursdays, ordinary Wednesdays and Fridays, albeit we know a more primitive redaction without any of them and, what is more, this latter has been perpetuated in the Curial use. In sum, even if they aimed at a comprehensive and systematic enactment of the Roman rite, the Carolingians were faced with outdated documents, recent but not generally accepted urban initiatives, and perhaps institutional diversity.

It seems that this state of affairs continued in the 9th century. Properization was still underway in Rome when earlier Roman books were already circulating in Gaul. New feasts have been introduced, and new chants composed. There is no need to suppose that everything missing from the “authentic” exemplars is Frankish addition; they can equally be the fruits of later Roman creativity. The canticle of the three children in the fiery furnace on Ember Saturdays is missing from the most archaic French uses and the first extant Frankish graduals, yet it has a firm place in the Beneventan and Old Roman books. 9th-century cantors probably proved quite active in composing new processional chants and filling the gaps of the earlier repertory.

Such experiences, after the first shock, might have contributed to a sense of relief. If the Roman rite was not an immutable monolith, it allowed intervention. The main difference between earlier and later developments is that, until the northerners searched for authenticity, divergence evolved involuntarily; after abandoning such a quest, they could freely continue the successive stages of properization, troping, and inventing rites on a local basis.

A chronology of divergence

Early divergence manifests itself through the haphazard distribution of variants, including Rome and Italy. Gelasian orations, for example, form a small minority, but can appear almost anywhere in Europe. Later but still Roman-based divergence conforms to meaningful geographic patterns which mirror the age when a given region was in intense contact with Rome: some parts of Gaul already in the 8th century, France as a whole in the 9th, Germany mostly in the 10th. Variants of this type are present in at least one layer of the Roman tradition and in the connected area. The aforementioned canticle of the three children, for instance, has three stages of development already in Rome. First, it was nonexistent as a chant, the text being recited as a lesson: this is what we encounter in the first sources and some uses of the Rhône Valley. Second, it received monumental music, maybe the longest composition of western plainchant: besides Beneventan and Old Roman sources, this variant is typical to West Francia (the territory of Charles the Bald after the Treaty of Verdun). Third, a more viable melody emerged with an abridged and partly paraphrased text; along with its predominance in Germany, it prevailed in the Curial use and already appears in the earliest Old Roman gradual as a marginal note.

We recognize local developments by their absence from Rome. In the atmosphere of relief, local ideas spread via the natural

routes of cultural communication. They similarly conformed to meaningful geographic patterns as new items composed in one place were firstly accepted by the neighbours. New assignments or new rites equally had a definitive sphere of influence. This type of variation starts in the 9th century but divides into three periods. The first is free experimentation. It seems that liturgy-making flourished but there was no ambition for creating permanent and systematic structures so far. Departing from the Roman practice was not conscious, and those engaged in it considered themselves as still adhering to a single authentic tradition. This chiefly applies to France and the great age of troping but often to the early Germanic evidence as well. A vast number of peculiarities exist, but we can hardly find any that characterizes a whole country or one of its politico-cultural units.

The second period coincides with the era of uses gaining self-awareness. Its symptoms are liturgical variants that cover large and contiguous landscapes. In a general sense, Germany already belongs here. On Holy Saturday, for instance, the ancient litanies have been replaced with the hymns *Inventor rutili* and *Rex sanctorum angelorum* throughout the north-eastern half of the continent. Yet the best examples are the reformed uses of the Anglo-Norman and the Ibero-Provencal churches, and the eastern and northern newcomers of Latin Christianity. For them, both ancient divergence and coeval attempts organized into lasting and coherent structures. The above-cited canticle of the three children had a poetic paraphrase by Walahfrid Strabo, sporadically known already from 9th-century sources. British and Spanish uses, however, fixed its place on the Saturday of the autumn fast as part of a system that provided each Ember Saturday with a different adaptation of the text. In Hungary, antiphonals and breviaries start with five Advent antiphons that substitute the traditional, psalmic series of ordinary Saturdays. This typical example of properization is not documented abroad before the late Middle Ages but connects every extant Hungar-

ian source from the 12th to the late 16th century. Needless to say, the same young uses excelled at designing characteristic processional and pontifical rites as well.

After about 1300, new feasts were still introduced and new items were still composed, but they did not constitute uses any more. This third period is simultaneously marked by a ceasing interest in liturgical structures as autonomous fields of creative work and the proliferation of contemporary pieces in the peripheries. As stated above, the distinction between the canonical core and its malleable outskirts was not the same in the more innovative South-West and the more conservative North-East. France, formerly modest in devising processional and pontifical rites, had more inclination to update its repertory than Germany or the East; Spain and Britain did both. The new pieces, however, did not exert overall influence even on a regional level. This is obvious from their chronological and geographic distribution. Like in the first wave of troping, new items, masses, and offices come and go without any ambition for permanence. They figure randomly on the map, accepted as fashionable extras or rejected as frivolous novelties according to the taste of the audience. It foreshadows the Neo-Gallican scenario where both liturgical variants and independent institutions existed without being associated with one another.

In consequence, not every liturgical variant constitutes a use. If they can be classified according to their age, they can be classified according to their scope, too. Although actual worship is a continuous sequence of texts and gestures, it is made up of components with different authority, functions, and historical backgrounds. This is what we may call the modular nature of the liturgy. Rites, layers, and modules form overlapping hierarchies and behave independently. Diversity and change in one field do not necessarily involve others and this is the common reason for both variety and endurance in liturgical matters. It is hardly imaginable that a however thoroughgoing reform could

modify everything, but it is equally implausible that nothing would alter during a long period of time. Not to underestimate change and still find the golden thread of continuity requires real detective work in some cases.

What makes a use?

The principles are plain. As with rites, the mass varies less than the office, and the office less than the rest. Among the rest, theoretically, the processional would vary less than the ritual, and the ritual less than the pontifical according to the frequency of the performance and the number of those involved. This, however, is overwritten by further factors such as the internationalization of the pontifical and the privatization of the ritual which, for the end of the Middle Ages, result in more consistent pontifical and more divergent sacerdotal rites.

Inside the mass and the office, there is a priority of *propers* against the ordinary. Since *propers* build up a hard structure, they are functionally unalterable, only actual items can be substituted. Yet some parts of the ordinary provide the fundamentals of the ceremony while others join only as accessories. The canon of the mass ranks higher than any of the *propers*, and psalmody is a vital condition for the office. The priest's apologies in the mass and the commemorations after an office hour also belong to the ordinary, but can be added, omitted, or replaced more freely. There is a number of stages between the two extremes. Some prayers said during offertory and communion are remarkably stable, while others fluctuate according to time and space. The opening and closing sections of the office hours are universal, but the selection of psalm verses for the Lenten *preces* varies over a wide range.

As with layers, texts recited by the celebrant have an advantage over chants and readings. Prayers, comprised under an abstract sense of sacramentary, are constitutive of the rite's ef-

ficiency, while chants and readings are only illustrative. The distinction is already formulated in medieval treatises as substance (*substantia*) versus solemnity (*sollemnitas*). Priestly texts, however, can also fall into the illustrative category. Blessings, formulas, invitations, and allocutions are typical supplements recited by the celebrant but inferior to the established chants and readings. Solemnity is again supported by the fact that it is more memorable from a human perspective. Singing and listening concern more people and demand more effort than the lonely and often silent praying of a single priest.

In general, the same applies to the occasional rites where there is no distinction between propers and ordinary. Some rubrics explicitly state that in the selection of prayers, every church of the diocese must conform to the custom of the cathedral, while they are allowed to follow their local traditions in organizing the Palm Sunday procession. Yet here the hierarchy of texts is even more intricate as occasional rites chiefly consist of sacerdotal items. Baptism, for example, has no chant at all and only one short Gospel passage, and even that is lacking from the earliest evidence. As a rule, formal texts directed to God are superior to those directed to the faithful, but also here there are remarkable exceptions. In baptism and several other rites, the verbal form that constitutes the sacrament is an indicative formula, theologically more important than any of the prayers. Yet from the perspective of variation, the basic rule still proves valid. A marrying couple might have expressed mutual consent in many ways, thereby administering the sacrament of matrimony, but the blessing of the newlywed bride remained the same since the first sacramentaries. For confirmation, too, a number of anointing formulas circulated, while the preceding oration was left unchanged.

Modularity prevails in several different fields. With hard structured rites, it describes hierarchies stretching from the annual cycle to the votive parts, and from the more established

parts of the year to the less established ones. Generally speaking, both the evolution of the calendar and the structure of the service books reflect this hierarchy. Earlier introduced seasons and days prove more universal and consistent than later ones. In the office, the psalter precedes the temporal, and the temporal the sanctoral. In the mass, the temporal precedes the sanctoral, and the sanctoral the votive parts. Such commonplace observations only gain significance when contrasted with the everyday experience of medieval worshippers. On at least six days of a week, they faced an overwhelming abundance of minor saints and votive intentions. Only privileged Sundays, fasts, and the greatest feasts reminded them of the temporal cycle. Weekdays existed almost only in theory but still the books preserved the latent logic of the structure.

Nevertheless, the usual divisions are quite misleading. In the first Roman books, the temporal and the sanctoral form one continuous cycle. It means that temporal dates have no absolute precedence over sanctoral ones. Instead, there is an inner hierarchy among both: Easter ranks higher than Christmas, Peter and Paul higher than Nereus and Achilleus, but all those belonging to the ancient layer of the calendar have an indisputable place in it. They were accurately commemorated all over Europe even if a more prestigious feast superseded them. Not only St Hermes kept his modest place against St Augustine or St Hadrian against the Nativity of the Virgin Mary herself, but St Anastasia held out even against Christmas. The season from Christmas to Easter solidified first. Shrovetide, Eastertide, the summer season, and Advent became only gradually fixed, and this is manifest from the degree of their diversity. Time after Pentecost itself went through at least three phases: first, it was a loose conglomerate of unassigned items, then its Sundays were numbered after the principal feasts of summer and autumn, last they got a continuous numeric reckoning.

After being detached from Rome, the sanctoral grew further, but mostly relied on items that had belonged to first-generation saints. This repertory provided the basic material of the nascent commune, conservative in repertory but novel in assignation. Diversity had more chance in the peripheries: the new genres of tropes and sequences. For a while, new feasts were celebrated with ancient masses and offices, but the increasing number of saints and the tedious repetition of common items self-evidently inspired properization, first favouring patrons of local or regional importance and then expanding to lesser saints and votive themes. This, however, was a gradual process over centuries, expanding from modest proper orations to entire cycles. Not surprisingly, it rarely affected Roman feasts of the archaic layer.

With soft structured rites, the concept of modularity grasps two of their prominent features. One has already been introduced by the example of ordinations. Types of gestures and texts fit into a historical order of evolution that matches their prestige and variability. The core prayers already appear in the first sources, endure until the modern age, and do not vary among uses. The diversity of later additions is in direct proportion with their age. We can certainly conclude possible diversity from historical evidence but, if it fails, we can inversely hypothesize historical processes by the degree of variation.

The other feature is that occasional rites were typically enlarged by a sort of ceremonial troping, i.e. by inserting or adding new elements to an existing rite. The dedication of churches, for example, grew out from the deposition of relics, the erection of a new altar over them, and the celebration of the first mass on it. In the creative centuries, it was completed with a triple circumambulation around the building; the inscription of the Greek and Latin alphabet in ashes spread on the pavement; the blessing and sprinkling of Gregorian water (a peculiar type of holy water mixed with salt, wine, and ashes); the anointing of the altar and the walls with chrism; the burning of grains of incense on the

yet uncovered altar, and so on. Each of these was an elaborate ceremony in itself with a series of prayers and accompanying chants. Modules in this sense were contiguous but independent from each other. Two uses could have the same blessing of Gregorian water without sharing their series of responsories and orations for the triple circumambulation. Some modules developed into recurrent textual patterns and ceremonial ideas, connecting even distinct ceremonies. The use of litanies and consecratory prefaces spread from ancient rites like ordinations to recent ones like the blessing of an abbot. Parallels drawn from well-known rites enriched the symbolism of particular ones: the coronation of a king borrowed anointing from baptism as both the catechumen and the king was a wrestler who must slip out from the grip of the enemy, and engagement by a ring from matrimony as he was wedded to his kingdom.

As uses consist of lasting variants, detecting them requires orientation in the hierarchies. All that glitters is not gold: diversity must be distinctive, continuous, and feature in comparable positions. The closer it is to the core of the structures the higher it ranks in the hierarchy. Evaluating variance means historical-comparative research: exploring the broadest possible context, identifying analogous points in the system, assessing their significance, and interpreting the actual solutions.

METHODOLOGY

In comparison with churches where the Roman rite was once celebrated, the proportion of extant service books is not only meagre but extremely uneven. The disproportion increases as we go back in time. There will be fewer and fewer sources and they will concentrate in libraries that were in the position of accumulating vast collections and surviving historical vicissitudes. Self-evidently, the material of such privileged archives will primarily represent the neighbouring regions. The Bibliothèque nationale in Paris is surely one of them and, indeed, Northern French cathedrals like Paris or Sens are represented by dozens of sources, while in the South we can be happy with one reliable document for an entire diocese. This is the reason why a survey that takes pure bibliographical evidence as its point of departure is destined to fail. It cannot provide a statistically relevant picture of the liturgy as it was actually performed throughout the continent.

Notwithstanding, the evidence is immense. Tens of thousands of service books have survived, each with hundreds of pages and dozens of entries on each page. This amount justly discourages even the most diligent researcher from a comprehensive approach as no human life is enough to process even a small percentage of the material. It seems more feasible to narrow the scope to single sources, genres, traditions, or ceremonies. If one still accepts the challenge of the whole, the number of sources must be limited to a reasonable selection. Two opposite difficulties should be overcome: the lack of evidence for certain places, on the one hand, and the abundance of it, on the other.

A possible solution lies in taking the agent and not the medium as a starting point. If the question is posed of who owns the liturgy, worshipping communities are the answer. They were the ones who in fact celebrated the rites and recorded or designed

them in their books. Therefore, a comprehensive survey of past European liturgy should start out from a network of ecclesiastical institutions. To put it in visual terms, this means maps instead of catalogues. In theory, such a map view would comprise every church where services were once conducted, resulting in a rather dense grid of institutions. Processing them is no more feasible than that of the books. In order to thin the grid, we must assume that the clusters of some churches converged so that some of them can be picked out as samples of more. As certain churches were larger, richer, and more influential than others, it is rational to take them as representatives of their surroundings.

Yet to avoid any subjective judgment on their actual influence, it seems better to estimate it according to the genuine standards of liturgical jurisdiction. Although the dimensions, beauty, wealth, and personnel of a church exclusively depended on the facilities of its patrons, not all were authorized to master liturgies of their own. The high medieval paradigm of *uses* suggests that, at least in theory and from that time, only cathedrals, religious orders, and monasteries had the power to determine the worship of their respective sphere of influence: cathedrals of their diocese, religious orders of their dispersed houses, monasteries of their congregations (if they had one; otherwise, although their practice was subordinate to no one, they stood isolated on the map). Even if we admit its practical and historical limitations, the concept of *uses* proves to be the best working hypothesis for thinning the grid and thus establishing a reliable institutional network. A map of European cathedrals, headquarters of centralized orders, and Benedictine or Augustinian abbeys would probably give a proportionate, if not exhaustive, picture of liturgical agents in the Middle Ages.

Selecting sources – a typological grid

Since the mere existence of an institution does not inform us about its liturgy, the next problem is to find the matching sources. We should logically start with the agent but still, the medium is indispensable. The problem of finding the competent sources arises on three levels: (1) if there are any; (2) if they are representative; (3) if they cover the respective field to a sufficient degree.

Several dioceses and far more monasteries have not left behind liturgical sources at all. They form blind spots on the imaginary map and we can only guess at the outlines of their liturgies by their environment. If there are sources, the strength of their attribution to a certain institution may rest on various grounds. The best witnesses are those that identify themselves as representing a certain tradition by an explicit title or colophon. Among them, those that feature in more related copies from different churches of the same jurisdiction and bear traces of intense use are even more reliable. There are others that meet the basic criteria but come from less influential places like manuscripts of a parish church inside an identifiable diocese. Again, some have no self-descriptive titles or colophons, but contain relevant historical records, distinctive feasts, or other liturgical markers that point to a certain origin. Some, however, and especially the earliest ones, can only be approximately ascribed to an institution on the basis of their palaeography or provenance. Accordingly, we can establish a hierarchy of trustworthiness. Needless to say, liturgical prints will figure at its top: though the latest ones on the list, they were typically commissioned by the bishop and the cathedral clergy, modelled on the best codices, distributed throughout the diocese, and applied until the abrogation of the use concerned. They prove ideal for representing their institution, but their information value as constituents of a pan-European sample is somewhat obscured by the third problem, their coverage.

The inner territories of the continent and the centralized religious orders are evenly documented by prints. In Germany, France, and Spain printed service books almost perfectly cover the institutional network of pre-14th-century dioceses. Religious orders are covered without exception. In the territories, however, where nationwide centralization prevailed by the late 15th century, only a minority of the dioceses have their prints: Italy, Britain, Scandinavia, and – with some restraints – Eastern Europe are affected. The evidence is undoubtedly telling for the period, but can hardly be treated as retrospective for earlier centuries. Monasteries are in an even worse position. Those that can be accessed through printed sources are only the scattered remnants of a once flourishing network of institutions.

The other problem with prints originates from generic limitations. The source material chiefly consists of missals, breviaries, rituals, and some ordinals. As a rule, historical-comparative analysis confirms their information value with regard to the mass, the office, and the processional rites, but pontifical rites are almost completely missing and sacerdotal rites often diverge from their precedents due to the above-detailed processes of internationalization and privatization. As a consequence, prints are still the best points of reference in a typological grid of European liturgy, but some territories, types of institutions, and rites will, unfortunately, remain outside of their scope. It is possible to compensate for this deficiency by collecting a geographically proportionate sample of earlier sources, but its reliability and coverage will never match that of the early prints.

To get a realistic picture, even prints require due circumspection. Uses with many surviving sources will be overrepresented in the sample, and some territories have a far denser institutional network than others. Nearly 60 printed missals document the use of Salisbury, while scarcely a bundle of fragments has survived from Compostella. This may be informative about the significance of a given tradition and its range of influence,

though the survival rate of copies may depend on other factors, too. Yet in terms of liturgical variation, every accessible tradition counts. Sources of ill-documented dioceses, therefore, are extremely wanted.

Furthermore, the density of medieval cathedrals and, as a consequence, the extent of dioceses resulted more from tradition than from pastoral needs. Both in France and Germany, almost every diocese published printed service books. That France published more than thrice as many as Germany does not mean that it had three times as many churches or inhabitants. In ancient Italy, any city surrounded by a limited zone of countryside worked as a bishopric. In this context, cathedrals played the part of modern-day parishes and were self-evidently more numerous. The Gallic ecclesiastical organization of ancient origins followed a similar policy and was especially dense in the highly Romanized areas of Provence and Burgundy, and north of the Loire. Dioceses east of the Rhine and north of the Danube were founded later and on the basis of a different strategy. Here not only rural territories but also several municipalities belonged to a few distant centres that governed them as a county is ruled by its seat, hence cathedral cities were less numerous but had larger bishoprics. This German strategy applied to the East and the North as well. Thus, even if sources are reduced to uses, uses should be carefully compared to their spheres of influence: their geography (if there are vast uninhabited mountains, forests, or deserts in them), population, and ecclesiastical institutions.

Liturgical markers

After establishing a typological grid of uses and selecting their characteristic sources, distinctive traits or liturgical markers must be isolated from the rest. A grid is self-evidently discontinuous, hence a sample will not exhibit all the potential variants but – provided that it covers the widest possible area – it

can reveal the range of diversity: the points of the system where variance signals and the degree to which it extends. As uses are subdivisions of the Roman rite, they have more in common than what they have to distinguish them. A quest for variants must, therefore, first discard a mass of information that, although highly valuable as constituting the foundations of the rite, is irrelevant in this special context. The next step is quantitative assessment: the ranking of the system's variable positions according to the number of variants that may occupy them. Such a method will highlight the sensitive points of the structure and define the list of their possible occupants. So far, this is mechanical work, and can be effectively performed by technology, if the critical amount of properly entered data is at hand. The last issue, however, is understanding the nature of variation in each specific case. It requires interpretation in terms of history, aesthetics, and semantics, entailing liturgical epochs, styles, attitudes, and their complex interactions.

Technically, the basic research consists in establishing analogies. We can take books as informants, and so, the description of a ceremony will consist of a series of textual items. This is not because musical or ceremonial diversity would be less valuable, but because written evidence forms the largest part of the information, and such is the logic of traditional Christian worship, that not only every melody, but also every gesture is anchored to its text.

First, we have to define the structure of each ceremony and its valid elements. It is a formal criterion that structural parallels be systematically stated. This is the basis of the wider cluster which we call rite. Where structural parallels are not systematic, one has to split the evidence into different rites. Undoubtedly, the Roman offertory chant and the Byzantine *cherubikon*, the Roman preface prayer and the Mozarabic *illatio* are functionally parallel. However, their parallelism is not systematic since not all the chants and prayers of the respective rites have their mu-

tual equivalents. Furthermore, even the related items have too many different attributes: the offertory belongs to the propers, the Cherubic Hymn to the ordinary, the preface introduces an unchanging canon while the *illatio* comprises the whole anaphora until the consecration. Only where structural coincidences are systematic can we speak of different uses within the same rite.

This is only obvious, however, in the case of ceremonies that have a well-defined and recurrent structure, above all the mass and the divine office. This is what we have labelled a hard structure. Insofar as occasional ceremonies are concerned, a hidden structure has to be detected with the help of comparing the common features of different variants. This is what we have labelled a soft structure. One could say that in the case of hard structures, evidence is evaluated within the frame of an already known system while, in the case of soft structures, evidence comes first and the system is derived only from an abstraction of the evidence.

The second stage of the work is when elements in the same position of parallel structures are contrasted. For example, the postcommunion prayer assigned to the 4th Sunday of Lent, or the formulas of giving the elected abbot his insignia can be compared. A mechanical comparison would lead to a binary opposition: some elements are the same and others are different. Nevertheless, liturgical features within the same rite can only be interpreted in the foreground of the wider context, i.e. if the background of the possibly widest cluster of parallels is also known. Uniqueness means that all the other variants differ, and it is not yet a symptom of interrelatedness between two uses if the postcommunion in the same mass of the same day happens to be the same. It is only symptomatic when this coincidence is unique or at least very rare in the entire rite.

Twofold standardization enables us to conduct such an overall comparison. From the system's perspective, we need an emp-

ty frame for the liturgical fabric with a structured nomenclature of the ceremonies, dates, topics, and modules along with their typical order and number of genres. Of course, it is easier with hard structures: the Gospel of the first Sunday of Advent or the offertory of the Saturday before Palm Sunday are self-evidently parallel with one another. It is more complicated but still viable with soft structures: the formula of donning the chasuble before mass or the chants during the distribution of the branches on Palm Sunday are equally parallel.

From the repertory's perspective, we need normative lists of the possible items that may fill the frame's positions: Gospel pericopes, offertories, vesting formulas, processional chants. Modern scholarship has already offered many tools for precise identification: not only can we quote biblical passages by chapters and verses but there are also reference lists for prayers (e.g. *Corpus Orationum*) or chants (e.g. *Cantus Index*). They are open to further additions; utilizing digital facilities will certainly contribute more and more to the organization of liturgical knowledge. Surely, they will be bold generalizations disregarding textual and melodic diversity. It will always remain a delicate problem to demarcate similar or related but distinct items from variants of the same item, yet the general use of incipits in the original context encourages us to do so. Medieval worshippers meant the same when they referred to the abstractions of the Gospels *Cum appropinquasset* and *Erunt signa* or the antiphons *Ante sex dies* and *Pueri Hebraeorum*, even though they were perfectly aware that both the text and the melody slightly differed from place to place.

Theoretically, we are on the whole interested in the correlations between two lists: the assignments of standard items and their standard positions. Both lists are, however, bewilderingly long. Effective research must concentrate on the most meaningful sections of both: their intermediary range. This key concept helps us to filter the relevant information and distinguish it

either from the commonplace or from the ephemeral. As stated above, common features of the rite are meaningless from a comparative perspective. It is impressive that the introit *Ad te levavi* opens the first Advent mass all over Europe since the first graduals, but it will not tell us anything about diversity. Again, an isolated rhymed office of a local saint in a private breviary may be a precious document of poetry and devotion, but it cannot be interpreted in terms of continuity or cultural transfer. A piece of information should occur at least more than once to be meaningful, regardless if it multiplies within the same tradition or connects more. In Würzburg, the mass of the 2nd (originally vacant) Sunday of Lent started with the Old Roman introit *Dominus illuminatio mea*, elsewhere usually heading the 4th Sunday after Pentecost. It is unique information, but it consistently marks the use of Würzburg and the Old Roman graduals. On the same day, nearly 30 uses preferred the rare introit *Domine dilexi*, all situated within the Ibero-Provencal landscape. Nevertheless, every unique item grows significant as soon as a single parallel emerges and, even without parallels, it highlights soft positions in the structure where innovation is acceptable.

The method of defining an intermediary range applies to other variable elements, too. Saints, for instance, have long been handled as identity markers although their biography is not necessarily indicative of their cult: a saint's place of birth and area of activity do not always coincide with the places where he or she was most respected. To estimate a feast's potential in identifying a source's origin, we need an overview of its general popularity. St Leodegar was an abbot near Poitiers and later the bishop of Autun in the 7th century, yet he features in more than 70% of calendars and sanctorals throughout Europe. His cult is simply ubiquitous. St Kilian occurs in little more than 30%. Though the patron of Würzburg, he was venerated all over Germany and its borderlands, so his cult in fact indicates a Germanic origin, but nothing more precise. Typical national saints like Il-

dephouse in Spain or Canute in Denmark range between 2–10% according to the respective country's extent and the number of its documented dioceses. They are the common property of large regions. Local saints have an even smaller percentage, yet they still come forth in more than one place. St Lutruda came from Champagne, but her relics were translated to Corvey, and, indeed, she was only celebrated in the nearby dioceses of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Brandenburg. Albeit of French descent, she became a distinctive marker of North-German origin. A host of saints, however, appears only in isolated positions and almost exclusively in calendars, representing more of a scholarly interest in hagiographical rarities than in their real celebration. Again, neither widespread nor isolated feasts contribute to the understanding of diversity while those between the two extremes define different layers of significance.

Statistical methods – frequency and diversity

One can detect the structure's sensitive points and measure their range of diversity with the help of statistics. By using statistical means, relevance shows itself in exact numbers. Granted that the sample proportionately covers the institutional network in question, the number of possible items in a distinct position will signal the position's variability. Vice versa, the total number of an item's occurrences either at a specific point of the system or in general will indicate its popularity. For the first category, we introduce the term an assignment's diversity, and for the second one an item's absolute or relative frequency.

Assignment describes an unambiguous liturgical position that can be filled with a unique item. Recalling the aforementioned examples, we can refer to the Gospel of the first Sunday of Advent or the first accompanying antiphon of the distribution of branches on Palm Sunday through a list of standard signifiers like Adv/H1/D/Ev or Palm Sunday/distribution/Ant/1. By

querying the possible occupants of these positions, we come to a list of standard items that may appear in them: it happens to extend to 5 and 11. With hard structured rites, this exponent can be compared to the absolute diversity of the position, here that of the Gospels in general, ranging from 1 to 32. With applying a well-tryed classification into quarters, 1 counts as uniformity, below 8 as low diversity, 9–16 as medium, 17–24 as high, and over 25 as extreme. Soft structured rites resist absolute classification but still, it is informative to contrast their diversity with other assignments of the same ceremony (e.g. the opening oration of the Palm Sunday procession) or analogous assignments of other ceremonies (e.g. the first chant accompanying the distribution of candles on Candlemas). With regard to not generally accepted assignments, one must also take into account the number of sources involved. Sunday masses and Palm Sunday processions were universally held, but rather few uses furnished Mondays with lessons or had specific blessings for anchors and fishing nets. For ceremonies only attested by a minority of uses, even a low number may express high or extreme diversity if it comes near to the total of the consulted sources.

With this method, the entire liturgical system can be exposed in terms of variation and the resulting quarters already provide a compass for rough orientation. Uniformity typically originates from ancient components, already established before the 8th-century dissemination of the Roman rite, or – rarely – recent ones, centrally promulgated by popes of the late Middle Ages. Low diversity tends to mark assignments that initially were open to variation but draw on a limited set of options already available in the first millennium. Thursdays of Lent and vacant Sundays are classic examples. Medium diversity comprises areas often extending to one-third of the continent. It often reveals the exchange of items or customs stretching over territories comprising several dioceses. High diversity usually features regional developments of the 11–13th centuries; it is characteristic of some

occasional rites and weekday pericopes. Extreme diversity signals that the assignment was absolutely free to local initiatives. Independently properized and relatively late sanctoral and votive masses and offices may fall into this category. Obviously, it is medium or high diversity that proves the most informative when researching uses in the context of their typology and interactions.

From the items' perspective, frequency expresses the number of occurrences. As it grows in direct proportion with the number of processed sources, plain numerals are unfit for its display. If an item comes forth a hundred times in a sample of a hundred sources, it suggests unchallenged popularity, yet a hundred occurrences in a sample of a thousand characterize a more peculiar phenomenon. Instead, we need a percentage of the actual occurrences as compared to the number of processed uses. The total of possible occurrences, however, is not an unambiguous term. By absolute frequency, we mean the item's popularity within the broadest liturgical context, regardless of its specific assignment. It is telling that *Veritas mea* was the most frequently performed offertory chant in the Roman rite, while *Intempesta noctis hora* (an offertory of St Benedict) was a Beneventan rarity.

Relative frequency means reduction to an assignment. With its help, we can assess the popularity of an item in a definitive position, regardless of its further possible occurrences. On the 3rd Sunday of Advent, for example, 96% of the uses prefer the epistle *Sic nos existimet homo* and only 4% harmonize it with the day's introit by choosing *Gaudete in Domino semper*. Curiously enough, the latter choice connects the Roman Curial use not only with late Spanish sources under its direct influence (Granada, Plasencia) but with old Campanian and Beneventan traditions (Albaneta, Capua, Kotor) as well.

Both kinds of frequency matter. The sense of relative frequency is more obvious; it shows its strength when comparing variants of the same assignment. We can learn that the Gospel

of the 1st Advent Sunday was *Cum appropinquasset* in 72% of the European uses, 15% read *Erunt signa*, 12% preferred the prologue of Mark (*Ecce ego mitto*), and there existed an insignificant 1% of uses with other choices. Consequently, the first item will not count as distinctive, but *Erunt signa* is in fact indicative of Mediterranean and *Ecce ego mitto* of Norman, Burgundian, or Aquitanian origins. Moreover, the annunciation narrative as a Sunday pericope positively refers to Girona.

Absolute frequency enables us to estimate the relevance of an item and define the intermediary range within the repertory of each genre. Here also, items that are not universally accepted but appear more than once will rank into quarters according to their popularity. Yet there is a fundamental difference between assignment statistics and item statistics. An assignment is self-evidently unique. There is only one 1st Sunday of Advent or only one Palm Sunday in a year and each has only one Gospel in its high mass or one first antiphon during the distribution of branches. An item, in contrast, can be repeated in several assignments. For those, therefore, the most expressive base of comparison is not the greatest number of occurrences which results from frequent repetition, but a central value featuring the frequency of items that are performed universally but only once a year.

To return to introits, common items dominate their list of absolute frequency. *Gaudeamus omnes*, *Os iusti*, *Statuit ei*, or *Mihi autem* opened dozens of masses on the feasts of various saints. Each of them amounts to more than 1% of the entire repertory but – as in this context one must count with especially small proportions – it is more fortunate to express their frequency with the more nuanced units of milli-percent (per cent mille) measurement: they are typically over 1000pcm. Introits shared between a Lenten feria, a Sunday after Trinity, and occasionally some votive masses approximately range between 500–900pcm, whereas *Ad te levavi* – the first introit of the cycle that was universally sung but only in a single assignment –

amounts to circa 300pcm, and so do others of the similar sort. It means that by and large 400pcm works as an expressive base of comparison, and quarters of absolute frequency should be established between about 2–100pcm (low), 100–200pcm (medium), 200–300pcm (high), and 300–400pcm (extreme). 1pcm, of course, signals uniqueness, and the extreme section contains the common property of the Roman rite. Surveys of diversity must primarily concentrate on the range between the two.

We can demonstrate the power of combining these two aspects by an analysis of introits for the 2nd Sunday of Lent. As a vacant Sunday, it originally had no proper chants, and, truly, 81% of the processed uses reapplied *Reminiscere*, the introit of the preceding Ember Wednesday. *Domine dilexi* is placed second as a typical Ibero-Provencal choice (16%), *Dirige me* third as the favourite of the Campanian-Beneventan region, including Dalmatia (3%). Sporadically, there are other options, too: *Sperent in te* for Coutances, Évreux, and Lisieux, *Intret oratio* for Uzès, and *Dominus illuminatio* for Würzburg. This is certainly enough to grade the concerning chants' significance and to identify their origins, but a deeper interpretation requires more.

In terms of absolute frequency, *Reminiscere* ranks far over 400pcm (in fact: 697pcm) as it is the universal introit of the Ember Wednesday in spring, the prevailing introit of the next Sunday, and a popular introit of some votive masses. *Domine dilexi*, however, features low diversity (47pcm) and exclusively appears on the 2nd Sunday of Lent, similarly to *Dirige me* with its 7pcm. *Sperent in te* is a clear marker of French-Norman origin. Besides the aforementioned two dioceses, it is assigned to Trinity Sunday in the neighbouring Avranches and reappears in the Norwegian Trondheim, a use famous of its Norman connections (altogether: 8pcm). Surprisingly, we could not find it either in the British or the Sicilian Norman traditions. In contrast, the relevance of *Intret oratio* (341pcm) and *Dominus illuminatio* (329pcm) is somewhat obscured by their extreme

frequency. Although unique in this special position, the first is the introit of the preceding Ember Saturday and several votive masses, the second one that of the 4th Sunday after Trinity and a few votive masses.

What happened then? Primordially, there was a vacant Sunday without any introit of its own. Mainstream uses supplied the deficiency in the usual way of repeating the introit of the preceding Wednesday. Uzès simply decided for the preceding Saturday instead, and Würzburg chose a sympathetic introit from Time after Pentecost. Similarly to the mainstream, both opted to recycle, if not from the same source. The innovative uses of Spain and Southern France, Normandy and South Italy, on the contrary, voted for properization. They willingly took the opportunity of a still unfilled assignment to furnish it with fresh compositions. And, more important in the present context, the freshness of these compositions could have been deduced from the statistics of their absolute frequency alike.

The same applies to occasional rites. On Palm Sunday, the lengthy processional antiphon *Ante sex dies* accompanied the distribution of branches in some Germanic uses (e.g. Brixen, Eichstätt, Münster, Salzburg); the shorter *Fulgentibus palmis* opened the module in others (e.g. Bamberg, Hildesheim, Minden, Prague, Olomouc, Regensburg) while *Turba multa*, the day's Benedictus antiphon fulfilled the function in the rest (e.g. Köln, Kraków, Mainz, Strassburg). In this position, the twin antiphons *Pueri Hebraeorum* characterize Western and Southern Europe as a whole but, in some Hispanic churches, they are replaced by *Palmae fuerunt* (e.g. Ávila, Urgell, València, Vic, Zaragoza). Only *Fulgentibus palmis* and *Palmae fuerunt* signal low frequency (3–6%) in absolute terms. In the broad context of Palm Sunday ceremonies before the day's high mass, their presence is a distinctive Germanic or Spanish symptom, respectively. All the other chants were universally sung in differing functions, so their frequency is only symptomatic when it is reduced to a

module. *Ante sex dies* typically sounded during the procession, *Turba multa* before entering the church. To the skilled eye, even the plain order of chants can reveal ceremonial information. *Pueri Hebraeorum*, although the most popular chant of the ceremony, only records distribution if it comes after the blessing of the palms. After the procession has departed, it testifies to the dramatic gesture of laying first branches and then copes before the cross as part of its adoration.

Mapping

Still, the most expressive tool of exposition is mapping. Mere statistics will always tip the balance in South-Western Europe's favour due to its denser institutional network. In a map view, however, it makes no great difference if a region is represented by more or fewer pixels; it only contributes to the sharpness of the picture. What really matters is the extent and homogeneity of the concerned regions.

Each use can be represented by a point on the map where its centre (the cathedral church) was situated, or by a territory over which the jurisdiction of the cathedral expanded. The former approach is more cautious and, indeed, more realistic. As we have already stated, there were several monastic institutions in most of the dioceses that had a liturgical tradition of their own, and even the subordinated parishes and collegiate chapters might have proven less obedient than they were supposed to be. In contrast, we can assume that at least the cathedral celebrated the liturgy that it claimed as its own. Such a network of geographical locations does not pretend to cover the entire territory of the liturgical West in the late Middle Ages, but it provides a large, proportionate, homogenous, and therefore statistically relevant sketch. By comparing any other information to this basis, the liturgical associations and the wider context of non-diocesan institutions can safely be explored as well.

There are two sorts of geographical patterns that emerge. The first is what we may call a territorial formula. In such cases, locations with equal choices form a geographical continuum. The dimensions may strongly vary from the majority of the continent to a small group of a few dioceses, but their common characteristic is that the results feature in neighbouring clusters. Not infrequently, there is a prevalent group that comprises more than 70% of the data. It does not signal a direct relationship between specific traditions but identifies the European mainstream, roughly characterized by a Franco-Germanic coincidence of western (French) and eastern (German) results.

Recurrent clusters that are not so dominant but surpass national frontiers we call liturgical landscapes, suggesting that they resemble the natural conditions of terrain and climate. Not deliberate decisions for one or another option are their cementing force but an almost organic convergence of dioceses with similar cultural and historical backgrounds: except for centralized religious orders, no uses are totally alien from their host environment. Frontiers dividing landscapes sometimes cross political and even ecclesiastical boundaries, yet they always prove reasonable in a past historical context. Of course, belonging to a landscape is not an automatism and does not manifest itself in every context and on every level of the liturgy, yet such patterns return frequently enough to consider them among the most helpful divisions.

Gallic, Germanic, Anglo-Norman, and Ibero-Provencal are the most typical landscapes, yet with many transitions, especially in Italy, Burgundy (including both Bourgogne and the ancient Kingdom of Burgundy, today's Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes region in France with its Swiss and Italian neighbourhood), Lorraine, and the Netherlands. As a rule, the northern stripe of the transitional zone is closer to Gaul than to Germany, and the Southern stripe is, conversely, closer to Germany than Gaul, but they are both susceptible to uncommon solutions. While

the Gallic landscape only refers to the north-western part of present-day France, approximately bordered by the rivers Rhine, Saône, Rhône, Garonne, and the southern slopes of the Massif Central, the Germanic landscape includes not only Germany, but also the territories east and north of the former Empire; the Anglo-Norman landscape Normandy, Britain, Sicily, and sometimes Norway; the Ibero-Provencal landscape Portugal, Spain, Aquitaine, Occitania, and Provence.

Finally, there are typical clusters that coincide with a country or prove to be even smaller than one. Some peculiarities are distinctive for Saxony, Poland, or Silesia, others for Southern Italy and Dalmatia. According to our terminology, they are referred to as regional choices. It is also justified to label those regional characteristics that precisely agree with a medieval political unit as national.

The other type of geographical distribution is when the results are dispersed. At first sight, such a pattern seems to lack any logic, but careful analysis may shed light on the factors that lay behind it. Properly selected on a local basis will surely belong to this category. They will possibly not reveal historical connections. Similarities between distant uses may go back to ways of transmission, either in the sense that certain types of ancient service books served as models in the period when a tradition was established, or that an episcopal see played a prominent role in the foundation of another. Although it is a well-documented fact that before the 14th century none of the newly founded liturgical uses adopted the customs of an earlier use intact, some traces of an early influence can surely be unfolded with the help of such coincidences.

Geographical analysis should precede historical assessment because it relies on more extensive and proportionate information. As time goes on, we have more and more sources from more and more origins, while early source material may be extremely misleading due to the lack of evidence from certain

locations. Historical conclusions can be drawn from mapping both directly and indirectly. Indirect conclusions rest on the coincidence of a geographical pattern with a historical state of affairs. As we have emphasized, already the distribution of printed sources seems to recall an ecclesiastical organization that predates the 14th century, as even the most prestigious dioceses that were founded later have no service books of their own, or share them with the diocese from which they were carved out.

What we call the European mainstream with its Franco-Germanic equivalences suggests a Carolingian formation, while the gap between East and West and the vertical stripe of transition resembles a situation after the Treaty of Verdun. Characteristics shared by Normandy, Britain, and Sicily cannot be earlier than the 11th-century Norman Conquest, and regional features in Saxony or national ones in Poland and Bohemia cannot predate the (re)organization of the ecclesiastical institutions in question. As to the direct impact of a single use on another, sporadic correspondences in a dispersed pattern may be equally telling.

Hypotheses based on geographical results are to be tested by the direct evidence of the earlier source material. If a feature proves to be distinctive, its presence must be traced back to more ancient manuscripts of the given use. Until the point in time when it can be detected in the past, the lifetime of the corresponding tradition can be extended, and vice versa, sources of uncertain origin in the past that bear the same characteristic can be safely attributed to the corresponding tradition. The method demonstrates how deep the validity of late medieval printed information reaches. In fortunate cases, it may also disclose the formative period of the entire use or at least one of its layers: the age when it was still in a malleable state, open to novelties, the reshaping of the old, and creative intervention.

A way of looking back

This method of isolating distinctive markers in late sources of unambiguous origins and searching for their presence in earlier and earlier evidence we call inverse chronology. It is the opposite of conventional liturgical studies, inspired by the genetic approaches of classical philology and source-criticism in the early modern era. Our method rather resembles the realities of archaeological work; like at an excavation, one must first dig oneself through the layers that are closer to the present, so inverse chronology deals first with the latest reliable evidence, and will only gradually descend into the abyss of the past. Late sources should be rehabilitated in comparison with the halo that still surrounds their earliest predecessors. They are not mere debris which we must get rid of as soon as possible to discover hidden treasures. As we draw away from the surface, the light grows dimmer: ancient sources are often less comprehensive, and their precise origin and context of use become more and more obscure. Those are the latest relevant sources that provide firm ground for any comparison.

Still, in the end, it is highly desirable to confront the earliest records with the latest ones. Is there any resemblance between the first witnesses and the printed ones? If there is, is it possible that the former ones are not simply the first extant witnesses of the Roman rite, but those of a certain tradition within?

The analysis of historical depth, as we call it, and a too optimistic assumption of continuity must, however, always reckon with the above-detailed change of paradigms that undoubtedly happened between the Carolingian era and the High Middle Ages. When the Roman rite became universally adopted north of the Alps, its reception was determined by prestige. The Franks searched for authentic sources that represented the practice of the Eternal City and were confirmed by the authority of the Church Fathers. When traditions diverged, the emperor took

measures to reunite them, at least theoretically. Some divergence could surely evolve from the fact that even Rome emitted its authoritative sources in different phases and redactions, and also by filling the gaps of authoritative sources by creative work and rearrangement, but no one was openly proud of it.

In the High Middle Ages and later, in contrast, liturgical differences were accurately preserved and fostered a kind of local pride. Thus the contents of a service book from the first millennium can truly be identical or almost identical to those of a printed one but even so, an attitude shift might have happened between the two. What once, regardless of its factual authenticity, claimed to be a compilation of St Jerome or St Gregory the Great, became something that was inherited from local ancestors and distinguished one from his neighbour. Undoubtedly, there is a remarkable continuity from the 7th century to the 17th and even later, but this is the continuity of the rite in its entirety. More specialized interest in uses must accept its limits that rarely allow it to extend deeper than the 11th century.

Even so, both historical comparison and geographical assessment are fruitful fields of liturgical studies. They can lead to genuine discoveries and reveal true connections. Yet, however fruitful a methodology is, it will never suffice to grasp the richness of medieval liturgical life. Independent of landscapes and periods, each use stands alone as a unique constellation of local circumstances, historical fate, aesthetic taste, and theological or ritual temperament. Uses are grounded in tradition, designed by creative minds, reformed by others, and handed down by a long series of committed generations. Researching them cannot do without the technicalities of statistics, mapping, and chronology, but their insightful analysis will be more like interpreting an outstanding work of art or writing the lives of the greats.

SECOND PART:
THE MASS

THE CORE OF THE MASS

Immediately after their title, early Gregorian sacramentaries tend to open with the rubric “How the Roman mass is celebrated” (*Qualiter missa Romana celebratur*). The pages suggest gravity. They are written in capital letters, often with red or gold; the preface and the canon may even start with full-page initials. What is surprising from a later perspective is that the folios are rather few. They exclusively deal with texts as if the mass was identical with a series of genres to be sung or recited one after the other. Most of them belong to the propers as if the mass consisted more of its changing than its unchanging parts: the *introitus*, the *oratio*, the *apostolus*, the *gradualis* or *Alleluia*, the *evangelium*, the *offertorium*, and the *super oblata* prayer. The list is apparently unfinished as there is no mention of a *communio* and an *ad complendum* prayer though the latter consistently appears in the manuscripts’ subsequent body.

The ordinary is represented by chants: the *Kyrie eleison*, the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* (except for Easter, only in solemn pontifical masses), the *Sanctus*, and the *Agnus Dei*; and by the most solemn prayers of the celebrant: the common preface, the canon, the Our Father with its introductory monition (*Praeceptis salutaribus*) and additional clause (*Libera nos*), and the call for the exchange of peace (*Pax Domini*). The priest performed the latter texts continuously and they in fact belonged together: the preface introduced the canon, and the canon was crowned by the Our Father. It seems, therefore, that the centre of the mass was a coherent series of eucharistic prayers extending from the dialogue before the preface to another dialogue before the peace. Since, at that time, the *Gloria* was still a supplement for exceptional celebrations, the chanted ordinary consisted of no more than three brief acclamations.

Until now, we have deliberately avoided a chronological approach, starting from the earliest sources, yet here they call our attention to a fundamental aspect of the problem. The 9th and 10th centuries saw an astounding augmentation of the mass ordinary and the output of this process partly survived until the end of the Middle Ages, growing into an integral part of local traditions. For the Tridentine perception, the mass ordinary already proved an indivisible whole from the first sign of the cross and the emblematic *Introibo* before Psalm 42 at the foot of the altar to the last Gospel after dismissal. This attitude, however, only resulted from the editorial policy of accumulating long, detailed, and inclusive mass ordinaries as separate chapters in the missals. It favoured the priest's point of view and was a decision for practicality against expressing different layers of canonicity, similar to the inclusion of tropes, hymns, and sequences into the more prestigious corpora of mass and office propers.

Such a policy did not absolutely prevail before Trent. There are plenty of printed missals where the eucharistic nucleus is highlighted by larger font size and nothing else is said about other parts of the ordinary, save that the *Gloria* and the *Credo* are written out in full at some unpredictable point in the book. In other, more detailed books we can observe a gradual expansion of the eucharistic nucleus to its direct environment. Offertory prayers accede before and communion prayers after it. Texts for accessing the altar or preparing for the recitation of the Gospel are considerably rarer and there are many missals, even among the most detailed ones, that lack preparation before, or thanksgiving after, the mass. This, however, does not mean that priests did not say them. The Halberstadt Missal of 1511 has no vesting prayers, but they appear in the breviary of the same diocese from the previous year. Not even did the extremely elaborate printed Sarum Missals contain any vesting prayers, but they were present in many earlier English books, purporting to represent the use of Sarum. In Southern Germany, it is typical that early and

high medieval pontificals and sacramentaries contain many rites that are still missing from 16th-century missals, including those that surround the everyday celebration of the mass. Accordingly, the presence and the arrangement of the parts of the ordinary reveal more about its prestige than its actual performance.

Both structurally and historically, therefore, a distinction between ordinary and propers is no less artificial than a distinction between temporal and sanctoral. As there is a primordial layer of the annual cycle, extending to Sundays, privileged ferias, and some feasts, and as there are several additional layers of later origin and higher diversity so there is a firm and ancient layer in the mass, too, equally comprising propers and some parts of the ordinary. Yet it is true that more of the temporal and less of the sanctoral belongs to the primordial layer of the year and, alike, it is true that more propers and less ordinary constitute the fundament of the Roman mass. This is the reason why we first turn to the propers when trying to explain liturgical variation.

Introit

By and large, the first part of the mass, also known as the liturgy of the catechumens, consists of propers, and the second part, the liturgy of the faithful, of ordinary. The only exception is a double act of chant and oration accompanying the communion at the end of the mass which are undoubtedly propers but typically not registered, as we have seen, in the *Qualiter missa Romana celebratur* rubric.

The mass starts with a chant sung during the entry of the clergy, the introit (*introitus*). As it was the motto of the day – medieval documents frequently refer to dates by their introits like *Gaudete*, *Invocavit*, or *Quasi modo* – and the first in a series of propers, they also called it *officium*, the Latin name both for liturgy or ritual in general and for the set of changing parts we now label as propers. It comes from this emblematic role that

the basic layer of introits, i.e. those of the temporal cycle and the wide-spread feasts, belonged to the least variable part and could serve as identifiers for cycles of propers throughout entire days.

The introit, like the majority of proper chants, has the function of acoustically covering silent ceremonies and sometimes interpreting them according to the theme of the mass. As the length of the parallel ceremonies depends on the dimensions of the service in terms of scene, servers, and solemnity, chants that cover them may be flexibly prolonged or shortened. This end was originally obtained by the insertion of verses of which more or fewer could be delivered, obeying a nod of the celebrant. By the High Middle Ages, however, most of the verses survived only sporadically and even those seem to have lost their functional value. It was only the introit that consistently retained a single verse as a reminder of ancient practice but no more with the option of dropping it or adding further ones. Verses prove more variable than the introits themselves as there was a tendency of replacing traditional and often recurrent psalm verses with more individualized biblical or even poetic excerpts.

Collect

The introit was immediately followed by the *Kyrie* and, if the day required, the *Gloria*. Then, the priest recited his first public prayer, the collect (*collecta*) or oration (*oratio*). The two terms are synonymous and occur simultaneously in missals, but in ancient sacramentaries it is more typical that collects bear no title at all, being perfectly identifiable as the first entries of each mass formulary.

We prefer to label the prayers in this position collects, reserving the term oration either for the inclusive genre or for other prayers that precede the collect on special occasions. For on days with multiple lessons before the Gospel, a prayer succeeded each lesson, and they might have been all referred to as orations

or collects. Yet it provided a challenge already for contemporary liturgists to identify the main prayer of the day. This was a practical necessity since the collect of the mass was also the default oration at the end of the office hours where there was no place but for a single one. Moreover, masses with multiple lessons fell, as a rule, on penitential days where attendees were summoned by the call of the deacon (*Flectamus genua, Levate*) to kneel silently praying and then rise again before subordinate orations. In contrast, they listened to the main oration standing, and it was introduced by the usual dialogue with the celebrant: "The Lord be with you, And with thy spirit" (*Dominus vobiscum, Et cum spiritu tuo*). Thus it must have been decided if the first or the last prayer should emerge above the others. It was a real question as, structurally speaking, the last prayer belonged more to the mass than to its penitential preparation and as such, it had a better chance to win the day. Lessons, on the other hand, sometimes influenced the theme of their subsequent prayers which were accordingly less fit for general use than the first one, recited before any of the lessons. Still, most of the medieval uses opted for the last prayer albeit there remained some that preferred the first and all avoided the use of lesson-dependent orations in the context of the divine office. We also chose to do so and, in the following pages, collect will always refer to a single prayer of each mass, positioned before the apostolic lesson, while oration will denote the preceding prayers and the overall genre. In either case, the priest started the prayer with "Let us pray" (*Oremus*) and finished it with a conclusion (*conclusio, clausula, finis*), formulating the patristic doctrine that every prayer should be directed to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. It usually began with the words *Per Dominum*, but the text slightly differed if the prayer still directly addressed Christ or if it explicitly mentioned him or the Holy Spirit.

Mass prayers could multiply. Other collects could follow the first and elaborate regulations prescribed if they should be said

under the same conclusion, formally merged into a double-sentenced prayer, or separately, divided by an *Oremus* and a conclusion for each or groups of them. The order and the division primarily expressed ranking, but it was also affected by numeric considerations of a theological or aesthetic nature. Some preferred odd numbers in accordance with their higher sanctity, citing even the pagan Virgil's sentence that God prefers them (*Numero Deus impari gaudet*). The number of collects was in inverse relation to the day's rank. Unrivalled collects marked the greatest solemnities and the less prestigious a date was the more collects acceded to its primary one. This, however, was not true for commemorations of regularly coincident feasts.

Basically, the propers of a mass formed a homogeneous series. It did not mean that they necessarily had any thematic inter-relationship or were the result of consistent literary or musical production but, in spite of their diverse layers and origins, they were centred around a single topic: a day of the temporal, the person or category of a saint, or a votive intention. Frequently, nevertheless, they were also thematically interconnected. The same texts figured in different musical genres or cited parts of one another and, in the long run, it proved a tendency to compose intentionally coherent cycles where it was still possible or at least invent thematic connections through exegetical means within the traditional text material. Such homogeneity was only broken by the insertion of secondary prayers. There were two kinds of them: commemorations of parallel topics and votive additions.

The coincidence of more observances provided the most typical occasion for commemorations. The feast of a saint frequently fell on a remarkable day of the temporal or more saints were remembered on the same date, not to speak of vigils and overlapping octaves. It must have been decided which mass of all the possible ones should be said, that is, which topic should determine the selection of the propers. Lesser topics had two options.

Normally, they were relegated to commemorations according to the order of their relevance. This, however, suggested a sort of inferiority. If even the losing topic enjoyed considerable prestige, it was allotted a mass of its own. Cathedrals and monasteries with a large clergy and numerous altars could afford the celebration of different masses on the same day, thus only the high or conventual mass of the day was bound to the prevalent topic. The lesser ones could retain their full propers as morning masses, in appointed chapels, or at side altars. In smaller churches, or if the lesser topic was so important that it demanded a high mass of its own, it was transposed (postponed to the next free date) or, less frequently, anticipated. Hence, added collects tell us much about medieval spirituality, devotional preferences, and the nuances of calendrical regulation.

Due to the ever-increasing number of feasts, the common experience of the High Middle Ages was that almost every day possessed more topics; in other words, average masses contained collects, and not a single collect. Votive additions already mirror this situation. Except for great solemnities, one collect plainly seemed too little and, even if there was nothing to commemorate, the main collect was supplemented with devotional prayers, arranged according to their hierarchy and the type of the day in usual medieval orderliness. It was locally prescribed of which intentions they must be said in which masses, days, and seasons. Certain saints had companions or associates, either because they shared a date or because of a real biographic connection. Pope Fabian and the martyr Sebastian had a common mass on 20 February but often with distinct prayers for each. In some places, St Paul was commemorated on feasts of St Peter, and the Virgin Mary on those of St Joseph. Even if a feast was permanently transposed, it might have retained a commemoration on its original date. In sum, it earned more notice if a mass had a single collect than if it had several.

Lesson and prophecies

After the collects came the lesson. The Gregorian rubrics call it *apostolus* as it was indeed most frequently a selection or pericope from St Paul, but other apostolic letters were of equal rank and excerpts from other books could serve the same purpose. In the Middle Ages, the lesson's most popular names were *lectio* or *epistola*. What defines lessons is primarily not their textual source but their position after the collect and before the gradual, or, to be more precise, before the series of interlectionary chants. Subdeacons were responsible for delivering them on a special recitation tone and at an ambo or lectern reserved for this function. They were introduced by the word *Lectio*, specified as *beati Pauli apostoli ad Romanos*, *beati Petri apostoli*, *Libri Sapientiae*, *Isaiae prophetae* etc. Lessons had no concluding formula outside of a melodic shift for the final clause, but the nearby servers might have answered with a prosaic formula like "Thanks be to God" (*Deo gratias*). The text itself started with "Brethren" (*Fratres*) for the Pauline letters to congregations, "Beloved" (*Carissime*) to private persons like Titus and Timothy, its plural, *Carissimi*, for the Catholic epistles, "In those days" (*In diebus illis*) for narratives, and "Thus says the Lord" (*Haec dicit Dominus*) for prophetic texts.

Some days had multiple lessons. As a rule, these were the great vigils of Easter and Whitsun along with the four Ember Saturdays; Good Friday, and some Wednesdays like those of the Ember Days, the fourth week of Lent (originally hosting the great scrutiny also known as the opening of ears, *apertio aurium*), and Holy Week. Sporadically, they feature on other dates as well, but none of them is universal. On the vigil and the three masses of Christmas, however, most of the European traditions applied two lessons before the Gospel, one from Isaiah and another from St Paul, without any penitential character. To distinguish extra lessons from the main ones, some books prefer

to label them as prophecies (*prophetia*), especially on the great vigils. As a liturgical term, prophecy does not imply that the text is derived from the book of a prophet but that it stems typically from the Old Testament. The sources do not always clearly differentiate between prophecies and lessons, but we know of an order of readers (*lector*) who were not yet ordained subdeacons, and of recitation tones and special ambos for prophecies which all suggest that at least some traditions stressed the generic independence of the extra preparatory lessons. In favour of structural disambiguation, we will also use the term prophecy to denote every reading before the collect, reserving the term lesson to the last one in the post-collect position. In this sense, there can be only one lesson in a mass, while the number of prophecies may range from one to twelve.

It is, however, worth emphasizing that prophecies and lessons mostly draw on the same corpus and are interchangeable. During the week after Pentecost, prophecies can be taken from the Acts of the Apostles, a typical source for lessons, while, on the ferias of Lent, Old Testament narratives and prophetic texts fill the position of the lesson. The distinction, therefore, is more structural than semantic. Good Friday has, semantically, two prophecies and no lesson. At some points, the two can also change their places. In Vienne, Christmas masses bring St Paul first and Isaias second. In some Spanish uses, Epiphany conforms to Christmas in having three readings and so the usual lesson (a pericope from Isaias) becomes a real prophecy and a Pauline epistle (repeated from Christmas) follows as a lesson.

The interlectionary chants:
gradual, tract, Alleluia, and sequence

After the lesson comes the series of interlectionary chants, comprising the gradual, the Alleluia, the tract, and – later – the sequence. All four have a function and a history of their own, yet

they also have some commonalities in comparison with other proper chants. Modern reflections were probably too much influenced by an aesthetic pattern of prose alternating with singing which had a lasting result in the liturgical reforms of the 20th century. From this perspective, reading three lessons seemed to be the primordial practice, similar to the Gallican, Mozarabic, and (partly) Ambrosian arrangement which had some parallels in the Roman masses of some Lenten and Ember Wednesdays, and the typical masses of Christmas. In this formula, a chant should have ensued after each lesson; a gradual after the prophecy, and a tract or Alleluia after the lesson. It is indeed so on Wednesdays with three readings, yet it is remarkable that chants alternating with lessons typically belong to the same genre (several graduals, tracts, and Alleluias), while chants of different genres have a tendency to appear side by side (tract or Alleluia immediately after the gradual). Even on Christmas when there would be no obstacle to insert the gradual after the prophecy and the Alleluia after the lesson, such an arrangement proves to be a Beneventan peculiarity. In every other place, the two lessons come after one another first, and the two chants, also after one another, second.

It seems that, for medieval minds, there was not such a sharp boundary between prose and song. Both were liturgical texts that must have been delivered properly, although the latter group with a much more elaborate melody than the former. It is true that the Roman rite knows of a pattern of alternating readings and chants, as it happens with lessons and responsories in matins, or lessons and graduals on Ember Days, but usual medieval masses rather resembled present-day Byzantine practice where the majority of proper chants figure in one block before the Small Entrance, providing something like a spiritual concert, a musical focus within the liturgy.

At least three phenomena support this approach. Structurally, highly melismatic psalm excerpts are the only pieces of plain-

chant in the mass that do not cover parallel ceremonial activities. Graduals and tracts are considerably long, but the clergy has nothing to do while they sound, only to sit and listen in peace. In contrast, the introit accompanies their entry, the Alleluia the procession to the Gospel ambo, the offertory the offering of the gifts, and the communion the partaking of the Eucharist. That the standstill during the gradual was unusual already in the Middle Ages is manifest from the development that many uses try to occupy the priest even then by transposing the first part of the preparation of the holy gifts to this time. During the gradual, the sacred ministers brought the bread and the wine to the altar, poured the water into the chalice and so on. In Sigüenza, the celebrant was also encouraged to perform some of the preparatory prayers during the gradual. This, however, was by no means the original scheme. In the earliest choir books, interlectionary chants often form an independent repertory not found in the *antiphonarium missae* but in the *cantatorium*, a separate volume intended for a skilled soloist instead of the *schola*, the whole body of singers. Finally, the spiritual concert approach is supported by the fact that once the new genre of the sequence had been invented, it joined the older series of interlectionary chants, thus rendering it even more extensive. In Beauvais, even an additional chant followed the sequence on greater feasts, the *antiphona ante evangelium*; it was one of the usual antiphons taken from the day's Gospel and sung in the office for the canticles *Benedictus* or *Magnificat*. This accumulation of chants in one block would surely not be the best way of harmonizing music and ceremonial, had melismatic psalm singing been considered only accompaniment and not an actual standstill of other ceremonial duties.

Still, the fate of graduals and tracts differed greatly from that of Alleluias and sequences. The ancient layer of graduals and tracts is almost exclusively based on psalm texts and applies florid but model-like melodic patterns. The core repertory of

Alleluias did the same, but it was considered extensible already at an early date. The growth of the genre was already underway when the northerners were first trying to master the Roman chant in the 8th century, and it continued until the end of the Middle Ages. Sequences enjoyed a less canonical status. As a rule, they were ornaments signalling the rank of a feast, but the level at which they appeared in the hierarchy of days varied on a wide range. Landscapes, regions, and even single uses were not unanimous as to their openness to novel sequences. Some of them used few sequences which, however, came from an early repertory and attained a high degree of stability and prestige. Others considered sequences an integral part of every mass formulary, but used simple ones or short divisions of lengthier items on ordinary days, reserving the monumental pieces for the greatest feasts.

In short, graduals and tracts perpetuate the legacy of ancient psalmody, an institution already mentioned in patristic narratives. They build up the most limited and least variable layer of chanted propers, while Alleluias and sequences are more numerous, more variable, and consequently more instrumental in differentiating traditions. This, however, is only true before the High Middle Ages. At a certain point, the generic difference between proper chants starts to disappear. Mostly, the tendency does not affect the established dates of the year, yet, for recent feasts and votive intentions, real and coherent series were composed, obliterating the historical, aesthetic, and semantic differences between the original genres.

Structurally, graduals consist of a first part and a verse. Unlike for introits, the verse is here more melismatic and has a wider register than the first part. *Cantatoria* that distinguish the parts of the soloist from those of the choir assign the verses to the soloist. In Southern and Western Europe, the gradual is typically called *responsorium*, yet there is hardly any trace of it being repeated in the manner of office responsories where

the second half of the first part recurs after the verse. Some French and Spanish uses, nevertheless, indicate the higher or lower rank of a feast by repeating or not repeating the entire first part of the gradual after the verse with the typical formulation *(re)iteratur* or *non (re)iteratur*. We can find similar directives in the East in Prague or Kraków, too. Amalarius, the Carolingian liturgical theoretician learnt from his Roman informants that the original way of singing responsories was to repeat the whole first part after the verse and it was only a Frankish deviation to limit the repetition to the second half, labelled *repetenda*. Be the historical truth as it may, the Hispano-French terminology and practice of performing solemn graduals seem to subscribe to this interpretation.

One gradual at least was a default element of almost every mass. On days with more lessons, each prophecy was followed by one. They did not lack from any weekday possessing propers and were the first in the series of interlectionary chants. The two exceptions were Good Friday with its two tracts and no gradual, and Eastertide beyond the octave with its exclusive use of Alleluias. It seems that graduals aired a moderately penitential character, somewhere between the more penitential tracts and the more joyful Alleluias. On Good Friday, the foremost penitential day of the annual cycle, even the gradual was replaced by a tract, while in Eastertide it was substituted by a further Alleluia. Easter and its octave, however, retained their gradual which proves that the penitential interpretation of melismatic psalmody is only a secondary attribution; an important conclusion that will echo throughout the analyses of plainchant genres.

Tracts are more formulaic and more penitential. They consist of a series of verses, normally without repetition, but we know of a few examples (e.g. in Clermont or Mallorca) where they were conceived in a responsorial manner with refrains. The length and the musical style suggest a quietly proceeding, declamatory attitude. It is commonplace in Gregorian scholarship to

assume that originally a soloist performed the whole chant, but many medieval rubrics speak of the alternation of soloists and clergy or two halves of the liturgical choir. The genre applied no more than two melodic patterns and their basic repertory did not count much more than a dozen of pieces. A few of them were monumental, typically in the 2nd mode and on prominent days, the others shorter, mostly in the 8th mode and on normal Sundays. The extended repertory consists of contrafacts, faithfully adapted to the musical models of the first generation but without much regard for the functional differentiation between modes and dimensions. In the High and Late Middle Ages, surprisingly many new tracts were composed for festive and votive purposes, taking full advantage of the genre's formulaic character and easy reproducibility.

Tracts served as a replacement for the Alleluia during the season from Septuagesima Sunday to Easter when the song of gladness was in exile. Yet not every day. As a rule, tracts distinguished Sundays and the canonical ferias of Shrovetide and Lent: Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Singing a tract on other weekdays was a Spanish symptom, although it sporadically appears in Northern France, too, especially on Maundy Thursday. Feasts and votive masses celebrated in the Alleluia-less period possessed tracts of their own. In Northern France and Flanders, there emerged a curious custom of singing two tracts on the 2nd Sunday of Lent, apparently because they wanted to retain both the ancient, psalm-based tract of the day and a more recent tract utilizing the text of the subsequent Gospel. Even outside of Shrovetide and Lent, tracts preceded the Gospels of Ember Saturdays and funeral masses. The only dates when they figured side by side with an Alleluia and so the two genres did not rule out one another, were Saturdays associated with Eastertide: Holy Saturday, the Vigil of Whitsun, and the Ember Saturday after Pentecost.

The term tract could also describe the lengthiest composition of western plainchant, the highly melismatic, refrained form of the canticle of the three children in the fiery furnace. It was equally sung on Ember Saturdays but after the last prophecy and before the lesson. In fact, it was not a tract in the strict sense of the word as it did not conform to the genre's structure, position, or melodic patterns. Indeed, the Ember Saturday canticle was more a function than a genre. In its most archaic form, the canticle is merely part of the prophecy without any indication of a specific tone or musical performance. Some traditions inserted a short and simple antiphon after the reading as a modest acclamation to the narrative. The third stage of development was the aforementioned "tract," which, however, soon yielded its place to easier pieces, became abbreviated, or was pushed into the reserve of the Ember Days in the first week of Lent, stressing again the penitential quality of long melismatic songs. The easier chants that advanced in its stead were typically labelled hymns; one of a still biblical, recitative character, and the other a metric paraphrase.

Alleluias normally prepared the Gospel and, as such, they could rank among the regular processional chants of the mass, covering parallel ceremonies. Ideally, the deacon read the Gospel from the top of an ambo that stood in the nave of the church so he must have proceeded there with his escort, carrying the Gospel book, candles, and incense. Before that, he prayed his silent preparatory prayers, asked for the blessing of the celebrant, and assisted him in putting grains of incense into the censer. From the 11th century, it was also customary for the celebrant to read the Gospel privately before it was uttered aloud by the deacon. All these demanded acoustic cover. Moreover, the joyful nature of the Alleluia aptly responded to the Gospel's glorious marching out from the sanctuary, a movement that medieval commentators interpreted as a kind of theophany; God manifesting himself before his people in the desert in a pillar of a

cloud (smoke of incense) or in a pillar of fire (burning candles). The Hebrew expression "Praise the Lord" acted in the Latin environment like an inarticulate yell, accompanying the Gospel book's entry as the shouting folk of Jerusalem celebrated the entering Christ on Palm Sunday.

Alleluias contained a verse or verses as well. The verses were melismatic and, in the classic Alleluia repertory, they ended with the same notes as the Alleluia melody itself, called *iubilus* or *neuma*. The verse belonged to the soloist or soloists who also intoned the Alleluia, while the refrains, both at the end of the Alleluia and of the verse, were sung together with the choir. Chants with more than one verse could extend longer than the parallel ceremonies and borrow some of the meditative, stand-still characteristics of graduals and tracts.

At least in three cases, Alleluias definitively lost their close contact with the Gospel. In Eastertide beyond the octave, Sundays and feasts had two Alleluias. The first played the part of a gradual, and only the second might have prepared the reading of the Gospel. On the Ember Saturday after Pentecost, not graduals but Alleluias separated the five prophecies and, in most of the uses, even the canticle of the three children took the form of an Alleluia with its verse citing the opening sentence of the canticle. Finally, the emergence of sequences put an end to the direct connection between Alleluia and Gospel. In theory, the medieval audience understood sequences as tropes or appendices to the Alleluia, but most of the sequences outdo Alleluias in length and complexity, and they comfortably fill the time needed for pre-Gospel ceremonies. Thus, sequences usurped the original covering function and re-interpreted Alleluias as interlectionary chants.

Chanting an Alleluia was a default element in almost every mass outside of the Alleluia-less seasons of Shrovetide and Lent. Some other penitential days were marked by the lack of Alleluias as well. Ember Days in winter (Advent) and autumn, and all

the vigils preceding great feasts belonged to this category. Vigils, however, meant both a selection of propers assigned to the given date and the obligation of fasting from morning to evening. If a vigil fell upon Sunday, it was not permitted to hold a fast, so the propers were usually kept, but the fast was anticipated. Accordingly, masses on Sunday vigils were allowed to have Alleluia. As mentioned before, the vigils of Easter and Pentecost formed peculiar exceptions. Although they possessed a probably very ancient Alleluia, the *Confitemini Domino*, it had no closing melisma and was immediately followed by a tract; genres that on every other day precluded each other. The same Alleluia appeared on Rogation Days, three ferias before Ascension that necessarily fell in Eastertide, but hosted expiatory processions.

According to their established myth of origin, sequences developed from providing the final melisma of the Alleluia with mnemonic texts. Though the genre consists of many types, styles, and generations, each having its specific ancestry, it is true that some sequences have a recognizable melodic relationship with their base Alleluia, and even more sequences reverberate the Hebrew word by quoting and paraphrasing or recalling it with a consistent series of rhymes ending with the vowel "a." Sequences sounded like tracts, alternating line by line or strophe by strophe between soloists and clergy or between half-choirs, but many had independent opening and closing units, similarly to the epodes of ancient ode poetry.

Historically, sequences by no means belong to the core of the mass, yet they were an integral part of the medieval liturgical experience. They were additions of less canonical status, but so were some modern Alleluias, too, composed according to the poetic and musical taste of succeeding centuries. In Bordeaux and many of the Iberian uses, the abundance of Alleluias went so far that almost each mass formulary listed two or three. This does not imply that more chants were performed after one another, yet it demonstrates positive feedback to creative initiatives.

Taking these modernizing tendencies into account, the musical focus in the heart of the liturgy of the catechumens could resemble a two-part spiritual concert where the first part is dedicated to early music (gradual), while the second to contemporaries (Alleluia and sequence). It is telling that penitential seasons deprived the audience of their fashionable favourites; tracts meant exclusively early music.

Gospel

Only second to the Eucharist, the Gospel crowns the first part of the mass. It is the crown of the propers, the coming of God after the figurative words of the psalms, the instruction of the apostles, and the enthusiasm of the poets. There is no mass without a Gospel, and there can be only one single Gospel within a mass. Gospel pericopes frequently determine the textual choices of other genres and historians can trace some Gospel assignments back to the patristic period, albeit the corpus underwent more revision than that of the lessons.

Under solemn circumstances, the deacon proclaimed the Gospel from the top of the Gospel ambo in a Gospel tone, surrounded by candles and incense. Ideally, the Gospel book itself was a lavishly decorated manuscript, an icon of Christ rising. Like before the preface that introduced the Eucharistic nucleus of the mass, a dialogue prepared the Gospel, too: “The Lord be with you, And with thy spirit” (*Dominus vobiscum, Et cum spiritu tuo*); “The continuation/beginning of the holy Gospel according to St Matthew etc., Glory be to thee, o Lord” (*Sequential Initium sancti Evangelii secundum Matthaeum etc., Gloria tibi Domine*). Unless the original text began with an adverb or clause of time, the pericope started with the formula “At that time” (*In illo tempore*). It had no ending formula except for a melodic shift for the last words, but the escorting ministers, similarly to the

end of the lesson, might have answered with a prosaic formula like "Praise be to thee, o Christ" (*Laus tibi Christe*).

Because of their distinct thematic focus, the Gospels are more apt to illustrate the concept of a pericope than lessons or prophecies. Pericopes were typically determined by two factors: their theme and their length. Most of them were identical to a passage, i.e. a narrative unit of the Bible like a parable or a miracle. This, however, was nuanced by the dimensions of the passage. Books in antiquity were measured by scrolls, and the extent of a chapter in a book tended towards a page or a column in an average scroll. Chapters of classical Latin authors range between 100 and 400 words, 150 on average, and the same is true for the core of the mass lectionary. Thematic units were not disintegrated, and this is the reason why pericopes like the discourse with the woman of Samaria, the healing of the man born blind, or the disciples of Emmaus remained intact. In the meantime, long pericopes that did offer some point of division were often split. The longest epistle of the temporal cycle, the "autobiography" of St Paul in the 11–12th chapters of the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians was read in full on Sexagesima Sunday, but in several uses in two halves alternately (*Libenter suffertis, Damasci praepositus*) on the subsequent weekdays. The same happened with Christ's manifestation to the disciples after his resurrection according to John: on Low Sunday, the entire text was recited, but, in the following week, the first part (*Cum esset sero*) and the second about the incredulity of Thomas (*Thomas autem*) by turns. The phenomenon reveals a strong sense of a standard dimension that defined the ideal length of a passage and, truly, this length of about 150 words or 5–10 verses is typical for the majority of the readings.

As a consequence, passages shorter than the ideal length tended to be combined. One-sentence pericopes, like the New Year Gospel about the circumcision of Jesus, are exceptional and might even surprise instinctive expectations. What we find on

the 17th Sunday after Pentecost is more typical. There the healing of the man with dropsy and the teaching on humility from the 14th chapter of Luke are combined without any thematic overlap, simply because none of them is long enough to reach the desirable extent. Thus traditional pericopes are, as a rule, thematically consistent units of standard dimensions. The Passions of Holy Week confirm this impression. Being extraordinarily long, they were not treated as liturgical Gospels in their entirety. The closing section was traditionally detached as a pericope of its own. While the passion narrative in a strict sense (arrest, crucifixion, death) was recited by three deacons representing the evangelist, Jesus, and all others, the story of the burial (80–110 words) was sung in a more elaborate melody by the deacon who served at the altar that day. Due to the theme and the heart-rending tone, it has been called *planctus* (dirge or lament) until modern times.

The offering of gifts: offertory and secret

The liturgy of the faithful began with the offering of gifts. Originally, it consisted more of *dromena* than *legomena*, more activity than speech. In solemn masses, bread and wine were not straightforwardly brought to the altar. On the one hand, the actual species of the offering were selected from among multiple specimens. In the Coptic rite, the ministers even today present a basket of bread to the celebrant who examines them at the gate of the sanctuary and brings only one to the altar. The movement displays that only the best, faultless victim deserves to be sacrificed to God. But the rest is not waste either. It serves as a donation to the church and shares the holiness of the would-be Eucharist to a certain degree; a part of it will be distributed among the faithful as a sacramental meal after the liturgy, similarly to the Byzantine *prosphora*. On the other hand, additional offerings joined the bread and the wine. Late medieval rubrics still speak of the offering of candles or coins in certain mass-

es, and prestigious sacramentals testify that holy oils and some victuals were treated as by-products of the Eucharistic process: e.g. the Easter lamb, grape and beans, and even fishes. All these were brought to the sanctuary as part of the offering and consecrated within the canon of the mass. The processions, the receiving, selecting, and arranging of the gifts took considerable time. Moreover, this was the situation when laymen and clergy came into the closest contact publicly within the mass. Hence, the offertory rites provided an opportunity to express loyalty and a sense of belonging, yet it was equally a platform to show off wealth and social status.

The Gregorian rubrics mention only two texts: the offertory and the secret. The first, a chant, accompanied the acts, and the second, an oration, finished and phrased what had happened. In its ancient form, the offertory is the most elaborate chant of the mass propers. Even in ages when it was no more sung or at least no more in its full plainchant form, the situation inspired outstanding music: polyphonic cycles, baroque motets, and organ pieces. It seems that, along with the parading of material wealth, the offering was the best time to demonstrate artistic skills. Mankind presented all its material and spiritual goods to the creator.

The offertory (*offertorium*, or, especially in Spain, *offerenda*) shares its processional nature with the introit as it covers parallel activities and can be extended with verses as long as the ceremonial requires it, but resembles the gradual with its highly melismatic verses and responsorial structure. Originally, offertories had two or three verses on average, but the verses were longer than those of the graduals and had an even wider register and exuberant melismatic ornamentation. At the time of their birth, they might have represented an unsurpassable compositional and vocal craft of papal singers in Rome. No wonder that they were not so faithfully learnt in the North and were soon rendered obsolete, either as not needed in the context of less large-

scale ceremonies than the papal mass or yielding their place to other, more fashionable music that could follow the singing of a simple, verse-less offertory. For offertory verses shared the fate of other highly melismatic genres with being reserved mostly for penitential functions. Most typically, they only survived in masses for the dead and, where they did not entirely disappear from the temporal cycle, Alleluia-less seasons maintained them. The impression is that, with the emergence of troping, polyphony, and instrumental music, the once highest achievement of plainsong could not escape becoming but an archaic curiosity, associated with mourning and atonement.

By responsorial structure, we mean not the allegedly Roman way of repeating the whole first part after the verses but the “Frankish” option of refraining only the first part’s second half. This method is common to many temporizing chants beyond the responsories: the invitatory and its psalm that worked as an interval of tolerance for belated participants at the beginning of matins, and processional hymns or antiphons. In this quality, the responsorial structure underlines the covering character of versed offertories. Self-evidently, leaving verses aside made any kind of repetition – and thus the responsorial structure – pointless, and offertories, deprived of both verses and refrain, began to act as antiphons, i.e. closed compositional frames.

A further peculiarity of offertories, however, is their lack of unity in length, musical style, and text choice. There are, of course, interrelated pieces, but the corpus as a whole is conspicuously heterogeneous. The basic Roman repertory proved stable in later transmission, hence the offertory does not belong to the most variable layers of mass propers, ranking approximately on the level of graduals. Yet before its pan-European diffusion, the genre might have been more receptive to innovative compositions and borrowings from foreign traditions. This also foreshadows the early modern state of affairs when “offertory” was more a function than a set of established chants; it could

equally denote a piece of organ music and an aria or choir work of randomly chosen lyrics.

The priestly prayer concluding the offertory rite is the secret (*secreta*). It was labelled (*oratio*) *super oblata* or, in a contracted form, simply *superoblata* in the Gregorian sacramentaries, but this terminology did not prevail universally and in the long run. In Spain, however, they typically called it *sacra*. All three terms refer elliptically to the gifts in neuter plural (*munera, dona*) as having been discerned, secluded, offered, and sanctified during the previous process, and the oration as being recited over them. Yet the most widespread title was soon re-interpreted in feminine singular as (*oratio*) *secreta*, meaning secret or silent prayer. This, and probably the medieval habit of reciting both the additional texts of the offering and the eucharistic canon silently contributed to the secret being said in a low voice, separated from its preparatory dialogue that the priest recited aloud before the offertory chant. Otherwise, the secret belongs to the triple cycle of mass orations and has every attribute of them. The number, order, division, and theme of the secrets are precisely parallel with those of the collects.

Their fixedness, however, is different. Collects recur beyond the mass throughout the office hours of the day and, in the temporal cycle, sometimes in the subsequent week. They are associated with, and have a thematic emphasis on, the day or the devotional topic, and they characteristically ask for eternal salvation and moral qualities facilitating this end. Collects are more individual and many utilize colourful imagery and rhetorically trained language. Some collects are even famous for their consistent application of agricultural, medical, or military metaphors. Secrets, in contrast, are exclusive to the mass, have a strict focus on the Eucharist, and ask for the acceptance of the gifts and the forgiveness of moral deficiencies that may hinder their benevolent reception. As a consequence, their themes and literary tools are more limited, and the items are more in-

terchangeable. A collect, thematically linked to a specific day, cannot serve its purpose on another day, while a secret, evoking only the sacrificial act in general, can comfortably migrate into another mass formulary.

Lastly, there is a third oration of a eucharistic profile, the postcommunion. It belongs to the same triple cycle and, recited aloud and with a preparatory dialogue, it is a perfect reflection of the collect at the other end of the mass. Yet it is closer to the secret with regard to its subject. If at all, it only superficially hints at the day or the devotional topic, being more concerned with the worthy and fruitful partaking of holy communion. Theoretically, secrets deal with the offering of the holy species before their consecration and postcommunions with their consumption after it, but there are several texts that do not discern the two themes to a clearly recognizable degree and, therefore, some orations figure in both functions. The phenomenon reminds us of the overlap between lessons and prophecies. While the genres are distinct from a structural perspective, i.e. we can perfectly distinguish a prophecy from a lesson or a secret from a postcommunion within a given mass formulary, they often draw from the same store of texts. On the contrary, a Gospel can never be a lesson and none of the proper chants can change places with those belonging to another genre, at least not within the traditional repertory.

The anaphora: preface, canon, and the Our Father

With the secret, the cycle of propers almost ends. The rest of the mass belongs to the liturgy of the faithful and, except for the last two items, consists of ordinary. They form a real continuum. The preface introduces the canon with the inserted acclamation of the *Sanctus*; the Our Father concludes the canon and has the insertion of the embolism; then the Lord's Prayer continues with its last clause, immediately fading into the call

for the exchange of peace, accompanied by the *Agnus Dei*. It is the celebrant who utters every prayer, only interrupted by the short acclamations of the *Sanctus* and the *Agnus Dei*, and, in its primordial form, everything was sung in a single tone and conformed to a coherent range of melodic patterns. Therefore, it is more illustrative to handle the process as a whole and, instead of the customary western categories of preface, canon, the Our Father, and Kyriale chants, to summarize them under the notion of a compound consecratory prayer, known as *prex* in Latin or *anaphora* in Greek.

An eastern anaphora regularly starts with what we identify as the preface dialogue: "The Lord be with you, And with thy spirit; Lift up your hearts, We have them lifted up unto the Lord; Let us give thanks to the Lord our God, It is meet and just" (*Dominus vobiscum, Et cum spiritu tuo; Sursum corda, Habemus ad Dominum; Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro, Dignum et iustum est*). It contains the thrice-holy hymn (equal to the Latin *Sanctus*) alike, but it is only a response within the anaphora and what follows is not interpreted as a separate unit. Other responses or acclamations may ensue without causing any discontinuity of the main text. Literarily and functionally, we can extend the use of the term *prex* beyond the central prayer of the Eucharist. It is apt to describe any large-scale consecratory prayer of different sacraments and sacramentals. There are such prayers in the East, too, like that of the blessing of waters on the Eve of Epiphany, but we have no need of them to understand western phenomena as there are plenty in the West as well. Several such consecratory prayers had already been present in the first sacramentaries, and several others joined them during the Middle Ages. Their majority belonged to pontifical rites like the ordination of deacons, priests, and bishops, the blessing of the chrism, the dedication of churches, or the consecration of virgins. Others were accessible to ordinary priests like that of the baptismal font, the newlywed bride, branches on Palm Sunday

or candles on Candlemas, and even to deacons as that of the paschal candle.

Formally, we can recognize such a text by its length, structure, tone, opening and concluding formulas. As a collective for non-biblical prayers performed by the celebrating priest, we may use the term *euchology*. In the established Roman rite, the basic *euchological* genre is the oration: typically a one-sentenced prayer with the aforementioned introductory dialogue and conclusion. Orations are brief, condensed texts. They consist of an invocation, an optative or imperative predicate like “grant, we beseech thee” (*da/praesta/tribue/concede quaesumus*) in their centre, and the aim of the petition, mostly in the form of a double clause, parallelism or opposition. *Preces*, in contrast, are voluminous, many-sentenced, expressive compositions. The invocation extends into a narrative that refers to God’s previous deeds in salvation history in connection with the object, person, or institution that is about to be consecrated, often intensified by anaphoric repetitions like the triple “O God, who” (*Deus qui*). In the centre, we find an operative petition, asking God to pour out his Holy Spirit or grace to the object. Lastly, the prayer details the hoped-for side effects of the sacramental. *Euchological* scholarship knows this pattern as the triad of *anamnesis*, *epiklesis*, and *intercessio*. *Preces*, however, are not always so clear-cut. They can be introduced by a prologue and adorned with litanic insertions like the blessing of the paschal candle (the *Exsultet*), and even incorporate exorcisms like the blessing of the baptismal font, both on Holy Saturday.

Sometimes, *preces* do not differ from orations in anything else. The blessing of the newlywed bride or the main blessing of branches on Palm Sunday can equally take the form of an oration grown large and a definitive *prex*. Prominent prayers that are central to certain rituals but do not consecrate anything always do so; a characteristic example is the chief prayer of the reconciliation of penitents on Maundy Thursday. The difference

lies in formal criteria. Preces in the strict sense are introduced by the preface dialogue. Then they begin with the formula "It is truly meet and just" (*Vere dignum et iustum est*), and use a particular recitation tone. There are simpler and more ornamented forms of it, but the musical essence is clearly recognizable and common to the ferial or solemn prefaces in the mass, the various pontifical blessings, and the paschal *Exsultet*. One of the *Ordines Romani* even remarks that the *Exsultet* must be sung in the tone of the mass canon which implies that, originally, not only the preface but the whole eucharistic prayer was performed so. Furthermore, preces are typically preceded by a real oration serving as an apology or invocation, analogous with the secret of the mass, and end in a silent or prosaic conclusion.

In the Roman interpretation where the preface is detached from the canon, the unit after the thrice-holy hymn begins with the words "Therefore we humbly beseech thee" (*Te igitur*). They count as the solemn entry into the most sacred text, highlighted in sacramentaries and missals with a full-page crucifixion. The cross is identical with or alludes to the first "T," the sign of salvation on the foreheads of God's servants in the Apocalypse. Yet it is not only the canon that contains this significant phrase. In the *Mundi conditor*, the most popular medieval prex used for the blessing of branches on Palm Sunday, the anamnestic introduction turns to the epicletic clause with the same *Te igitur*. We also find it in the *Qui in principio*, a universal and undoubtedly very ancient prex for the consecration of chrism on Maundy Thursday. In both cases, however, the words *Vere dignum* and *Te igitur* start the first and the second unit of the same text respectively, and not two separate texts. These parallels argue for handling the preface and the canon as parts of the same anaphora.

There are, however, remarkable differences between the canon and the rest of the preces. The latter ones apply a vivid, rhetorical language that is well-documented from Eastern euchology and has some forerunners in late antique private religious

literature. The style of the canon is no less refined but more reserved. It recalls the precision and dignity of the ancient Roman state cult with its enumeration of synonyms, intentional use of legal and pagan sacrificial terminology, and syntactically distinct paragraphs. For the present survey, the last thing counts most. It is difficult to discover an *anamnesis*, *epiclesis*, *intercessio* pattern in the canon. Instead, many consider it as a ring composition of distinct, oration-like texts, and, indeed, several clauses end with a formal reference to “Christ, our Lord,” and even the regular conclusion “Through (the same) Christ our Lord” (*Per [eundem] Christum Dominum nostrum*).

Medieval scholarly tradition and Old Latin parallels also recommend a composite interpretation of the canon. Commentators agree on the antiquity of the text, but they identify several sentences as additions of different popes. Citations from the canon are already present in documents as early as the 4th century, yet some debated as late as the 11th century if specific insertions were authentic or had to be left out. Unlike in the East, the anaphora of the Old Latin rites belongs to the propers. Gallican and Mozarabic eucharistic prayers change according to the year and have distinct orations for introducing the anaphora (*contestatio/immolatio/lillatio*), after the thrice-holy hymn (*post Sanctus*), after the consecration (*post mysterium/secretal/Pridie*), and before and after the Lord’s Prayer (*ante/post/ad orationem dominicam*).

There are reminiscences of a similar situation in the Roman rite. The three orations that precede the consecratory words of institution, the *Communicantes*, the *Hanc igitur*, and the *Quam oblationem*, may bear the specific title *infra actionem* or *infra canonem*. The text of the *Communicantes* varied on Christmas, Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsun and its Vigil, and in the octaves after Easter and Pentecost. There was a special *Hanc igitur* for Maundy Thursday, Easter, and Whitsun. The *Quam oblationem* only differed on Maundy Thursday, the foundational feast of the Eucharist. Nevertheless,

a proper *infra actionem* was originally not a privilege of the greatest feasts as it is demonstrated by the unique *Hanc igitur* of the nuptial mass and some other votives masses, offered for the catechumens, the king, the sick, or the deceased. It rather seems that great feasts only preserved a few of a once more abounding variety of insertions, and indeed, richer sets of archaic sacramentaries confirm this view.

The use, distribution, and history of the prefaces do not differ fundamentally from those of the *infra actionem* prayers, only that a little more survived in the established Roman rite and it was more common to apply proper prefaces. In fact, it is more precise to speak about insertions into the preface than proper prefaces. As we have argued, the preface is not an independent genre but the first part of the anaphora. It always starts with the same stereotypical formula (*Vere dignum ... aeternae Deus*), and it always ends with either of two stereotypical formulas (*Per quem maiestatem* or *Et ideo cum angelis*). The so-called common preface (*praefatio communis*) that appears in the *Qualiter missa Romana celebratur* is not a particular text but barely the opening and closing formulas without any insertion.

Medieval and early modern service books contain ten universally known insertions: about Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Passiontide or the Holy Cross, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, the Trinity, the Virgin Mary, and the apostles. The choice of the topics predestines most of these to act as seasonal prefaces, yet the coverage is not full; neither ordinary time and Advent nor saints beyond Mary and the apostles have proper prefaces. Along with its *infra actionem*, the nuptial mass maintained a proper preface as well in many places. Locally, a few others might have joined this repertory. A part of them proves to be relatively late composition in honour of prestigious feasts and especially patron saints. Others are remnants of an earlier stage of development when almost each mass formulary had a preface of its own. This is what we find in the Ambrosian rite, and there is an ever-growing

number of proper prefaces in the Roman rite, too, as we go back in its history. Sacramentaries of the first millennium tend to insert a preface into the triple set of orations between the secret and the postcommunion, and some of those texts are common between the Ambrosian and the Roman heritage.

The earliest times are still obscure, yet it is obvious from the long history of the Latin corpus that anaphoric insertions were always oscillating between expansion and reduction. A primitive anaphora might have been enlarged and diversified, but, in this holiest part of the mass, the quest for solidity, authenticity, and theological accuracy periodically pushed back creative energies, resulting in a narrower range of options. It is, nonetheless, remarkable that the anaphora is not an absolutely unchanging part of the mass. Although the heart of the ordinary, it shares some of its features with the propers.

Medieval commentators traditionally interpreted the Our Father as part of the canon, and it also had an insertion, the *Libera nos* or embolism. It reminds us of the Gallican and Mozarabic anaphoras, listing a proper oration after the Lord's Prayer (*post orationem dominicam*). On Good Friday, the embolism sounded aloud, like once the rest of the canon. Finally, the primitive mass ordinary ended with the call "The peace of the Lord be always with you" (*Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*), inviting the participants to reify peace and reconciliation that had been mentioned both in the Our Father and the embolism.

The *Agnus Dei* is still missing from the earliest ordines of the Roman mass. It was regularly omitted on Holy Saturday and preserved a more rudimental form with *miserere nobis* thrice on Maundy Thursday. Both facts indicate a relatively late origin, also registered by historical sources; according to them, Pope Sergius I introduced its singing as a covering chant during the fraction in the late 7th century. Still, on average dates, it remained an undisputable element of the chanted ordinary.

The partaking of the Eucharist:
communion and postcommunion

The communion (*communio*, in Spain also *communicanda*) was the fourth of proper chants covering one of the eucharistic celebration's great processions, sung during the partaking of the Lord's Supper. Structurally, it was perfectly parallel with the introit: a more or less short antiphon with psalm verses and doxology. The schola increased or reduced the number of verses according to the needs of the situation, obeying a nod of the celebrant for the doxology. Communion verses, however, did not survive even in the stylized shape of introit verses. Masses for the dead preserved one verse for each antiphon in a responsorial form, repeating the second half of the first part after the verse, but in other functions, they mostly sank into oblivion. Communion verses sporadically survived as ornaments of prominent feasts, in items of extraordinary structure, or in extremely conservative uses like those of Lyon or some past-oriented Danish dioceses. They were basically the same as those who had maintained offertory verses.

The basic repertory of communions applies psalm texts, similarly to other chanted genres of the mass propers. The pieces are usually shorter and simpler than the introits, yet the corpus was more open to novelties both from a musical and a textual perspective. Longer, complex chants, some originally conceived as first parts of responsories, and, first of all, texts taken from the Gospel enriched the repertory. While some second-generation tracts utilized extracts from the Gospel, too, more systematic use of New Testament texts is characteristic of communions. Being invited to the Feast of the Lamb represented a state of fulfilment within the symbolic proceeding of the mass, and thus, the directness of the Gospel appropriately contrasted with the figurative speech of previous psalms. It was like a veil drawn apart.

We have already described the postcommunion (*postcommunio*, *post communionem*, *postcommunicanda*) as the last prayer of a triple series, structurally a parallel of the collect, and semantically related to the secret. The only thing still worth mentioning is that sometimes even further orations may accede to it. The most well-known example is the prayer over the congregation, the *oratio super populum*, that, in the established Roman rite, was recited on the ferias of Lent. It came immediately after the postcommunion, had no introductory dialogue but the habitual *Oremus* and a special appeal by the deacon for the bowing of heads (*Humiliate capita vestra Deo*). Yet it is exceptional if a *super populum* has any penitential connotation. The overwhelming majority of the corpus matches the collects in articulating general petitions and having no reference to the Eucharist. Such extra prayers follow the postcommunion with the title *alia (oratio)* in many ancient sacramentaries and sporadically in late medieval missals as well. It seems that once there was a real mirror image of the collect at the end of the mass, and indeed, the alternative term for postcommunion, “for completion” (*ad complendum* or *complenda*), suggests a general theme and independence from the act of communion. One can reconstruct a process of merging two types of orations, one for communion, and another for completion, into a single, predominantly eucharistic one, and the survival of the latter in a penitential context.

There are fossils of other orations, too. In Easter week, many sources provide a rich set of them with the titles “for vespers” (*ad vespervas*), “at the cross” (*ad crucem*), “at the baptismal fonts” (*ad fontes*) and so on. These paschal prayers were designed for the solemn vespers that contained processions to the baptistery and backward. Yet we can find similar *ad vespervas* prayers on other dates, too, and there are several feasts with at least two traditional, enduring collects like St Stephen Protomartyr, Epiphany, or Ascension Day, sometimes assigned to the octave or some of the office hours.

Most probably, the clue to the phenomenon is the need for extra orations for the divine office. St Benedict ordered to close the major hours with the Lord's Prayer. As already mentioned, the typical medieval method was repeating the collect at the end of the hours. It was, however, quite a bore seven times a day and sometimes through an entire week. Two of the office hours, prime and compline, were already exempt from this law as having unchanging prayers. For a similar purpose, short, simple, and general office orations are listed in ancient sacramentaries under the heading "morning and evening prayers" (*orationes matutinales et vespertinales*), and at least the late medieval Breviary of Constance distributes exactly these among the non-seasonal hours. Feasts required something more customized, and this might have been the other reason for adding further, collect-like *alia*-s after the postcommunion of archaic mass formularies.

THE OUTLINES OF THE CYCLE

Let us imagine an anthropologist who descends into the past to attend a single mass. For this spectator, items will appear in a straight line, one after the other. Generic attributes only become clear by repetition. Not even the most keen-eyed observer will recognize the difference between ordinary and propers for it requires at least two masses to realize that there is a *Kyrie* and a *Sanctus* in each, while the introit and the collect vary. He or she will not be able to detect an abstract pattern of antiphonal or responsorial psalmody as the first is only manifest in the introit, and the second in the offertory (if performed with verses), or the communion of funeral masses. Even two masses may be misleading. If the preface happens to be the same in them, it seems an unchanging part; if it differs, it proves to be part of the propers. Yet already a single mass can disclose that there is a category of orations due to the pair of the collect and the postcommunion, and it is easy to perceive the layers of chants, prayers, and readings according to the regularly relaying tasks of the singers, the celebrant, and the readers.

This means that each liturgical item is multi-dimensional. On the one hand, it belongs to the series of the actual service; on the other hand, it belongs to the series of a specific genre, related to other genres of the same layer. An introit is part of a given mass formulary, yet it is, nonetheless, part of the corpus of introits. The true nature of an item, therefore, only manifests itself in ever-widening circles of repetition. Four Advent masses are enough to discern ordinary and propers, but we have to wait until Christmas to understand that the *Gloria* is also part of the ordinary, until Septuagesima to realize that there is such thing as a tract, until Ash Wednesday to hear the first *super populum* prayer, and until Eastertide to hear double Alleluias. Some of the pontifical rites like coronation or dedication may not happen for

decades, thus grasping the totality of rites demands an almost indefinitely long period, yet hard-structured rites like the mass and the office fit into one liturgical year as their widest possible interpretive context.

This, however, is only exhaustive for a single use. With the comparison of different uses, we come to a third dimension, namely that of stability or different degrees of variance. One year in a certain tradition suffices to determine that the introit varies and the *Kyrie* does not, but it is insufficient to ascertain that the Alleluia is more variable than the introit. The layers and the corpora of items all have backgrounds and reception histories of their own that contextualize their unique entries and we must understand primarily these contexts for reliable orientation. It is like a third level above ordinary and propers, splitting propers into a category of unchanging propers, i.e. propers that are the same everywhere and at all times, and of changing propers that differ from use to use and vary historically. Both aspects are informative. Unchanging propers point to the essence of the Roman rite. Their very invariance reveals the code, the structure, and the set of items which were always respected by everyone as untouchable. Changing propers form a delicate hierarchy according to the degree of their variability. They point to the fields where divergence was tolerated or even desirable and help to assess the breadth of tolerance for such fields.

Collating traditions

Missals typically open on the first Sunday of Advent. When starting to read them on this level, we find that the introit, its verse, and the collect are the same everywhere. The lesson is almost always the same, differing only in a small group of Capuan and Dalmatian origin. The gradual and its verse are universal, and so is the Alleluia apart from the Iberian Peninsula and Southern France where further options emerge from

one to four. There is no sequence outside of France and Britain and the peripheries of their influence (Geneva, Trondheim, and, remarkably, Zagreb). Where there is one, it tends to be the same, but with some exceptions, equally divergent from one another. The Gospel is more variable than the lesson. There is a predominant choice with about 75% of the occurrences, yet two others are still characteristic; one for the Mediterranean landscape, the other especially for Burgundy, Normandy, and Aquitaine, and we record peculiar Gospels from Le Puy, Valence, and Girona. The secret is almost universal, but Regensburg and a manuscript missal from Sens deviate. There is no variance in the offertory, yet it is significant that verses sporadically survived in Lyon, Die, Cambrai, Sarum, Regensburg, Naumburg, and Copenhagen. Where they did, they prove to be identical. Finally, the communion and the postcommunion are the same throughout Europe.

Going deeper into the Advent season, further distinctive attributes appear like the presence, quantity, and selection of pericopes for weekdays, the Alleluia of the second Sunday, the introit verse of the third Sunday, or the introit antiphon of the fourth Sunday. They are already enough to approximately predict the liturgical provenance of a book. In early modern France and Germany, for instance, the maintenance of medieval tradition can be discerned from Romanizing tendencies by the first Sunday Gospel *Cum appropinquasset*, the presence of ferial readings, and the introit *Memento* for the fourth Sunday.

Similar findings demonstrate how important it is to read service books on this third level of changing and unchanging proper. Yet such work is hardly suitable for narratives and it would be tedious to continue the enumeration of features like these. It suffices to say that, already in the first mass of the annual cycle, the majority of items are fixed or divergence is limited to an insignificant number of uses. There are, however, still plenty of markers signalling regional affiliation through the survival of

archaic features, or, on the contrary, receptiveness to creative impulses. The typically Mediterranean readings are archaisms, especially where lessons are also concerned. Gospels differing both from the archaic and the prevailing variant are novelties, and so are additional Alleluias and sequences, although recent items did not spread together in a single wave. They figure independently; special Gospels thicken in Burgundy, extra Alleluias are a Spanish symptom, and sequences belong to the French mainstream.

Advent served only as a sample. In the following chapters, a detailed analysis of this kind will be avoided. Instead of going into technicalities, we leave comprehensive research to databases, analytical tools, and elaborate case studies. We aim to unfold the rules and circumstances that govern and determine the fixity, degree of divergence, geographical patterns, and capacity for renewal of the genres concerned.

Though genres or layers of propers tend to behave independently, they are equally involved in the annual cycle; a system that itself consists of harder and softer parts. Regardless of the single items, a day or function may be more or less subject to variation so that we can speak of the sensitivity of an assignment both in a broader cluster of dates and topics and in a narrower cluster of layers and genres within them. We can anticipate that the fourth Sunday of Advent and any other Sunday that follows an Ember Saturday will show a higher degree of divergence, and lessons for Fridays will vary more than those of Wednesdays. Therefore, we start our survey with a rough outline of the cycle.

In mature missals and breviaries, a fourfold structure of temporal, sanctoral, commune, and votive parts prevailed, a somewhat artificial apportioning as it does not display the realities of actual worship. Masses and offices made up of different parts happened continuously. Temporal and sanctoral feasts coincided or ensued after one another, sanctoral feasts applied items of the commune, and votive services might have been appended

to regular services or even replace some of lower rank. Neither does the fourfold structure represent any historical reality. It suggests that the "Year of Grace," the cycle of preparatory and festive seasons centred around Christmas and Easter was conceived separately from the anniversaries of saints and that the common of saints underlays as a store for individual feasts. On the contrary, temporal and sanctoral were intimately connected and common propers were mostly abstracted from the formularies of individual saints. Separating the parts was an achievement of generalizing and classifying acumen. Yet, despite its practical and historical irrelevance, the classic arrangement proves to be clear and easy to use until the present day so it is feasible to discuss the cycle according to them.

Advent

In this classic arrangement, the temporal started with Advent. An Advent start, however, was only inherent in the cycle of chants. Corpora of readings and prayers consider the Vigil of Christmas as the overture of the year and, thematically, concentrate on the eschatological aspects of Advent. This explains the close relationship between the first and the last readings or euchological formularies of the year. There is no definitive demarcation between the end of ordinary time and the preparation for Christmas, but the weeks in late autumn gradually fade into the themes of the last judgement and the urging of Christ's second coming.

Another ambiguity comes from the Ember Days that necessarily occur in Advent. Tradition treats Ember Days as the fasts of the four seasons and assigns them to the first month of each. They are called the fasts of the first (March: spring), the fourth (June: summer), the seventh (September: autumn), and the tenth month (December: winter). For centuries, there existed a practice of celebrating them in ascending order: the first

week of March, the second of June, the third of September, and the fourth of December. This system, however, did not conform either to temporal or sanctoral reckoning, and, what is more, it was alien to the earliest accessible Roman convention that fixed Ember Days to temporal weeks: after the first Sunday of Lent, after Pentecost, and after the third Sunday of Advent. Only the autumn fast remained in the third week of September where no temporal point of reference was provided.

As demonstrated by the outstanding degree of their fixity, Ember Days rank among the earliest institutions of the Roman rite. Each comprises a Wednesday, a Friday, and a Saturday. They belong to the least variable days of the year except for the fast of June, uncomfortably affected by the octave of Pentecost. In contrast, Sundays after Ember Saturdays were vacant. Some historians said that they had originally no mass due to the all-night vigils that preceded them, while others thought a Sunday unthinkable without celebrating the Eucharist, but either way, vacant Sundays lacked propers of their own. If a mass was still celebrated, it borrowed its propers from the previous Ember Days. The primary impact of the phenomenon was that vacant Sundays were an appeal for properization. By escaping the authority of Roman documents, they provided freedom for composing new items instead of repeating those of the preceding *ferias*. Hence, vacant Sundays excel on the scale of diversity either because they reuse the material of the previous Ember Days in slightly differing selections or because they avoid repetition with fresh propers.

A secondary impact can be the discrepancy due to the virtual omission of a vacant Sunday from the series of a given season. If we consider the vacant Sunday nonexistent and, as in Advent, we take Christmas as the absolute point of departure, any series of items may drift one week further and, truly, this is the key to the Advent pericopes. Archaic Mediterranean traditions simply repeated the Ember Day readings and distributed three sets

among the previous three Sundays, while properizing northern traditions moved the whole series of three sets one week closer to Christmas and provided the first Sunday with a new lesson and Gospel.

Outside of the Ember Days, *ferias* in Advent point to the problem of weekdays. Traditionally, unprivileged *ferias* were aliturgical in the sense that no public mass was celebrated with the gathering of the faithful (*ecclesiastica synaxis*). Liturgical *ferias* were those that possessed propers of their own like the days of Holy Week or the Easter octave. Yet the distinction between the two categories was not rigid. One aspect of the properization process can be aptly described as the conquest of *ferias* during which more and more weekdays acquired propers and, thus, joined the category of liturgical days. We will soon encounter some examples of the tendency, but Advent is relatively unaffected. The only thing that appears already here is the introduction of ferial readings, an initiative that will extend over the whole temporal. In its most established form, this initiative provided Wednesdays and Fridays with an independent lesson and Gospel respectively, albeit chants and prayers were self-evidently taken from the latest Sunday. Ancient sources often add Saturday, thus having readings on Saturdays is an archaic feature in later service books as well. On the other hand, furnishing Monday and even the whole week with readings is a disparate attempt, restricted to late medieval uses of Languedoc and Catalonia.

Christmastide and the season after Epiphany

Christmas is a structural problem in itself. Theoretically, it is a sanctoral feast as being fixed to 25 December, a certain day of a certain month, yet it constitutes the temporal seasons of Advent and Christmastide. The latter, however, is too short for a full-scale season and, what is more, it is scattered with prestigious sanctoral feasts. There was not a single *feria* between Christmas

and the Vigil of Epiphany. Beyond the most ancient feasts of Christmas, St Stephen Protomartyr, St John the Evangelist, the Holy Innocents, and their octaves, there was the late but very popular Thomas Becket, Pope Silvester, and in the West also Trophime, the Translation of St James, Columba, and Genevieve.

This interference of temporal and sanctoral affected the strategies of compiling service books, too. The established arrangement of the Roman Missal put the Christmastide saints and their octaves into the temporal and started the sanctoral with the Vigil of St Andrew (29 November), close to the possible beginning of Advent. In Southern France and Spain, however, sanctorals typically open with St Stephen Protomartyr which also means that Christmastide saints are missing from the sanctorals. The most consistent books are those Iberian missals that transpose even Christmas and Epiphany to the sanctoral section like those of Évora, Ourense, Segovia, and Sigüenza.

The free weekday that remained (usually 30 December), if there was any, hosted the only Sunday of the season, labelled by its introit *Dum medium silentium*. If two Sundays fell between Christmas and Epiphany and both were celebrated, the propers were repeated. When we speak of hosting a Sunday, it highlights the dual nature of a liturgical day, already touched upon in the context of Sunday vigils. On the one hand, a day denotes a position in the calendar, but on the other, it is equivalent to a set of propers. According to the medieval approach, propers must be saved; namely, as far as possible, unique texts and melodies in the service books must be performed somewhere. In the week after Christmas, any saint's feast ranks higher than the Sunday thus the mass and the office were most probably said of a feast on the actual Sundays falling between Christmas and Epiphany. Yet the temporal propers were saved by appointing the only free weekday to be a virtual Sunday.

Dum medium silentium raises a further question. Some items, and consequently some masses within octaves and seasons bear the traits of the festive theme, while others are commonplace. There is no hint of Christmas in the orations of the subsequent Sunday, and we find similar thematic independence on the Sundays after Epiphany or in Eastertide. It seems that, on an archaic level of the Roman rite, many of these Sundays counted as ordinary time and remained untouched by the later evolving octaves or seasons that incorporated them.

This is more apt for the prayers than for the chants, and the truest for the readings. Indeed, the abundance of seasonal Gospels after Christmas is in striking contrast with the scarcity of other temporal propers. Semantically, they prolong the season by directing every passage on the Saviour's childhood and youth to the interval between Christmas and the second Sunday after Epiphany. The disproportion of propers continues to be a problem throughout the year. While childhood Gospels outnumber the corresponding season, resurrection Gospels are all consumed in the Easter octave and cannot serve Eastertide Sundays anymore. Such discrepancies demonstrate that the concept of an octave or a season evolved gradually and only after the consolidation of some repertories. Christmas had no genuine octave when the story of propers began, but it had three masses. Easter had no genuine season, but it already had an octave of its own.

Exactly this ambiguity portrays the Epiphany season. Ordinary items survive in a seasonal context, yet sets of seasonal items do not perfectly meet the needs of the respective seasons, and may sometimes even outstretch them. Technically, Epiphany has an octave, but neither are its days provided with propers different from those of the feast, nor does the Sunday within the octave have any connection to the themes of Epiphany, save its Gospel on the twelve year old Jesus in the Temple. In contrast, the feast celebrates three manifestations of Christ, all of which is recorded by distinct pericopes: the adoration of the Magi,

the baptism of the Lord, and the miracle at Cana. Since one mass can only host one Gospel, the Epiphany thematic must be extended to the octave and beyond, to the subsequent Sunday. Thus the character of the octave and the short season after Epiphany oscillates between being ordinary time and an extension of Christmastide. Candlemas, a sanctoral feast 40 days after Christmas strengthens the latter tendency by celebrating again the infant Jesus nearly three weeks after his baptism in the Jordan and thus disrupting linear chronology. The divine office of the season, nevertheless, proves to be a reserve of ordinary items with general psalm texts, displaced from the season after Pentecost by properizing tendencies.

The tension between a festive and an ordinary approach is responsible for the ambiguity about the real start of the season after Epiphany or, in other words, the winter part of the ordinary season. Ordinary Sundays were not much honoured in the Middle Ages so commemorating the octave of Epiphany might have prevailed over them. If it did, the mass on the Sunday within the octave was said of Epiphany and the season began only after the octave had been finished, meaning that the first Sunday of the season was in fact the second Sunday after Epiphany, and the numbering of the weeks started, instead of Epiphany, after the octave of Epiphany. The phenomenon repeated itself in the summer part of the ordinary season when the first Sunday after Pentecost coincided with the octave of Pentecost, later superseded by Trinity Sunday. Moreover, after the introduction of Corpus Christi in the 13th century, even the second Sunday after Pentecost fell into the octave of Corpus Christi. Many traditions opted for transposing the virtually first Sunday of the season to the second and, due to Corpus Christi, even to the third Sunday after Pentecost.

This provision did no harm at all as propers fell short of supplying every week either during the winter or the summer season. After Epiphany, there were only three or four sets for

an interval of six weeks maximum, and after Pentecost only 23 for 28 maximum. Yet transposition resulted in a conceptual problem and some rubrical intricacies. The conceptual problem was similar to that of Candlemas. Albeit the first Sunday after Epiphany is almost independent of the feast, it has its Gospel about the boy Jesus. Between the adoration of the Magi (Epiphany) and Christ's baptism (its octave), the pericope is chronologically right, while, after the baptism scene, it is a step backwards in time. There was nothing like this in early summer. In both cases, however, there arose a difficulty in what we can term the problem of weeks zero. As a rule, the previous Sunday determined the liturgy of the next ferias. Epiphany could fall on any weekday, and Corpus Christi always fell on Thursday. If the ensuing season only began after their octaves, there remained some undetermined weekdays between the octave and the season's beginning, a sort of liturgical no man's land. Saints' feasts practically solved the problem, but some service books still took care of such intervals by providing them with specific items and especially ferial readings.

Here again, we face the dual nature of days, but now on the higher level of a series. The Sundays or weeks after Epiphany or Pentecost may equally denote a mechanical reckoning of days after the respective feast and a series of propers for the respective season. As Sundays after Epiphany might have drifted one week forward, and Sundays after Pentecost even two weeks, a first Sunday in terms of mechanical reckoning is not necessarily identical with a first Sunday of a series. The significance of this observation becomes clear when we turn to analogies. Comparison is only reliable from the latter perspective; a series is analogous with another series, regardless of the fact that, in real-time, different traditions celebrated different observances. Two weeks after Pentecost, some cathedrals already celebrated the second Sunday, some the first Sunday, and some the fourth day in the octave of Corpus Christi. It is useless to compare their propers.

Yet it is useful to compare them either for Corpus Christi or the parallel Sundays. And indeed, it is telling that most service books take the numbers of Sundays and weeks very seriously: a numeral corresponds with a set of propers. The 3rd Sunday after Pentecost (*post Pentecosten*) and after Trinity (*post Trinitatem*) should theoretically describe different dates, yet they both refer to the day when the introit was *Respice in me* and the Gospel the parable of the lost sheep.

The last peculiarity of the Epiphany season is its shortage of propers. With the earliest possible Easter, only one Sunday fell between Epiphany and Septuagesima, but, with the latest possible Easter, there were six. In the majority of uses, the season possessed three sets of chants and four sets of readings and prayers. When the period was shorter than four weeks, some propers must have been saved by imposing them on weekdays, but when it expanded to four or more weeks, at least the chants, or even the whole series had to be repeated. To put it in another way, a late Easter generated vacant Sundays at the end of the season. The simplest method to fill them was surely repetition, but vacancy offered a loose domain to properization, too. This is the reason why Sundays after Epiphany are increasingly more variable, particularly as readings are concerned. In Lyon, there are also lessons for the 7th Sunday after Epiphany, a date that can never occur. It is probably a remnant of archaic lists of pericopes that had been compiled before Shrovetide was established.

Shrovetide and Lent

Seasons work like tectonic plates with faults between them. We can more expect earthquakes and volcanism around the faults and more liturgical variety on the boundaries of seasons. Unlike plates, however, ordinary seasons are harder where they begin and softer where they end. Shrovetide (the three weeks after *Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima*, and *Quinquagesima* Sundays) is more

like a festive season with its habitually hard beginning and its definite end, directly attached to Lent. Although a relatively late development of the annual cycle, it was a rather solid part of it in the formative period when most of the propers were composed, selected, and arranged. It was an integral part of the Roman stational system, richly provided with chants, prayers, and readings. As associated with the expectation of early spring and thus the traditional Roman new year, it served as a fresh restarting point in the annual cycle which is manifest from the bounty of antiphons and responsories composed for its office hours. Shrovetide masses are not so prominent in quantitative terms, but they are memorable for their prestigious stations, characteristic items, and fixity.

Malleability only appears when Lent starts. The starting of Lent is a problem in itself for the season only unfolds in its full liturgical equipment on the first Sunday whose Latin name, *Quadragesima*, obviously resumes the reckoning of Shrovetide Sundays. The four weekdays before were secondary and somewhat pedantic additions, extending fasting discipline to precisely 40 days without Sundays, but failing to ensure equal propers. This, however, is only manifest in the office. The masses for Ash Wednesday and the two following days possess all the attributes of Lenten ferias. Only Thursday shows a lower and Saturday a higher degree of divergence, foreshadowing the rules of variance throughout the subsequent season.

Lent is the heart of the Roman temporal. It is the only full season when every weekday has a mass of its own with genuine propers. The summer part of ordinary time often reuses chants and readings primordially designed for Lenten ferias. Each mass of Lent is closely associated with one of the stational basilicas of Rome. Though many interpretations circulate on the significance of the stational system, they generally agree about it being a display of social coherence and historical continuity; the pope's unity with and control over his people, and the popu-

lace's attachment to its saints and their burial places. Comparative research, however, stresses the invariance of the season. It is Lent before all that proves to be the least divergent in the entire ecclesiastical year. In every layer of the propers and on the majority of dates, we find an unchallenged concordance between western traditions. Two conclusions may be drawn from this; first, that the Roman liturgy of Lent was so elaborate that it left no field for further properization, and, second, that its elaboration had been accomplished before the Roman rite spread over the Alps.

Albeit true on the whole, this statement must be nuanced for certain days. The vacant Sunday after the Ember Days of the first month, March, was perpetually fixed to the first week of Lent, and, in Rome, this probably happened already at an early date. The expiatory nature of the quarterly fast did not contradict the great fasting season so liturgists only needed to implement the structural peculiarities of the Ember Wednesday and Saturday. Yet the second Sunday was left vacant. Its items were freely selected from the propers of the previous ferias or inspired properization, hence, with its variously arranged and novel items, the second Sunday of Lent is one of the best indicators of regional belonging.

As it is widely known, Thursdays in Lent were aliturgical before the pontificate of Gregory II in the early 8th century. Then, they became incorporated into the stationary system and were provided with propers, yet the majority of their items was second-hand, i.e. reused from other days of the annual cycle. There is remarkable coincidence between Lenten Thursdays and some ordinary Sundays of the summer season, and the direction of the borrowing is not always clear. Anyhow, these Thursdays are not so convergent on a European scale as the rest of ferias. They typically waver between reuse and properization, but their choices can rarely be explained according to regional patterns, indicating that they were not the results of separate local ini-

tatives. It rather seems that there was some ambiguity about them already in Rome and properizing ideas emerged there already in the 8th and 9th centuries, prior to or parallel with the system's adoption in the North. Maundy Thursday was a special case as perhaps the ceremonially busiest day of the year but still a Thursday in Lent. Its several reused propers and missing tract suggest a once aliturgical character which, nevertheless, has been effectively compensated with more recent, properized items and rituals beyond the mass.

Finally, the most divergent ferias in Lent are Saturdays: those before the first Sunday, already mentioned in the context of Shrovetide, and those before Palm Sunday. They, too, were originally aliturgical, but their variants mainly conform to an east-west divide, indicating regional development, particularly in the East and the North, independent of Rome.

Holy Week and the Paschal Triduum were an integral part of Lent and thus basically uniform, but considerably less uniform than the preceding season. Indeed, comparative research questions the overall validity of Anton Baumstark's famous first liturgical law, namely that the most solemn days retain the most ancient rituals and remain intact of modernization. This law was inspired by the extremely austere Curial Holy Week ceremonies, and it certainly applies to plenty of phenomena. Yet it neglects that, just as they preserve archaic features, the most solemn days also attract modernizing initiatives, and even archaisms tend to survive due to reinterpretation. Divergence in Holy Week mostly manifests itself in rituals added or inserted to the core of the mass, but there are some rival and almost equally ancient options that concern its basic structure and choice of items, too. Nevertheless, acknowledging the higher variability of Holy Week does not negate its honourable antiquity; neither does it invalidate observations that conclude to an earlier stratum from the season's peculiarities. We would rather propose a new liturgical law, emphasizing that divergence and its patterns

point to stages of development, and the more variable a feature is the later it evolved.

Eastertide and the octave of Whitsun

Along with Whitsun, only Easter possesses an elaborate octave. Within them, every feria has a full mass formulary with distinct and non-recurrent items, determined by the theme of the feast on the preceding Sunday. They are no less uniform than the days of Lent. On the other hand, the markedly divergent corpora of Alleluias and sequences make their entrance on Easter Sunday and will play a prominent role throughout the season. Of course, there are Alleluias and some sequences in the winter season as well, but most of them apply traditional melodies and are fairly convergent; the number of competing items is limited and variation is frequently just a matter of ordering. A higher quantity of novel items appear in Spain, but they, too, originate from a well-defined corpus. On the contrary, Easter brings with it an escalation of Alleluia- and sequence-production, and already in the octave. The interlectionary chants were sung also in the office hours, first of all in the solemn vespers that contained a procession to the baptismal fonts. The abundance of Alleluias endures over spring and summer, hence, starting with Easter, their selection and order become one of the chief characteristics of liturgical uses. Comparing the Alleluia-series for the octaves of Easter and Whitsun, Eastertide, and the season after Trinity Sunday has long been a trustworthy tool for musicologists to identify the origin of a certain service book, and it remains so even with our widening horizon of surveying every kind of propers.

The octave of Easter is a sort of week zero. According to the typical medieval reckoning, Easter Sunday did not rate among the Sundays of Eastertide, and the numbering of Sundays started with Low Sunday or *Quasi modo*, one week after the feast.

Theoreticians formulated the doctrine that Eastertide counts as a single week with the octave as a week-long Sunday. As we stated above, all the Gospels about Christ's rising were assigned to the octave, and the rest of the propers were primarily concerned with the neophytes, those who were (ideally) initiated on Holy Saturday and receiving mystagogical catechesis during the following week.

There are structural differences, too. The Easter octave has a special arrangement for offices without chapters and hymns and masses with a gradual and only one Alleluia, features that cease from Saturday and give way to a regular office and masses with two Alleluias. The opportunity of having two Alleluias further increases the range of possibilities. Usually, a widely popular, more traditional item figures in one of the positions, and a rarer, more peculiar one in the other. Some uses apply recurrent Alleluias in one of the positions and an ever-changing one in the other. The option of singing only one Alleluia also exists, mostly for ferias and feasts of lower rank.

Similar to the octaves of Christmas and Epiphany, the semantic conflict between seasonal and ordinary items appears in Eastertide, too. The bounty of Alleluias notwithstanding, it is obvious that Eastertide was a speculative expansion of the feast to fifty days in a period when many of the ordinary items were already at hand. After Low Sunday, the bulk of chants and prayers are independent of the resurrection theme, and so are the readings, save the slender link of Gospels taken from Jesus's Farewell Discourse and thus indirectly preparing his ascension. A customary way of lessening the conflict was the repetition of the Easter liturgy each Sunday until Ascension Day. Sundays were the feast of the Resurrection *par excellence* thus for example the Carmelites, an order particularly devoted to the Holy Sepulchre, commemorated Easter on every Sunday of the year in a votive fashion. Churches north of the Alps were prone to doing the same within the forty days of celebrating the risen

Christ's presence on earth. The mass and the office were similar to those of Easter Sunday save that they did not conform to the structural traits of the octave; there were chapters and hymns in the office and two Alleluias in the mass.

Such measures undoubtedly consolidated the control of Easter over its season, but they led to the rubrical difficulty of hosting the Roman propers for the respective Sundays. The regular solution was to impose the propers on Monday or the next free weekday, unoccupied by any important sanctoral feast, thus generating a virtual proper Sunday after a virtual Easter Sunday. Service books equally label them as *feria secunda* (Monday) and *dominica propria* (proper Sunday) which makes a systematic comparison of Sunday liturgies in Eastertide even more intricate. Unlike Lent, Eastertide was not void of many ancient and prestigious saints' days, and these had to adopt the structural requirement of double Alleluias. Moreover, the Roman rite prescribed a seasonally distinct but thematically general liturgy for saints, especially martyrs, falling in Eastertide, highlighting the relationship of Christ's passion and glory with those of his saints. Some feasts with specific propers, however, were exempt. This, again, makes comparative research more complicated, for while evaluating the items of a given date, Eastertide sanctoral propers in general must not be mistaken for genuine propers. If a saint in April or May has another feast in the year, e.g. the translation of relics beside his or her heavenly birthday, it comes forth that the lesser feast adopts the real propers because the major feast cannot escape the impersonalizing impact of the Easter season.

The week of Ascension Thursday worked as a week-long Friday in a season of 7×7 days and, consequently, had an expiatory character. The Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before (the latter was identical to the Vigil of Ascension) hosted the Rogations or Lesser Litanies, processions of atonement that concluded in a mass of their own. As institutions of non-Roman origin, both the Rogation mass and that of the vigil show a

higher degree of divergence than the more established formularies of the season. Ascension itself provided the starting point of a semi-season. The structural features of Eastertide continued, yet the following Sunday did not recall Easter any more and the often repeated seasonal Alleluias about the resurrection were replaced by Ascension Alleluias.

The Vigil of Whitsun was a smaller-scale replica of Holy Saturday. On the one hand, it typically but not necessarily shortened the ceremony by omitting the rites around the holy fire and the paschal candle and by reducing the number of prophecies. On the other hand, it was less radical in preserving archaic omissions like those of the offertory, the *Agnus Dei*, and the communion. Its variants mainly repeat those of Holy Saturday, or depend on local measures abbreviating them.

Whitsun and its fully equipped octave are almost entirely parallel with Easter week. They are firmly established and uniform except for Alleluias and sequences, even though there are no solemn vespers that could further expand the repertoires of chants and prayers. The two differences recall well-known problems: Ember Days and vacant Thursdays.

The Ember Days in early summer could be absolutely independent of Whitsun. Ancient service books frequently assign them to the second or third week of the season after Pentecost. Yet strict adherents of the Roman directives insisted that the fast of the fourth month, June, be perpetually assigned to the octave of Pentecost, and they succeeded in the end. Unlike in the first week of Lent, this led to a deep thematic conflict between a joyful season, only second to Easter week, and the penitential character of an expiatory fast. Fasting discipline was willingly suspended, but texts connected to fasting could nonetheless survive and were only gradually substituted by texts with Pentecost themes. The masses of Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday in the octave possessed two alternative formularies; one derived from the octave and without the structural traits of Ember Days, and

another with the more readings, orations, and interlectionary chants appropriate for an Ember Wednesday and Saturday but disregarding Whitsun. Because in the historical period from which the bulk of liturgical evidence comes it was no more possible to celebrate the fast outside of the octave, the two formularies had somehow to be harmonized. A clear-cut solution was to say two separate masses, usually a morning mass of the fast and a high mass of the octave, as it happened e.g. in Clermont and Le Puy, or the other way around, as in Cluny. Most of the uses, however, blended the two formularies, supplementing predominantly Pentecost masses with the extras of Ember Days. Thus, variants chiefly evolved in the fields of readings, orations, and interlectionary chants. In all three cases, we can clearly distinguish Pentecost-related elements from Ember Day-related ones, regardless of their actual constellations. Among the readings, prophecies drawn from the Acts of Apostles witness adjustment to the octave, while real prophecies from the Old Testament stand for Ember Days. Orations invoking the Holy Spirit belong to the octave, while those that mention fasting, abstinence, or any form of expiation spring from the Ember Days. Alleluias between the prophecies result from the logic of an extended Eastertide, while graduals and non-Alleluiatic forms of the canticle of the three children point to the Ember Days.

The Thursday within the octave was originally vacant, similar to its analogies in Lent. In contrast with Easter Thursday, it had neither proper chants nor prayers. After joining the liturgical days of the octave, Thursday also received a lesson and a Gospel of its own. They are predominant but not exclusive, for some archaic traditions maintain different choices. The selection of other items chiefly relied on Whit Sunday, but several other options circulated, too, borrowing texts from the vigil, the weekdays of the octave, or the Easter season. The following Sunday was either the octave or a vacant Sunday. Both, however,

mingled with Trinity Sunday and the beginning of the last and longest season of summer and autumn.

The season after Pentecost

The two great dogmatic feasts in early summer, Trinity Sunday and Corpus Christi, are temporal feasts according to their reckoning in the calendar and position in the service books. Nevertheless, they had been celebrated as votive masses earlier than as temporal feasts and this fact is reflected by their relatively high diversity. When they were promoted to regular solemnities, this meant that the locally accepted text and music of the respective votive mass gained a firmer place and a more respectful position in the hierarchy of celebrations. Yet the fate of the two feasts was somewhat different due to the different authorities behind their promotion. Trinity Sunday was a local initiative, long rejected by Rome and the papacy. The mass of the Holy Trinity had been the basic votive mass for Sundays already in the Carolingian period and, as emphasized above, propers for Sundays after Pentecost were fewer than the Sundays themselves. Thus the introduction of the feast meant originally no more than filling vacant Sundays before or after the series, as in the West it was customary to celebrate Trinity at the end of the ecclesiastical year, too, or even at both ends of the season after Pentecost. This flexibility and the lack of a clear Roman standpoint led to greater diversity. On the contrary, the cause of Corpus Christi was soon embraced by the Holy See and the feast was promulgated in a papal bull, containing also its mass and office as an attachment. In the 13th century, it was only a recommendation and did not mean any obligation to apply exactly those, but the authority of Rome weighed heavily in an age when liturgy as a marker of identity was already dropping. Alternative propers only survived where a different votive mass on the Eucharist had been firmly rooted in the local soil.

Not much has been left to say about the season after Pentecost or, in other words, the summer part of the ordinary season. It has colourful sets of weekday lessons and Alleluias, it is deficient in propers at its end, its last readings and prayers anticipate the eschatological aspect of Advent, and it contains the autumn Ember Days, the fast of the seventh month, September. All four features have already been discussed elsewhere; Alleluia series in the context of Eastertide, deficient propers in the season after Epiphany, Ember Days and the ambiguity about closing or opening the annual cycle in Advent. It is only worth adding that the Tridentine method of transposing propers that had been omitted after Epiphany to the end of the year was unknown in the Middle Ages and, before Trent, even in the Curial use; they simply repeated the propers of the 22nd or the 23rd Sunday, although the last Sunday (*dominica ultima*) enjoyed a distinguished position, regardless of its numbering. The service books mostly inserted the Ember Days between the 17th and the 18th Sunday according to a hypothetical Easter on 27 March, the assumed original date of Christ's resurrection. Yet it did not generate a vacant Sunday, as it had done in the previous seasons; the fast's actual date varied from year to year so that its proximity did not always influence the same propers.

What is really remarkable in the season after Pentecost is its particularly serial and tectonic nature. By seriality, we mean the phenomenon of successive propers, layers, or genres that may drift forward or backward against their environment, but, still, preserve their position in relation to each other. The metaphor of tectonics aims to express that some groups of propers massively stick together, but there are faults between the plates which allow considerable variation.

If putting the high medieval liturgies of the weeks after Pentecost side by side, we find that a static comparison between records exhibits far more diversity than a dynamic comparison between series. When we identify Sundays and weeks with nu-

merals, introits or lessons will be basically the same on each, but Gospels or collects will diverge. By considering a full list of every genre, however, we realize that Gospels mostly begin to depart from one another with the fifth week, and collects from the third week. Adding or omitting a formulary from one of the series we are comparing perfectly restores their harmony. Even among the introits, that of the seventh Sunday (and of the Vigil of Ascension), *Omnes gentes*, is famous for not being part of the primordial Roman repertory. It is missing from the Old Roman and some Carolingian graduals or figures at the end of post-Pentecost introits. This implies that items rather belonged to a series of their genre (e.g. Gospels) or layer (e.g. euchological formularies) than to the specific mass of a given Sunday. We have experienced something like this with the readings of Advent.

The three types of discrepancies originate from different epochs and record different phases of the Roman rite. They do not involve an equal number of traditions or the same geographical regions. The euchological drift constitutes an east-west divide, while the Gospels separate Rome and its closest relatives and especially Southern Italy from the rest. The lack of the introit *Omnes gentes* is a sheer archaism, no more evident in the High Middle Ages, albeit some trouble about the ordering is still detectable in a few late sources.

Tectonic characteristics reveal themselves in a closer look at the archaic Gospel series of Campania. Seemingly, there is not a single coincidence between them and the northern mainstream. Sections of their lists, however, are perfectly parallel with shifted sections of other lists, and the same applies, in a lesser degree, to the peculiar assignments of Rome and its closest relatives. Reims, one of the earliest liturgical centres in Northern Gaul, goes even further. It has an exceptional Gospel series, but the set of items as a whole is equivalent to those of Campania, Rome, and all the mainstream variants.

Such puzzling observations can be interpreted along the guidelines of a gradual development that left some traces on the historical material, but partly took place before the well-documented period. First, ordinary time must have been aliturgical. This does not mean that no liturgies were celebrated for months, but, as with vacant Sundays and Thursdays, that they borrowed texts and music from elsewhere. Elsewhere did not necessarily mean an already established part of the year, although many of the chants and some of the readings reuse items from Lent. It rather meant a loosely arranged stock of possible entries from which any selection was viable, as we still find it in some ancient sacramentaries and office antiphonaries. It is perspicuous how much more heterogeneous the material of ordinary time is textually and musically than that of the winter and spring seasons. Stocks were open to rearrangement, abbreviation, or enlargement, but each written source must have contained its entries in a definitive order. Due to their lower authority, these orderings were exposed to mutation, yet they had some chance to spread themselves due to the automatism of the copying process. Fluid beginnings like this might have been responsible for convergent sets of differently ordered items with interpolations or omissions, but also for the consolidation of slowly prevailing series.

A series, however, did not necessarily comprise more than half a year. As already mentioned, weeks after Pentecost can range from 23 to 28. Both ancient lists of pericopes and Old Roman graduals divide the period into smaller sections of approximately one month, numbering Sundays after the greatest sanctoral feasts of summer and autumn, such as Peter and Paul, St Lawrence, or Michaelmas. Implicitly, this method suggests that the series of Sundays was not uninterrupted. If a Sunday coincided with a great feast or fell in its octave, its liturgy might have been postponed, which also explains the relatively low number of temporal propers as compared to the length of the season. Summer and autumn were originally not a season in

the strict sense of Advent, Lent, or Eastertide. It had a certain quantity of free Sundays and a befitting store of propers; Sundays had to be equipped, and propers had to be saved. Seriality first froze in month-long sections between the principal feasts that divided the period, resulting in the tectonic structure of some post-Pentecost repertories.

Not even the numbering of the formularies did imply an equal number of weeks. In late medieval Esztergom, the privileged ordinary Sundays were still those on which a new book of the Old Testament began to be read in the office with its corresponding cycle of responsories. These were called the openings of new histories (*historia nova*), assigned to given Sundays of given months. In other churches of Europe, the history-related propers of the office (lessons, sermons, responsories, and certain antiphons) shifted around each year as they were not locked to mass-related proper items (homilies, Gospel-antiphons, chapters, and collects) and were written in the breviaries in two separate sections for the same period during summer and autumn. Esztergom permanently combined the two series, but, in order to avoid confusion, arranged that the Sunday of the Book of Wisdom (*Liber Sapientiae*) between 31 July and 6 August should always count as the 9th Sunday after Pentecost. If, due to a late Easter, there was no place for eight full ordinary weeks in June and July, some Sundays were omitted or, more precisely, their propers were imposed on weekdays.

The next stage was a conceptual separation of the temporal and the sanctoral cycles, and the extension of the seasonal approach over ordinary time. From then on, it was no more a Sunday that might have fallen on a great feast, but a great feast fell on a Sunday. The temporal expanded into an all-comprehensive substratum of chronological orientation where the mechanical succession of weeks could not be interrupted. The rigidity of this rule is most manifest in the current Tridentine rubrics that do not tolerate any weeks zero and thus force the first Sundays

both after Epiphany and Whitsun into permanent latency. A positive aspect of the seasonal approach was the thematic reinterpretation of ordinary time; the winter part as Epiphanytide and the summer part as Whitsuntide or Trinitytide. The latter is obvious in the widespread custom of singing about the Holy Trinity on ordinary Sundays in the office hour of prime, some hymns, the preface of the mass, or the sequence. This concept solidified the numbering of Sundays and the propers assigned to them, but it did not solve the newly emerging problem of missing propers at the end of both seasons. They remained a memento of several, once more volatile faultlines.

Though it is the concept of an unbroken temporal that resulted in the established form of the season after Pentecost, there remained one more step to take. Ancient lists and collections transmitted each item or layer separately, hence there was more textual coherence within the genres than within the actual masses. Everyday mindsets, however, were incapable of perceiving such wide-ranging connections. Moreover, the lack of inner coherence within a single mass was only true for the temporal. In the sanctoral and especially in the commune where seriality was out of the question (there was no second opportunity to articulate the same topic), chants frequently referred to the readings. The new wave of temporal communions and Alleluias drawn from the day's lectionary imitated this coherence. The same tendency redirected the lesson of the 4th Sunday of Advent, *Gaudete*, to the 3rd Sunday with the eponymous introit. Finally, some liturgists declared the requirement of corresponding propers as a general law. Hence, if one offertory likened the offering of bread and wine to the holocausts of rams, bullocks, and fat lambs (*Sicut in holocausto arietum*), the parallel secret must have been one that refers to the Old Testament sacrifices (*Deus qui legalium differentiam hostiarum*). Such streamlining initiatives met a warmer welcome in Germany and the East, resulting in the slide between eastern and western euchological traditions.

The sanctoral

The basic difference between the temporal and the sanctoral is that the latter is extensible. None of the year's 365 days is exempt from the temporal, and, at the deepest level of its existence, every feast is implicitly a feria. Being a saint's feast is only the second nature of a day, evident from the fact that it can be postponed or anticipated. In special cases, the saint's feast even gives way to the feria. Some vigils, Ember Days, and, above all, the Paschal Triduum are privileged weekdays when the deepest, ferial stratum of the year unfolds.

On the other hand, not every day of the year is a feast. On a local level, real ferias do exist even if virtually every date of the calendar hosts dozens of saints. Worshipping communities knew well that there are many feasts celebrated throughout the Christian world but outside of their own liturgical scope and tried at least to commemorate them. For this purpose, they appended the daily reading of the martyrology to the end of prime. It was a perpetual calendar, briefly mentioning the saints of a date with the locations where they were venerated, sometimes giving a summary of their lives and histories of martyrdom. Reciting the martyrology was a substitution for the ceremonial cult. Worshippers were perfectly aware that they cannot celebrate each saint and, indeed, doing so would obscure the nuances of festal hierarchy and spoil the emphasis on local or institutional devotions. Therefore, every calendar had more or fewer empty lines, even the densest ones.

As the temporal was all-comprehensive, it could not grow larger. After the establishment of the cycle, no one was in the position of adding a new season, week, or day to the year or abolishing existing ones. We will not find any service book without Shrovetide or a six-week Lent although we can detect the historical vestiges of their gradual evolution. Weeks zero and last weeks of the ordinary times are pale memories of an epoch

when the temporal was still not in full possession of the year. Therefore, temporals are ideal for collating liturgical traditions as they have all the parallel positions, but only the parallel positions. Syntactically, they speak the same language.

Not so with the sanctoral. It is not continuous, but it can be extended, at least in theory, to infinity. This merely syntactical contrast, however, conceals the deeper structure of the sanctoral and the fact that, at its beginnings, it was tangled up with the temporal. After surveying both the calendars and the sanctorals of circa 180 early printed missals from all over Europe, a quantitative look at the results clearly shows the proportions. They contain about 4300 sanctoral occasions. Taking defective or fragmentary sources into account, having at least 100 occurrences suggests that the entry occurs in every service book, either in the calendar or in the sanctoral. 200 occurrences mean that it is present in both. St John the Baptist has about 360 entries, Christmas more than 300, Transfiguration over 220, and Thomas Aquinas over 140. Yet only approximately 300 feasts belong to this category, hardly more than 7% of the entire sample. Almost 93% comes forth fewer than 100 times, 86% fewer than 10 times, and 60% only once or twice.

These values demarcate divisions within the sanctoral. The first consists of universal feasts. Here belong, self-evidently, the great feasts of the Lord and the Virgin Mary with the apostles and other chief biblical protagonists. The remnant comprises groups of basically three sources. The most peculiar is that of the patrons of Roman basilicas and other ancient Italian and African martyrs whose cults were handed over with the first Roman books and faithfully transmitted during the Middle Ages, even if their biographical identities were not always clear. Praxedis, Pancratius, Abdon and Sennen, or the Seven Sleepers cannot be absent from any medieval service book. Non-Roman confessors form the next group who were already renowned in late antiquity; Church Fathers like Ambrose and Augustine, or influential

bishops and wonder-workers like Martin and Nicolas. The last group consists of later saints who achieved universal popularity: founders of religious orders like Benedict, Bernard, Francis, and Dominic, or the embodiments of high medieval ideals of secular sanctity like King Louis IX or Elizabeth of Hungary. Except for the Roman martyrs, they are the same whose names we still primarily bear in societies of a European background.

The circa 25% of saints who are not omnipresent but occur with significant frequency determine ever-narrowing circles of regional, national, and local saints. To evaluate their real proportions, one must consider the actual number of dioceses and sources from a country or region. Dunstan of Canterbury has 10 entries, Stanislaus of Kraków 27, Ildefons of Toledo 40, and Martial of Limoges 88, though they are equally national or regional saints. Local saints can be better determined by pure numbers; King Lucius, for instance, is peculiar only to Chur, or Gondulphus and Monulphus to Liège. Even if a saint is regional, his or her octave or Translation indicates a specific site. The Translation of Emeterius and Celedonius is peculiar to Calahorra, and the octave of Kilian to Würzburg. This is the only type of saint whose presence in a service book truly indicates its origin or reveals special devotion in a certain place.

The majority of underrepresented saints, however, do not rank among them. Predominantly, they exclusively figure in calendars, and, if they attain a position in the sanctoral, they are only commemorated through added orations, and often only optionally. We can call them martyrological saints, as calendars were sometimes really headed as martyrologies, and some of them aimed to accumulate as many saints as possible. Printed missals still sharply contrast as having abundant or reduced calendars, while their sanctorals are typically less disproportionate. It was a question of taste if a person, age, or institution preferred to celebrate a saint every day when it was feasible, preferred votive masses, or perhaps said mass of the temporal season. For the

first choice, it was convenient to find every, however superficially known, saint in the calendar. They were not exceedingly many per location, but together they formed more than half of the saints ever mentioned in liturgical sources.

It can be justly debated if calendars or sanctorals deserve more credit. Calendars are more exact and indicate the prestige of a feast by red letters or adding its precise rank, but sanctorals attest to actual celebration. Calendars are not directly involved in the liturgy so they can be more conservative. Several calendars in the early 16th century still forgot to record the 14th-century feast of Visitation which had been, nevertheless, long there in the ensuing sanctorals. Sanctorals, in contrast, often lack entries that are present in the preceding calendar; not because they are necessarily negligible martyrological feasts, but because they have no genuine propers. Calendars and sanctorals assume one another; the first as lists of days to be celebrated, and the second as texts to be uttered. And it is exactly this that recalls the dual nature of liturgical days, namely that they simultaneously denote a date and its texts.

As dates, the feasts of the first category are in no way behind their temporal equivalents. Michaelmas, the Invention of the Holy Cross, or All Saints are no less stable in the year than any Sunday of any season, nor do they appear in fewer sources. The difference lies in their propers. St Michael has a fully equipped, personalized set of propers that serves as a stock for his lesser feasts, solemnities of other archangels, and votive masses venerating angelic powers. The Invention and also the Exaltation of the Holy Cross partly rely on temporal items of Holy Week, only supplementing them in the fields of missing or less canonized propers. All Saints, though the very first in quantitative statistics, is almost entirely equipped with second-hand items of several martyrs. This comparison reveals that the degree of original properization is a distinct factor of liturgical days. It is more or less independent of the festal hierarchy, but it has a

fundamental impact on the dissemination of a feast. As stated before, propers must be saved, hence, if a however unimportant feast has genuine propers, it has a better chance to survive.

The common of saints

This observation turns our inquiry to the common of saints. St Lucy, Felix in Pincis, or Pope Marcellus were not the foremost saints of the Church of Rome, still they figure between 340–360 occurrences in the aforementioned sample. The reason is that they happen to be the first virgin, confessor, and bishop martyr in the annual cycle. In the earliest Roman mass antiphonaries, all were honoured with full propers, similarly to their subsequent companions like Prisca, Fabian, or Vincent, but, as the year passed on, fewer and fewer proper chants distinguished repeating types of saints. New types like the martyrs of Eastertide or exceedingly important personages like St John the Baptist or St Lawrence inspired new formularies, but, as a general rule, the production of sanctoral propers proved to be an ebbing tide of creativity. The same is true for readings and prayers. Gregory the Great commented on the parable of the hidden treasure in his 11th homily in the basilica of St Agnes on her heavenly birthday, but the pericope grew into the most popular Gospel of the entire year, furnishing the feasts of hundreds of holy women. In the Gregorian Sacramentary, the collect later popularized as that of several apostles still belongs to St Philip and James (1 May) who are buried in *Santi Apostoli*, the Basilica of the Twelve Holy Apostles in Rome.

The commune is, therefore, basically a derivation and a generalization of the Roman sanctoral. From a scholarly perspective, maintaining or losing contact with this primordial source is a chief characteristic of the commune's local manifestations. Some uses assign precisely those items to the respective saints that belong to them in the most ancient Roman service books,

although they freely mix them for saints missing from the basic Roman sanctoral. Other uses, when revolving the same stock of items, treat even the most traditional Roman saints similarly to the rest, and provide them with haphazard items of their broader category. The two approaches represent two stages of development. The first still handles the primary sanctoral as the first logical stage of a process, derives a commune from it as a second stage, and, finally, redistributes the material among the entries of the secondary sanctoral. The second approach neglects the existence of a primary sanctoral and takes the abstract commune as its point of departure, levelling feasts that logically precede and succeed the composition of a common of saints. The two approaches do not correspond to historical periods; they rather represent different attitudes towards the legacy of authoritative papal service books.

The other aspect of comparing communes consists in their varying inclination to differentiation. They universally have four divisions; the first for apostles, the second for martyrs, the third for confessors, and the fourth for virgins. Yet many problems arise already at this level. Some of the original items speak in the plural, others in the singular. Some assume that the martyrs are also bishops, or the virgins are also martyrs. Mark and Luke are evangelists like Matthew and John, but not apostles. Anna or Mary Magdalene are women, yet not virgins. Certain books do not specify the commune, but leave it as an overall, loosely arranged resource from which any feast can be provided for. Each gets the texts that once a compiler or a liturgical decision-maker found the most appropriate. The other way is what we may call the properization of functions. Attraction towards reason and orderliness tempted medieval intellectuals to settle subdivisions within the commune, and led to pedantic differentiations between one and more; bishop, priest, and layman; virgin martyr and not a martyr; and to earlier unknown subcategories like evangelists, abbots, widows, or saintly matrons.

These developments did very moderately affect the actual material of the commune. It was generally agreed that the commune should contain only traditional, widely acknowledged items of the Roman repertoires. At most, the store of readings could be cautiously enlarged along with the always extensible corpora of Alleluias and sequences, but, even with these genres, accretion happened mostly within the confines of the sanctoral. It was, however, quite typical that special categories of saints monopolized certain items of the general repertory. In Poland, the introit of St Lucy, *Dilexisti iustitiam* marked specifically widows, and in Normandy, the introit of St Felix, *Os iusti*, went with abbots.

The votives

What service books present and liturgical scholarship labels as the votive part is in fact an amalgam of manifold functions and origins. Lack of clear discrimination may obscure that they fundamentally differ in terms of antiquity, properization, and divergence. The most recent layers of the votive part were almost unconditionally extended and often merited a disapproving judgment as superstitious extravagancies already in the early modern era. The older layers, however, were essential components of the liturgical economy and drew on a sober textual basis. Without discussing nuances, we divide the material into ritual, regular, and occasional votives.

By ritual votives, we mean those that are closely connected to rites outside of the mass; first of all nuptial and funeral masses, and, secondly, the dedication mass. There are ancient and established masses for the ordinations of bishops and priests as well, but they do not include full sets of chants and readings, only prayers. The nuptial mass is consistently present in the first Roman sacramentaries and mass antiphonaries. It is almost perfectly provided with propers of its own, hence it is surprising that only the eucharological layer became universally

adopted on the continent. As for the chants, it was more typical to apply those of the Holy Trinity, but other options circulated as well. Funeral masses were fairly conservative in their chants. As being daily sung in the High Middle Ages, some alternatives acceded to the core repertory, but they were a modest accretion of pan-European popularity. Orations for the deceased, on the contrary, multiplied boundlessly. Parallel with the functional properization of the commune, every sort of dead and every occasion commemorating their passing away or funeral received customized prayers, and even thematically unspecified prayers were distributed among these specific intentions.

The dedication mass is a specific case. From the perspective of the liturgical fabric, it is not a ritual mass unless celebrated as the fulfilment of the actual dedication of a newly erected church. Its more typical use was the anniversary of a church's dedication that each institution held on a different yet locally constant date of the year, conforming either to sanctoral or temporal reckoning and even combining the two on a certain Sunday of a certain month. From a thematic perspective, it resembled the commune with its defined topics but undefined dates. Congregations commemorated both the dedication of their local church and that of their cathedral, but they could admit, in theory, an unrestrained number of further important dedications, too. In each of these cases, they used the same formulary. It did not vary considerably and was not further specified; only the dedication of an altar and the days of the octave might have received extra orations. As a consequence, the dedication mass floats among the divisions of service books, and its position is peculiar to uses or regions. Some incorporate it into the temporal, either at its end or in the actual part of the year when the feast was celebrated. Others place it among the votives or add it to the common of saints as one of the repeatedly occurring formularies with no constant place in the calendar.

Regular votives were commemorative formularies for each day of the week. The arrangement was by no means universal, but the most typical assignments were these: a mass of the Trinity on Sundays, of the angels or for wisdom on Mondays, of the Holy Spirit on Tuesdays, for the atonement of sins or the temporal season on Wednesdays, for charity, of the Eucharist or the patron saint on Thursdays, of the Holy Cross on Fridays, and of the Virgin Mary on Saturdays. Wherever one of the topics was exchanged for another, the whole order was upset, but each feria was dedicated to a particular devotion in every use. Marian masses on Saturdays departed from the rest as being differentiated according to seasons. There were distinct Marian formularies for Advent, for the time between Christmas and Purification, for the time between Purification and Easter, by and large coinciding with Shrovetide and Lent, for Eastertide, and for the ordinary season between Trinity and Advent.

A common attribute of regular votives is that they are second-hand. The Marian mass in Advent is mostly identical to the formulary of the Annunciation and that of the Christmas season with the Marian mass of New Year. The mass of angels derives from Michaelmas, that of the Holy Spirit from Whitsun, and those of the Trinity and the Eucharist cohere with Trinity Sunday and Corpus Christi. It is not always self-evident that such masses primarily belonged to the annual cycle and only secondarily migrated to the votive part, but we can confidently state that the repertory of regular votives is typically restrained and traditional. Only Marian masses of the ordinary season have a strong tendency to accumulate novel compositions, above all Alleluias and sequences, but offertories and communions as well.

Such votives belonged to the regular liturgical life of well-provided churches as morning masses. Cathedrals and large monasteries could afford even more of them per day at side altars or in appointed chapels. In this quality, masses for the deceased also joined the regular category. One could say that, if a day was a

feria at its most fundamental level, this fact could manifest itself both in a temporal and a votive fashion. Being a weekday did not automatically imply that its seasonal nature came into force. It could equally imply that the more basic association between a day of the week and its particular devotion had to be articulated.

As we have already emphasized, the conquest of the year by the temporal was a gradual process. It was not always self-evident that seasons are so extensive as we now know them, that the ordinary times are real seasons, and that Sundays perfectly control their following weeks. Besides, the comfortable situation of having a series of complete service books for each parish cannot be safely projected to the age of manuscripts. Indeed, we find something different at both ends of the timeline. Several of the earliest extant liturgical sources can be interpreted as portable exemplars of itinerant priests, containing rich but never exhaustive material. Even in the printing press period, tiny missals with selected propers were being continuously published and similar extracts were appended to rituals, not to mention books of hours, a very popular genre that by definition offered a substitute for the breviary. All these suggest that, under primitive or unfavourable circumstances, regular votive masses worked as a rudimentary temporal, observing days, while disregarding weeks and seasons.

The last group of occasional votives comprises a variety of masses for different occasions, practical and spiritual intentions, and personal or communal devotions. They can commemorate the anniversary of a bishop's ordination, ask for rain or the defeat of enemies, pray for mental qualities like mercifulness or mutual agreement, and can honour a scale of objects from one's own Guardian Angel to Veronica's Veil. There is a difference between defective formularies, only containing a triple set of orations that were added to the main orations of another mass and between full formularies to be used in independent masses. Despite their bewildering abundance, occasional votives are

analogous to the inner organization of the sanctoral. The topics are not evenly spread. A rather limited number of masses is ancient and almost ubiquitous; there is practically no sacramentary or missal without a mass for peace or the sick. The corpus, however, is infinitely extensible and local or historical tendencies to accumulate large votive collections or to reject them attest to changing mentalities.

The method of compiling propers for such votives mostly draws on the annual cycle. In contrast with regular propers, here it is obvious that votive masses select from an already existing repertory. The compiler of a mass to be offered for the king or the gift of tears will browse the temporal and the sanctoral for chants and readings mentioning related words, themes, and motifs, and bring together distant but equally traditional items in a new context. In this respect, votive masses are sophisticated literary centos. Orations are mostly, yet not obligatorily, exempt from this rule. They are the texts that specify the final intention of the mass and hence must make it explicit. A votive formulary gains its strength from the associations evoked by traditional chants and biblical passages, but it redirects this power towards freshly formulated goals.

This is, at least, the majority's respectful attitude. There is a certain historical point both for the sanctoral and occasional votives where the sense of distinction between an established and an extensible liturgical repertory wears off. Fashionable devotions like honouring the Name of Jesus, his Five Wounds, Our Lady of Sorrows, or patron saints against pestilence like St Roch and Sebastian inspired poetic propers that lack any precedent in the traditional textual and melodic material. The phenomenon is parallel with late developments in the sanctoral, and the small proportion of such propers as compared to the votive part as a whole is also similar. There were, however, transitional cases as well. Some recent items deliberately retained the opening words or the syntactical structures of previous texts to

create paraphrases and possibly musical contrafacts of prestigious models. They suggest that putting traditional inhibitions aside did not mean a total loss of orientation skills. Worshippers of the Late Middle Ages could still identify and discern components of different epochs and authorities. Tastes and mentalities might have changed, but the ways of preserving, reframing, and substituting inherited items always reveal a deep sense both for the hierarchy of genres and the hierarchy of cycles.

THE MASS PROPERS

A reproduction will usually appear more convincing than the original. St Patrick's in New York is probably closer to the popular ideal of a Gothic cathedral than the Notre Dame of Chartres, and Neuschwanstein is closer to that of a Gothic castle than the Avignon Palace of the Popes. Liturgies are far from perfect in this sense. As artefacts of a considerable past, they do not impress us with their unity of style or balanced proportions, but still, they have a fascinating aesthetic and intellectual power that results from their very complexity.

If considered synchronically, every mass, every day, and, indeed, the whole liturgical year is a smooth process of movements. They are sewn together by frequent repetition; during the final words of the introit, a singer already has in mind the first notes of the *Kyrie*, and the conclusive "Amen" after the collect acts as an upbeat to the lesson. Acoustically, items work like arias, recitatives, and choirs in an opera or an oratorio, evolving from one another and making the impression of continuity. Due to the relay of roles, constant and changing parts, simpler and more sophisticated texts, and chants of folkish or professional performance, the mass provides a type of flow experience. From a more distant perspective, this applies to the rhythm of the day with its short and simple little hours, the milestones of matins and vespers at its two ends, and the mass in its centre; or to the year with its various intensity of feasts and seasons.

For the analytical mind, juxtaposed elements of different backgrounds pose an interpretive problem. The embedding of past achievements into present structures has always meant a challenge for exegetes. As we have seen, the liturgical cycle is full of fossils inherited from earlier stages, yet liturgical history is only possible because they are still there and have never or at least not systematically been updated and synchronized.

Antiquity incorporates weight, prestige, and contact with one's ancestors, thus it cannot be arbitrarily modified; to invest it with real force and meaning deserves an interpretation as if it were addressed to one's own age as a well-organized whole. No community lives entirely in its present and none is totally captured by its past; in varying relations, every culture is a dialogue between present conditions and past institutions.

This also means that streamlining efforts spoil the liturgy's most characteristic features. Charming inconsistencies and bold associations belong to the liturgy's very nature and, nonetheless, foster historical investigation. Streamlining, however, has always been the natural outcome of integrative exegetical efforts, themselves inspired by the experience of aesthetic and intellectual unity, as it is manifest from the idea of harmonizing propers since the turn of the first millennium and up to some interpretations and corresponding reforms of the modern liturgical movement. An impartial survey, therefore, must abstain both from the antiquarian approach of idealizing nonsense and disorder only because of its authenticity and from inventing meaning and orderliness where they have never existed. Without underestimating the harmonious effect that liturgy exerted on its actors and audiences, we need first to isolate the ingredients that have been assimilated into the interplay later known as the mass propers; the lectionary, the gradual, and the sacramentary.

THE ORDER OF PERICOPES

System, density, and variation

The term 'order of pericopes' denotes a system of liturgical readings throughout the ecclesiastical year. It concerns primarily the mass, yet it exercises a strong influence on the divine office as well. In the mature uses of the Roman rite, a homily, i.e., a commentary on the daily Gospel closes the readings of matins on days that have a Gospel of their own, and, in the monastic office, the passage is recited in its entirety. Furthermore, the antiphons of the Gospel canticles, those of the *Benedictus* and the *Magnificat*, echo sentences of the same passage, and such antiphons may occur in the little hours alike. The chapters (*capitulum*) of canonical hours are often divisions of the daily lesson that can also provide the textual basis for some antiphons. The choice of pericopes is a distinctive marker of a liturgical day in general.

The Roman order of pericopes, or at least that of the lessons, is traditionally attributed to St Jerome and goes truly back to Christian antiquity. Yet it is distinctly Roman. There is no real overlap between it and other systems like the Ambrosian, the Mozarabic, or the Gallican. Beneventan sources, however, despite their remarkable differences, share the majority of their lessons with the Roman tradition, especially with its archaic, southern Italian representatives. Eastern traditions are also distinct. What they have in common with Rome is limited to some natural choices for feasts that have biblical origins. Self-evidently, a lesson on Whit Sunday recalls the effusion of the Holy Spirit according to the Acts of the Apostles, but even Christmas or Easter Sunday have different Gospels in the Byzantine Church.

The earliest Roman source material comprises lists of incipits and sometimes explicits (*capitulare, comes*), Bible codices with liturgical notes in the margins, and manuscripts that were de-

signed for actual liturgical use. According to the overlaps mentioned above, books of the divine office (homiliaries, antiphonals, or breviaries) can also prove to be sources of pericope systems. Indirect but very ancient and reliable witnesses are the sermons of some Church Fathers that were delivered on a recorded occasion and comment on specific scriptural passages. They inform us not only about the chosen pericopes, but also provide a *terminus ad quem* and a place of origin for their liturgical assignment.

Orders of pericopes can be analyzed chiefly from two perspectives. The first is a descriptive, strictly liturgical point of view; based on the annual cycle, what texts were recited and when, or, in other words, which passages were assigned to which days. The second is a thematic, scriptural viewpoint: taking the Bible as a starting point, on what basis were some texts selected (or neglected) and assigned to definite days. While liturgical history mainly deals with the first approach, biblical and patristic studies may greatly benefit from the second. Comparative analysis of the sources reveals the first aspect, and, indeed, this is what performers and participants of liturgical ceremonies once perceived. Yet the second sheds light on the mindset of those intellectuals by whom the very idea of an order of pericopes was once conceived and realized. Let us first turn to the study of the service books themselves.

Not every day of the ecclesiastical year is equally furnished with lessons in the Roman rite. The basic stratum is made up of Sundays from Advent to Whitsun, traditional Lenten weekdays, Ember Days, the octaves of Easter and Whitsun, and the oldest and most celebrated feasts of both the temporal and the sanctoral cycle like Christmas, Ascension Day, or St John the Baptist. These are recorded by practically every non-fragmented source from the earliest times on.

There follows the intermediary stratum of ordinary Sundays. Although they belong to the basic level of the rite, they were

not publicly celebrated as part of the stationary system by the Roman pontiffs and their reckoning, as detailed earlier, underwent minor changes until it solidified in its medieval and early modern form.

The next, still fundamental layer consists of Lenten Thursdays and some of the Saturdays of Lent, the last Sundays of Epiphanytide and the post-Pentecost season (from the 5th and the 23rd respectively), and the feasts that were introduced universally but in a later period, like All Saints' Day, Trinity Sunday, or Corpus Christi. These are omnipresent at the latest from the High Middle Ages.

All the Wednesdays and Fridays that are not privileged *ferias* belong to the fourth layer (outside of Lent, Ember Days, and the octaves of Easter and Whitsun). These *ferias* were commonly provided with lessons not only in the High Middle Ages and the printed missals but already in a considerable percentage of the earliest pericope lists and lectionaries. Especially in the earlier material, Saturdays may join the two privileged weekdays. Gospels are more numerous, however, as even in missals from the age of the printing press, there are several uses where Fridays lack epistles of their own. This is not the case with Wednesdays, usually having both lessons.

The fifth and last layer consists of ordinary weekdays beyond Wednesdays, Fridays, and – taking archaic sources also into account – beyond Saturdays. They are rather divergent and only a high medieval development, documented mostly by some southern French and Catalonian missals, but sporadically even elsewhere.

In contrast, the Curial use of Rome, some of Southern France (e.g. Angoulême, Toulon, Gap), the uses of the religious orders, and – remarkably – all the mature uses of the Hungarian Kingdom lack ferial readings in the non-privileged seasons. Statistically, neither the traditions with more-than-average weekday

pericopes nor those with no weekday pericopes at all belong to the cluster that can be analyzed in quantitative terms.

In sum, introducing the notion of pericope density reflects the experience that – taking both history and geography into account – the above-listed days are provided with pericopes in a decreasing measure. There is more information available about Lenten Sundays than ordinary Sundays, more about ordinary Sundays than ordinary ferias, and more about ordinary Wednesdays and Fridays than ordinary Tuesdays. Not surprisingly, the scale of density matches the scale of variation. Pericopes of more densely documented days are more uniform; more scarcely documented days have more varying pericopes. For a reliable result, both the historical and the geographical perspectives must be evaluated, as already the earliest sources provide some information about the less dense layers, but even the latest sources may be limited to the densest ones. The evolution of the order of pericopes must have made great progress before its first written sources were recorded. To penetrate its prehistory, statistical and typological analysis has to be applied.

In terms of pericope density, more than 70% of the recorded sources have readings for ordinary weekdays, yet only a little more than 40% of them have Friday lessons as well. This is less than 60% of those that have weekday readings at all. Greater diversity in a lesser sample indicates an even greater diversity in absolute terms; accordingly, a relatively low diversity in an extremely narrow sample indicates great diversity. The Mondays of Advent range between 2–7, but the total of the involved sources is just about the same. It means that practically every source has different pericopes.

Further caution is required on days that can host more than one liturgical topic. As different feasts may fall on the same date in the sanctoral cycle, there are several days also in the temporal to which feasts of a different origin are assigned. An obvious example is the first Sunday after Pentecost, shared between the

first Sunday of the post-Pentecost series, the octave of Whitsun, and Trinity Sunday. The temporal assignment without further specification seems to indicate high diversity, yet actually, the items belong to separate topics. By taking a closer look, we find that the octave of Whitsun and the first Sunday of the summer are of low diversity, although they quite often interchange their pericopes. The bulk of the evidence that suggests high diversity comes from Trinity Sunday, a feast that was later introduced to the annual cycle and left more space for local initiatives. Therefore, an exact query of assignments must take not only the dates but also the topics into account.

We have already realized that assignments do not always mean a one-to-one link between days and items. As it is most clear from the common of saints, some topics draw on a set of items. The stock of options may be rich, yet not unlimited. There is a certain freedom in selecting one specific entry on the list, but no freedom to abandoning the list itself. It seems that something similar happens on the highly diverse days of the temporal. Wednesday and Friday readings may be very divergent but, considering the whole set of lessons within a specific season, we find that the same readings occur in slightly different positions – at least within a specific region. In Germany, the readings of a Wednesday or Friday in Advent differ from diocese to diocese. The Germanic cluster of ferial readings in Advent is, however, almost the same. The exact choice of texts and in what order they were actually recited may differ (and it was undoubtedly peculiar to a certain use), yet until Christmas, the same collection was delivered everywhere. In Southern France and Spain, however, an entirely different and more divergent set of ferial Advent lessons was cultivated. Some systematic choices even shed light on interregional connections. A series of Friday lessons from Proverbs in the season after Pentecost, for instance, is peculiar to Galicia in Spain (Compostella, Ourense), North-

ern Burgundy (Autun, Auxerre, Chalon-sur-Saône) and Denmark (Copenhagen, Lund, Viborg).

To discover valuable findings like this, an intermediary level of sets and series must be settled between the total of the source material and isolated uses. It requires the analysis of single items. As the same pericope may come forth in more textual variants and sometimes in different dimensions, the records from actual service books are to be connected via standardized entries. A typical title or opening phrase may refer to a precise selection of biblical verses with a precise topic. To cite an extreme example, the discourse of Jesus with the woman of Samaria is a universal choice for the Friday of the third week in Lent. Yet, it starts not only with different wording in different books but also from a different verse of the 4th chapter of the Gospel of John. The incipits are characteristic of some regions, while the choice of the pericope is invariable. The analysis is worth being accomplished, but it leads to different conclusions with a narrow scope (about the original wording) and a broader one (about the chosen biblical passage).

Once we have the standard entry for each item, a query can be made about all the assignments in which the corresponding item occurs. It is highly informative if the occurrences are peculiar to a specific region or a specific season. In the first case, relatively rare items indicate a close historical or geographical relationship between some uses. With the help of such results, liturgical regions, lines of transmission, and formative periods can be detected. The second case, when a certain pericope appears in various positions but within the same season, reveals relevant sets of items. A combination of the two, a set of items only present in a certain region, marks the wider categories of liturgical landscapes; the uses in question did not interact directly, but they relied on a common heritage and were probably established among similar historical circumstances.

The compiler's perspective

Orders of pericopes were coherent systems, designed by competent individuals in a specific historical period. They were conceived as ritual means of keeping alive the sacred texts from a divine point of view, and again, as ritual means of perpetuating cultural memory from a human point of view. It is not enough for a sacred text to exist merely physically, in scrolls and codices, or mentally, in the consciousness of the believers. It must be recited aloud, and penetrate the cosmos with the vibration of its sound. It must be recalled, again and again, brought to the minds of those who are responsible for accommodating themselves to its values and for handing it over to the next generation. Such might have been the considerations by which Church Fathers were prompted to transform the Scriptures into a recurrent cycle of selected passages.

The statement is not theoretical, nor is it only proven by medieval traditions that refer to patristic origins, or by analogies from other religions with sacred books. The foremost proof comes from the primary evidence, as it suggests a comprehensive attitude at least towards the texts of the New Testament.

We know that the numbering of Bible chapters and verses was not yet at the disposal of the Fathers. The orientation within the text relied on two factors: the method of dividing the text into thematic units, sections or passages, and that of dividing it into physical units, pages or columns. The first is self-evident, as even now it is common to quote a passage by its contents like the flood, the passing through the Red Sea, the hymn of charity, or the vision of the new Jerusalem. With the passages of the Gospels, such a thematic approach was even more desirable. A basis of comparison must have been introduced; concordances could take entries as a point of departure to link together passages that are present in more than one of the Gospels like the parable of the sower, the healing of the paralytic, or ultimately

the passion narrative. As traditional pericopes are, as a rule, thematically consistent units of standard dimensions, the aim of the first compilers might have been a synopsis of the Gospel and an anthology of the apostolic letters throughout the days of the year that were frequented by all the faithful. In the earliest times, mass was only celebrated on the days when a gathering of the Church, an *ecclesiastica synaxis* was obligatory. These were the days that originally possessed proper liturgical texts at all: Sundays, the octaves of Easter and Whitsun, privileged ferias of Lent and the Ember Days, along with the most prominent feasts. If read continuously, their lessons provide a comprehensive selection of the two basic corpora of the New Testament.

It is important to emphasize again that Gospel pericopes and lessons worked independently. Their selections were probably designed as autonomous series and, in the long run, lessons remained more resistant to historical changes, probably because doctrinal and moral texts left a shallower imprint on the audience's memory. The correspondence between the lesson (along with the prophecies) and the Gospel of a day is remarkably loose. When comparing traditions, the two series can entirely drift apart from one another in a season of the year, mostly in Advent and after Trinity, without changing the inner sequence of their respective lists of epistles or Gospels.

Both the temporal and the sanctoral were involved in this archaic synopsis or anthology. Passages that are present in the temporal cycle do not return in the sanctoral, and vice versa, those belonging to ancient feasts are missing from the temporal system. In some cases, the presence or the absence of a pericope in the temporal cycle can be an indicator of the feast's relative antiquity. Self-evidently, the Gospels of Christmas or Epiphany are the exclusive property of those days. All the passages relating to the conception and the birth of St John the Baptist are missing from the temporal cycle, although the opening chapters of the Gospels are otherwise meticulously checked by the system.

The annunciation scene, however, is the Gospel of the Ember Wednesday in December, and Mary Magdalene at the tomb of Jesus is that of Easter Thursday. It means that their reuse on the corresponding feasts is secondary from a historical perspective and that such feasts were introduced into the Roman rite only after the primordial layer of the pericopes had already been fixed.

At the early level, thematic duplication was avoided. Only the passion is narrated according to all four evangelists. As with other passages, the order of pericopes proves to be a kind of Diatessaron, a harmony of the four Gospels. The concept becomes manifest in the very formula of their liturgical recitation: "The next section of the [one and only] holy Gospel (*sequentia sancti Evangelii*) according to [one of its actual witnesses] (*secundum N.*)" Famous stories or parables that are unique to one of the evangelists become pericopes almost automatically. Of those that have parallel variants, usually, the first one wins; if the temptation of Jesus is equally related by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, it will be the version of Matthew that represents the passage in the lectionary.

The method recalls the Eusebian Canons, the chief tool for collating the Gospels from late antiquity to the High Middle Ages. The often beautifully ornamented columns of the Eusebian concordance tables typically introduced late antique and medieval Gospel books; they were the other basic indexing tool besides the *capitularia* indicating liturgical assignments. To identify thematic units in the main text, Eusebian numbers were written in the margins as well and frequently corresponded to liturgical divisions. The principle of listing parallel passages from left to right in the canon tables might have resulted in the dominance of Matthew and the relative neglect of Mark within the synoptic circle. The principle holds for Luke and John as well, but they were compensated by the abundance of their unique passages.

Accordingly, the lessons of the days with an *ecclesiastica synaxis* prove to form a closed, comprehensive and proportionate system. Thematically, it covers the entire corpus of the Gospels and provides a rich anthology of the apostolic letters. In terms of variation, it proves to be the most universal layer of the lectionary until the abolition of local uses in the early modern period. Its use is attested by the homilies of Gregory the Great and in part already by sermons of Leo the Great so that the traditional dating to the age of St Jerome and Pope Damasus does not seem unfounded.

As the Lenten Thursdays and the feasts that first break the rule of avoiding duplicates were introduced in the 7–8th centuries, this period may serve as a limit for the following layer. It seems probable that some loose selection for the ordinary Sundays after Pentecost already existed at this time. Their cluster is rather constant in the mature traditions although their exact sequence may vary. Most probably, the principle of sets prevailed here again; lessons for the ordinary Sundays were already part of the primordial selection without being rigorously fixed at a certain date.

The first attempts to widen this repertory can be seen on vacant Sundays and especially on Lenten Thursdays. The more archaic way to provide them with lessons was the adoption of already existing pericopes. Vacant Sundays repeated, as a rule, one of the readings of the preceding week, while Lenten Thursdays borrowed from various distant dates of the year. This approach suggests a rather reverent attitude towards the ancient pericopes as if no intervention was legitimate in an already established and respectable tradition. One has the impression that the reformers of the 8th century were still highly aware of the efforts of their ancestors to build up a coherent and comprehensive system. Soon, however, they overcame their shyness. In the majority of advanced lectionaries, both vacant Sundays and Thursdays of Lent are provided with lessons that are unique or at least

dominant in this position. The gaps began to be filled, namely, passages not used so far as pericopes started to be assigned on days that were not occupied by the choices of the earlier system. For example, a brand-new selection from the 5–8th chapters of John took the Lenten Thursdays. This lengthy argumentation between Jesus and the Pharisees might have been unattractive for the first compilers, yet they aptly expressed the growing tension that was about to lead to the crucifixion and thus foreshadowed the Holy Week. Furthermore, their frequent Eucharistic allusions superbly combined the theme of Lent (the passion) with that of the mass (the Eucharist).

This enlargement must have happened at an early date and already before the Carolingian dissemination of the Roman rite. Not only is it already documented by the first generation of sources, but it forms a dispersed geographical pattern. Although the heartland of the archaic, duplicating tradition is in Rome and the Mediterranean, sporadically it occurs almost everywhere: France, Germany, Denmark, Czechia, and Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, the majority of the continent adopted the innovative tradition with the new pericopes. They are equally represented by uses from the South and the North, and, in many cases, both approaches are present in the same region or even blended by the same tradition.

The next wave of enlargement involved the ferias. References to ferial lessons outside of Lent and the great octaves are already present in the first documents that survived and, in the age of authority, as we had put it, each source pretended to represent the use of Rome. The official sources of the established Curial rite, however, persevered in not adopting them, and their absolute diversity confirms the assumption that they did not belong to the original repertory. Similarly to the post-Pentecost readings, their selection was governed by the principle of sets, and thus their assignments were somewhat loose. Even so, several independent collections circulate, which may be a symptom of

competing initiatives. After the dissemination of the Roman rite, local authorities were tempted to join their predecessors in liturgy-making: to fill the gaps of the annual cycle and to dispose of the so-far neglected remnants of Holy Writ. Their creativity resulted in a virtually full appropriation of the apostolic letters and the rehabilitation of parallel passages (*concordia*) from the synoptic Gospels beyond Matthew.

The four Gospels in Latin amount to approximately 60 000 words and the apostolic letters represent about 80% of them, ca. 48 000 words. With pericopes of 150 words on average (passions excepted) and with taking also the sanctoral into account, it is not unrealistic to distribute this quantity in a cycle where even ordinary weeks possess at least three sets of lessons. This development took place on a regional basis after the Carolingian dissemination of the Roman lectionary when distinctive pericopes and collections conformed to territorial patterns. This had been the typical state of affairs documented in the sources of the High Middle Ages, and only the post-Tridentine adoption of the Curial use did relegate it to the past. With that, peculiarly, the least innovative tradition gained a monopoly.

Ways of reuse and reshaping

After the consolidation of local lectionaries, further developments balanced between respect and creativity. Even for recently introduced feasts, seldom did new pericopes arise. They relied on the traditional store, based on the choices of the archaic Roman lectionary for specific saints of the same category. Gradually, this basic store of sanctoral readings was enriched in a process parallel with the enlargement of the temporal series. It was an urgent need as the number of saint's days ever increased, and – from the celebrant's point of view, too often forgotten by scholars – the lessons of the common of saints were repeated most frequently. Therefore, a local commune can range from a

very conservative, narrow type that is almost identical to the urban Roman sanctoral of the first millennium to a colourful and more ample collection that gathers new texts with the same ingenuity as the ferial layer. Needless to say, traditions preferring the former type are closer to one another in their choices, while those with a commune of more numerous and more peculiar choices tend to be more diverse.

Some feasts, especially of the Lord, the Virgin Mary, and biblical saints or events, borrowed lessons from the temporal cycle. As mentioned above, it is an indicator of a feast's antiquity if its pericopes are unemployed by the temporal. As a matter of course, relatively late feasts like Visitation or Transfiguration repeat lessons from elsewhere (the Winter Ember Friday and the Spring Ember Saturday, respectively), and such ancient Roman feasts as St Lawrence or Peter and Paul have lessons of their own. Assumption Day and Michaelmas also have unique lessons, but the Invention of the Holy Cross and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin share readings with days of the temporal. In the former case, the related day is the octave of Whitsun, originally a vacant Sunday, and the date of the feast, 3 May, had been occupied by Roman martyrs: Alexander, Eventius, and Theodolus. In the latter case, the shared Gospel is identical to the Genealogy of Matthew that was recited in a solemn tone on Christmas Eve at the end of matins. The singing of a Genealogy on the night of Christmas and Epiphany is not an ancient Roman practice, but the Gospel in general at the end of solemn matins probably is. In both cases, the direction of the borrowing is ambiguous. 7–8th-century feasts, therefore, prove to be a landmark to distinguish between an old and a new generation of festal pericopes.

Votive masses attest to a more creative way of duplication. As stated before, the usual method of their creation was a witty juxtaposition of well-known but originally disparate liturgical items on a thematic ground. Votive lessons, however, have not always remained intact. More often than not, they went through a pro-

cess of abbreviation due to the requirement that votive masses, mostly celebrated privately at a side altar, should be short, but also because the verses for the sake of which the given passage was chosen were rendered more emphatic by omitting the rest. Typical instances for both are the dialogue between Martha and Jesus in funeral masses from the long Lenten pericope of the raising of Lazarus, or the episode of flagellation and crowning from the Passions in the mass of the Crown of Thorns. Here, the rule of standard dimensions did not apply any more. As there was no sharp distinction between votive masses and new feasts, several outcomes of the votive technique of pericope-making found their way also into the annual cycle.

It was not only the votive technique that reshaped the Passions. It has already been mentioned that the last section, also known as the *planctus*, was ceremonially and musically detached from them. Other divisions articulated the texts as well. Quite frequently, the moment of Jesus's expiration was highlighted by rubrics and dramatized by a unique musical formulation of the Aramaic sentence "Eli, Eli, lamma sabachtani." The stripping of Jesus and the division of his garment or the rending-in-two of the Temple's veil could be similarly emphatic movements accompanied by illustrative gestures. Still, the Passions served long as a sacred, inaccessible precinct of which votive texts were only cut off in the High Middle Ages and afterwards.

Biblical lessons outside of the mass propers form the last category of reused or reshaped pericopes. Their recurrence in the divine office has already been touched upon. A specific variant of the phenomenon is the reading of the Genealogies, Matthew on the Vigil of Christmas, and Luke on that of Epiphany. Though not recited in the mass, both seem to be integral parts of the system of pericopes. The same holds for the lessons that precede the blessing of the branches on Palm Sunday. The Old Testament lessons are unique in this position, and the Gospel recalls the problem of the direction of early borrowings. In a pan-European

context, the triumphal entry to Jerusalem according to Matthew is the most widespread Gospel of the first Sunday of Advent, yet it is missing from the Roman and many other Mediterranean traditions. Exactly in those and in most of the western uses of Europe, the variant of Matthew is read on Palm Sunday, while many eastern uses prefer the parallel versions of Mark and Luke, and Anglo-Norman uses prefer that of John, obviously to avoid duplication. If we assume that the Mediterranean traditions represent a more archaic arrangement, it may be concluded that, here again, a non-mass pericope counts as an integral part of the cycle. A similar suspicion emerges concerning the lessons before the washing of feet. According to the testimony of the most ancient Roman sources, Maundy Thursday – as originally every other Thursday in Lent – lacked lessons of its own. Its future lessons, however, were delivered that evening as the opening to the ceremony of the *mandatum*, the washing of feet. Certainly, both lessons evoke the Last Supper, but it would have been unnecessary to repeat them, had they already been recited during the mass of the day.

Other lessons of occasional ceremonies have more in common with votive pericopes. Where it was read, the last Gospel of the mass ordinary was the Prologue of John, the same as in the high mass on Christmas Day. In two different senses, but in actual reality, the Word has just been made flesh in both cases. The churching of women (their reception into the church after childbirth) repeats the Gospel of Candlemas. The blessing of wine on St John's Day starts with the Gospel on the wedding feast at Cana, the pericope of the second Sunday after Epiphany. All these and several other instances bring to mind the technique of votive reinterpretation. A passage that was read at a certain point of the year in the more general context of salvation history is re-read with a narrower focus on a material issue in the present moment. Such lessons were not singled out from the Bible in the abstract. They were received as pericopes. And

this makes it also perceptible how strongly texts of the Bible were associated with certain dates, and how deep a source of inspiration this could have been for the liturgical mind.

THE MASS ANTIPHONARY

Plainchant and its transmission

Ancient documents refer to the annual cycle of proper chants in the mass as the *antiphonarium missae*, a term describing the same book type as the gradual but more appropriate to denote its content in the abstract. There is a strange relationship between the hierarchical rank of these chants and the attention dedicated to them. Cantors or psalmists stood on the lowest grade of the ecclesiastical order, and chants ranked lower than readings (recited by deacons, subdeacons, or lectors) and orations (reserved for priests). Yet in fact, readings multiply easier than prayers, and prayers than chants, for it is less costly to select an already existing text from the Scriptures than to write a new text, and to write a new text less costly than to compose a new melody. This holds even truer for an age without musical notation when inventing, maintaining, and transmitting extensive repertoires was only possible by professionals with outstanding capacities and long years of instruction. High-ranking prelates were easily replaceable, but liturgical singers were both cherished performers and living stores of memory.

It seems that the composition and regular performance of the mass and office antiphonaries were unparalleled achievements of the Roman church, admired by all who attended papal services in the 7–9th centuries. Historical records on liturgical issues from the age of Pepin the Short and Charlemagne are more concerned with the mastering of musical skills and repertoires than

anything else. This is the field where the question of authenticity first emerged. Books with lists of readings and collections of prayers claiming Roman origin had long circulated in the Frankish realm, but chants were more than their lyrics hence their melodies could only be acquired from accredited cantors. This contributed to a more exclusivist attitude towards authentic Roman practice than in the cases of recited genres.

Pure texts, however, could be more effectively standardized. We may assume that, under the circumstances of oral transmission, melodies were less uniform than an imperial official would have expected. Due to their liturgical assignments, many chants occurred only once a year. Singers had to recall them without written aids after a long time during which they had few opportunities to refresh their memories; dozens of other chants must have been rehearsed and performed from day to day. As in unwritten music cultures all over the world, the artistic personality and ornamentation style of individual performers probably played a prominent role in realizing the pieces, especially their soloist's parts. There is even a legend that the Roman singers were jealous of their art and wilfully deceived their Frankish colleagues by teaching them forged melodies. Furthermore, the great formative period of the Roman chant was not yet past when the Franks began to attain its output. Collections of readings and prayers cited bygone authorities, but the *schola cantorum* still flourished, and, indeed, was at the top of its career. The very divergence of early musical repertoires in Gaul, Rome, and Benevento proves that the common heritage evolved in various directions already during the 8th and 9th centuries. In many cases, it is pointless to search for an original.

Still, the fundamental unity of the Gregorian chant is astonishing in its first musically decipherable renderings. They attest to the power and durability of oral transmission. Divergence primarily concerns those genres and assignments that were unfinished in the 8th century; with the rest, variation is limited to

unconscious, quasi-dialectal developments. The pieces of the core repertory are essentially the same both textually and musically, assigned on the same day; differences resemble the variation of folk songs recorded in distant settlements of continuous cultural areas. In the same location, however, melodies tend to be consistent. Uses mean musical traditions as well, and their sources often agree from note to note over centuries.

Though the epoch of transalpine interaction is crucial for the study of Roman liturgical chant, horizons open both forwards and backwards. We can state that the pan-European dissemination of the mass antiphonary was an even greater achievement than its original composition. The music of the papal masses was once the business of a carefully selected and trained elite, but, in the dawn of the modern age, we find fully notated graduals and antiphonals in every village church, and their contents diligently taught to every schoolboy. If the distinctive feature of western music is its written transmission, the process began in a liturgical context with the quest for musical authenticity and the zeal for propagating it. A once oral elite culture proved to be the model of written popular culture.

On the other hand, the history of the Roman chant did not begin with the *schola cantorum*. The fundamental unity of text, music, and assignment only implies that synthesis has been attained by the reign of Pepin the Short and his contemporaries. Uniformity indicates Roman consensus in the 8th century, but it rests on a prehistory no less complex than its afterlife. The well-documented period inserted recent compositions into a much more extensive repertory of ancient pieces, and we might reasonably suppose that it was not otherwise with recent compositions before the well-documented period. Textual choices, musical styles, and ambiguities of liturgical assignment help to demarcate historical layers within the established pre-Carolingian material just as new pieces and local variance do within the post-Carolingian. Comparative analysis stands on firmer

ground in the latter case as it can conclude from direct evidence, but, indirectly, some observations may also penetrate the darkness that surrounds the early history of plainchant.

The Gregorian core and its extension

In every genre, there is a deep gap between the stock of universally known proper chants and regional, rare, or unique developments. Their distribution does not resemble that of the readings with their constantly decreasing graph, but it recalls the uneven proportions observed above with the popularity of saints. Approximately 25–50% of each genre's repertory belong to the basic stock; then follows a modest intermediary range of relatively wide-spread yet not omnipresent chants, often conforming to landscapes or regions; and, lastly, the corpora of sporadic or unique chants come near to one half of the material. We can always determine a point or short section in the statistics where the number of occurrences rapidly falls.

The introit *Si enim credimus* is a Germanic alternative for the *Requiem* in funeral masses, but also popular in the eastern provinces of France. It comes forth more than twice as many times as its second in the list, *Laetemur omnes*, a typically Western French and Norman introit of the Conversion of St Paul. It means that, as for introits, the gap lies between pieces that build up circa 150 down to 90pcm of the genre's corpus. The transition between ubiquitous and regional graduals is smoother, but the gap between 200 and 100pcm is only bridged by an intermediary range of fewer than ten items. After them, the usual break comes between *Concupivit rex*, a mostly Burgundian choice for holy females that appears more than twice as many times as *Propter veritatem*, a typically French gradual for the same category (ca. 240 to 90pcm). The occurrences of *Gaude Maria*, the default tract of Candlemas, almost double those of the primarily French funeral tract *Absolve Domine*. The gap is only filled by

two chants. As tracts only concern penitential seasons and thus form a smaller repertory, here the rupture is between circa 1100 and 700pcm. As to offertories, *Stetit pontifex* is a popular contrafact for votive masses against pestilence, and *O pie Deus* is a funeral offertory, peculiar to Northern and Eastern Europe. The first is twice as common as the second, and only eight items fall in the intermediary domain (ca. 240 to 90pcm). With communions, the gap divides the western *Beati mundo corde* for martyrs and the equally western *Vincenti dabo*, a chant honouring the Name of Jesus (ca. 220 to 80pcm).

From these formulas, it is already clear that the Roman core repertory sharply contrasts with its regional or local supplements, and that it is the narrow intermediary range that provides the most valuable information for comparative research. Yet, for a deeper insight, we must consider the inner proportions of each genre and interpret them according to varying attitudes towards augmentation, the genre's position within the liturgical fabric, and the proper's intended publicity.

The first extant missal with musical notation from Esztergom, Hungary comes from the first half of the 14th century. As notated manuscripts typically do, it writes out each musical item only once. These chants with full text and melody are assigned exactly to the same days as in the earliest comprehensive textbooks from the 8–10th century, edited by René-Jean Hesbert, or the first graduals with neumatic notation like the celebrated Ms. 239 from Laon, although the overall missal represents the established state of the use of Esztergom with all of its distinctive features and high medieval accessories. Such extreme conservatism, overarching more than half a millennium, does not concern every aspect of the liturgy but the chants and orations of the propers. It can be justly labelled Gregorianism as it was the allegedly authentic antiphony (both for mass and office) and sacramentary that claimed Pope Gregory the Great as their author. Hence, Gregorianism represents a purist attitude

in questions of liturgical music and can be recognized primarily by two factors: the preservation of common chants in their precise sanctoral position and the resistance to unauthorized new chants in the context of the annual cycle.

Gregorianism marks one extreme on a scale of attitudes towards the legacy of Rome. It does not always spring from continuity with the earliest evidence, but, not infrequently, from an academic, back-to-the-sources doctrine of adherents of the 11th-century Gregorian movement. This is obvious from the geographic scope. On 19 June, the Roman church celebrated the Milanese martyrs Gervase and Protase consistently with the introit *Loquetur Dominus*, the offertory *Laetamini in Domino*, and the communion *Posuerunt mortalia*. Alleluias varied from source to source already in the earliest evidence; only the gradual was selected from a narrow yet finite repertory. Old Roman books had *Clamaverunt iusti*, early Frankish ones preferred *Gloriosus Deus*, but other options from the common of martyrs circulated as well. When mapping the occurrences, we find that the Old Roman choice has not left a significant imprint. The early Frankish choice, however, concentrates between the Seine and the Loire, the heartland of the Carolingian Empire; it is scattered in Germany, Hungary, and Poland, and prevails in Denmark. The French focus does not deserve comment; these were the first territories to receive the Roman chant in the 8–9th centuries. In Germany, Roman authenticity worked as a certification seal for imperial ambitions already in the 10–11th centuries, and, subsequently, became associated with the Gregorian reforms in the 12–13th centuries. Such inclinations were not shared by everyone; the Germans were divided between papal and imperial fractions, similar to their Czech and Hungarian neighbours. In Denmark, however, the high medieval creation of the national liturgy obeyed Gregorian directives. Similar patterns repeat themselves in almost every case when we compare variants in traditional assignments to the earliest Frankish doc-

uments. For the conservatives of the second millennium, they represented the authentic antiphony of Gregory the Great.

This also meant that, for them, the Gregorian repertory in the strict sense of the word consisted of a closed number of authentic items. The above-cited feast of St Paul's Conversion was not part of the first Roman sources, but it soon spread over the continent. Its high medieval propers split the map in two with a frontier band along Upper France and Burgundy. Churches in the East prove purist; they repeat the *Scio cui credidi*, a Gregorian set of the original Roman feast of St Paul (30 June). The West, however, sings *Laetetur omnes*, a fully composed series of novel propers. This is a recurrent pattern. The exact borderline may shift between the Rhine and the Rhône, but anyway, it is typically the East that adheres to the Gregorian fundamentals. If Burgundy and Provence are involved, this may suggest an early, 9th-century divide between West Francia and the rest; if Gregorian features are only characteristic of Germany, they tend to be the results of restoration attempts in the 10–12th centuries.

Innovation and repertory

It is worth emphasizing that this kind of purism did not entail an entirely hostile reception of novelties. The constraints did not extend to the loose domains of processional rites, sequences and so far undefined Alleluias, new feasts, and votive services; they only differentiated between a canonized layer that ought to be protected and still unfixed layers where creativity could freely unfold. Yet the western tendency for innovation was not boundless either. By moving towards the other extreme on the scale, we must consider the canonicity, function, and precedents of each chanted genre separately.

Disregarding Alleluias and sequences, late medieval repertories are evenly spread. There are about 360 introits, 490 offertories, and 550 communions for the entire year; 410 graduals

for the seasons outside of Eastertide, and 250 tracts for the Alleluia-less seasons. If we consider that every day can host more sanctoral assignments, additionally several votive masses, and circa 120 days have full temporal formularies, a rounded range between 1–3 chants per genre per day seems quite realistic. There is a stark contrast, however, between a genre's core repertory and its supplements. The traditional Roman sets of introits (ca. 140) and communions (ca. 130) far exceeded those of the graduals (ca. 90) and offertories (ca. 80), not to speak about tracts (less than 30). This implies that the core repertories have been disproportionately augmented; there is a scale of accession that grows from the introits in the direction of communions. To understand it, we must delineate how the respective genres were regarded by medieval clergymen.

Even today, the most emblematic texts of a mass prove to be its Gospel and its introit; they are those that a naive but attentive observer can easily remember. Introits are apt to serve as markers of entire formularies both in medieval sources and modern scholarly discourse. Moreover, their cycle was fully composed; almost every temporal *synaxis* and every principal feast are equipped with an introit in the earliest extant sources, and the first supplements, like the *Memento* for the 4th Sunday of Advent, also go back to ancient times. This means that introits could not be replaced without losing their emblematic role, and neither was there an urgent need in their case to supplement a defective repertory. Yet, exactly for the same reason, composing a new introit provided a challenge and an attractive opportunity to enhance a locally important feast and, through this, to perpetuate the memory of an author or his ecclesiastical body. Introit verses provided an opportunity for reconciling tradition and innovation. In several cases, a boldly selected verse customizes the intact introit, and this may answer for the outstanding number of additional introit verses (ca. 440 against the traditional 70).

Graduals and tracts often recur already in the traditional repertory. They were no more the opening of the service and applied a uniform set of melodic formulas. In consequence, they were less characteristic for the precise date; only some graduals with extraordinary melodies and some extremely long tracts became closely associated with their days. Any modestly talented musician was able to set a new text to the existing melodic patterns and, indeed, the required skills belonged to the rudiments of medieval education. This is what we meant above by easy reproducibility. On the other hand, traditional graduals were exclusively based on psalm texts and breathed the air of antiquity. For a person still imbued with respect for Gregorian authenticity, it might have been an audacious and even disrespectful step to interfere with the genre. Tracts were more open to innovation. Some non-psalmic tracts (although obvious contrafacts) belong to the universally known layer of the genre, and already medieval experts were fully aware that some tracts like the *Dixit Dominus* on the 2nd Sunday of Lent or the *Eripe me* on Good Friday were later additions.

One can find the most numerous unmotivated duplicates in the repertory of offertories. It is difficult to find any substantial connection between the 3rd Sunday after Epiphany, the 3rd Tuesday of Lent, and Maundy Thursday, yet their offertory was equally *Dextera Domini*. The cycle gave the impression of being unfinished. In addition, the first attempts to supplement it already figured in the core repertory. No one could mistake the monumental and dramatic pieces of late summer and autumn Sundays about Moses, Daniel, Job, or Esther for a traditional psalmic offertory. The ceremonial act of offering itself outmatched the length of an average offertory without verses, hence, most probably, some singers frequently added further compositions to the official chant, similar to organ pieces or congregational hymns of later epochs. Of these, the best might have aspired for liturgical recognition, especially if replacing

worn-off duplicates. Accordingly, the tendency to multiply offerings was not counterbalanced by any liturgical scruples which may explain their steep increment.

The statement applies even more to communions, although their cycle by no means gave an unfinished impression. The core repertory counted almost as many items as that of the introits, but they were musically more heterogeneous and departed from the traditional textual basis of psalms more often than any other genre. Such precedents encouraged medieval composers to take a similar direction and this may account for the unparalleled growth of the stock of communions by the end of the Middle Ages.

In this sense, Alleluias and sequences could be safely exempted from the category of mass propers. Their supplementation was unlimited. Still, we must recall what had been said in the context of the ecclesiastical year. There existed traditional Alleluias, especially for the winter section of the temporal and the principal sanctoral feasts, affecting the related categories of the common of saints. Further temporal Alleluias draw on a relatively closed store of possibilities, even if their assignments prove looser in comparison with other chants. Greater freedom, therefore, does not automatically signal unconditional diversity. We must distinguish between fixed assignments, freely arranged but limited and traditional sets, and truly local, contemporary additions that, in large numbers, only figure in the secondary layers of the sanctoral and the votives.

Even sequences, the *par excellence* modern genre of mass propers, show an analogous distribution. The number of only those sequences that were in verifiable liturgical use far exceeds one thousand, yet more than 70% of them are unique or very rare. Only about 20 are universally known, and those associated with the temporal or principal feasts count no more than 300. The statistics represent a slowly slanting graph, indicating that, in this case, there was no Roman core repertory as such. The

east-west divide between conservatives and innovators, however, can be detected. Germanic churches typically adhere to the Notkerian sequence repertory of the 9–10th centuries, at least for the milestones of the ecclesiastical year, while French and British churches were more open to the 12th-century wave of Parisian sequence poetry, hallmarked by the style of Adam of Saint-Victor and his followers. Iberian churches, although very receptive to other manifestations of liturgical poetry, sang surprisingly few sequences. Their attitude seems to foreshadow the almost total rejection of the genre by the post-Tridentine period.

Innovation and assignment

A further aspect concerns the assignments where an extension was likely or unlikely. Before the Neo-Gallican service books, it was inconceivable to drop an established chant of the Roman core repertory, and at least exceptional to transfer it from its traditional place. The courage to innovate moved from more solid assignments to less solid ones, basically comprising three types of properizing activity.

The first consisted in eliminating duplicates. The most archaic examples are vacant Sundays like the aforementioned 4th Sunday of Advent, or defective seasons like the 4–6th weeks after Epiphany where some southern churches recycled propers from the season after Pentecost. Here the first, default assignment of each chant was universally safeguarded, but some uses got rid of the repetitions either by new chants or by borrowings from distant points of the year.

On a smaller scale, duplicates could be avoided by differentiating between high-ranking feasts, their octaves, their vigils, and other feasts of the same saint. St Martin, the iconic confessor bishop of the early church, was typically celebrated with a common series of chants (*Statuit*), at most supplemented with a proper Alleluia and a sequence. In Tours, the Loire Valley, and

sporadically Southern France, too, he had a fully composed series of poetic propers (*O beatum virum*). This, however, did not result in abolishing the *Statuit* mass that was undoubtedly less personal but more ancient and widely respected. In consequence, most of the churches honouring St Martin applied his personalized series on his vigil, on or within his octave, or on the feast of his Translation (4 July), and kept the commune for his main feast (11 November).

St Martial, the honoured saint of Limoges, had no fully composed series, and still, the Limousine church celebrated his four feasts with three different sets of propers, each with a different focus. The main feast (30 June) and his two Translations (10 October and 12 November) blended a traditional series for saintly bishops with an equally traditional series for apostles. The latter implied that Martial was the apostle of Gaul, one of the Lord's seventy-two disciples, personally baptized and sent to Aquitaine by St Peter. Limousines were very keen on the subject. A diocesan council of 1034 solemnly declared that he deserved the title of an apostle, and petitions for warranting his apostolic veneration continued up to the 19–20th centuries. In this milieu, a however commonplace chant from the common of the apostles conveyed a significant message, but none of them did entirely replace the more modest items of a bishop's commune. A third set of chants sounded on the feast of Martial's Apparition (16 June), mainly compiled from the said commons, yet with an introit borrowed from the Easter octave ("Come, ye, blessed of my Father") and a unique introit verse, invoking him as a heavenly citizen just possessing the kingdom prepared for him from the foundation of the world. In a primary sense, the addressee was certainly Martial himself, but in Easter week, the identical text had spoken to the neophytes. Accordingly, the chant might have addressed the newly baptized French in a secondary sense. The speaker was Martial and the prepared kingdom referred to Gaul as just being Christianized by him and his companions.

The second type of properization comprises accretions to traditional repertoires. Extending the common of saints was a self-explanatory ambition as the most frequented commune chants were performed at least thrice as often as average Sunday items. Similar to the elimination of duplicates, the tendency could result both in the reinterpretation of old chants and the composition of new ones. The above-cited introit of Easter Tuesday (*Venite benedicti*) is not exclusive to St Martial; it has been incorporated into the common of martyrs in several uses. The method was more accepted than supplementing the established commons with brand-new items, but it happened, too. In the context of statistics, we have already mentioned that the otherwise conservative churches of Burgundy added local graduals to the commons of holy females or martyrs. When browsing the intermediary ranges of single genres, we regularly find such entries. Their common features are that, first, they inconsistently join traditional formularies and only rarely build up full series of propers, and, second, that they feature within relatively narrow geographical frontiers. *Caeli enarrant* is a Catalonian introit for apostles, *Magna est gloria* an Eastern French offertory for martyrs in the neighbourhood of Besançon, and *Euge serve bone* a Lyonnaise communion for confessors.

The third and most radical form of properization was the composition of serial propers; representing the opposite extreme on the attitude scale that began with Gregorianism. In some cases, serial propers simply meant a more consistent replacement of duplicates. Typical examples are the Conversion of St Paul, the Decollation of St John the Baptist, or Our Lady of Snows. Originally, none of them possessed real propers; they only borrowed the items of major, pre-existent feasts of the same saint. The introduction of a new feast could also stimulate poet-composers to create a series of coherent propers. Immaculate Conception, Visitation, or Transfiguration belong to this category. Others, like the Espousals of Mary and Joseph, the Tears

of Jesus, or one's Guardian Angel already waver between being part of the votives or the sanctoral. As we have seen, highly venerated devotional subjects had good chances to be elevated into regular feasts. Such was the fate of the Compassion of Mary, the Archangel Raphael as the patron of pilgrims, or the Lance and the Nails of Jesus. Last but not least, some extremely popular saints could break the rule of respecting traditional chants. St Catherine, Genevieve, or Anthony the Hermit each attained a fully composed series without preserving their previous chants. This made not a big loss; only common items for virgins and confessors were at stake.

When turning to the geographical scope of such innovations, our observations on western daring and eastern restraint are confirmed. Replaced duplicates, extended commons, and fully composed propers all concentrate on the West side of the Rhine. This, however, does not mean that Central and Eastern Europe did not take part in the enrichment of the Gregorian heritage. They happily embraced such early initiatives as the introit *Memento* or the tract *Dixit Dominus* on the vacant Sundays of Advent and Lent, respectively. Indeed, they were more unanimous in embracing them and dropping their earlier alternatives than western and southern churches. Moreover, the Lance and the Nails of Jesus was a markedly German feast, promoted to the temporal on the Friday after Easter week. The Compassion of Mary had two different series of chants, one in Swabia, and another in Saxony. Saxon, Bavarian, Czech, and Polish traditions were also active in adorning Corpus Christi masses with alternative chants, and there was a Poland-centred series for the Lord's Mercy as well.

Undoubtedly, western and especially French innovations were more numerous, but the line of demarcation did not draw between undertaking and inertia, but between public and private worship, sanctoral and votives. Before the Late Middle Ages, eastern churches thought that they were not authorized to over-

write the annual cycle of propers. Their enterprises were limited to the semi-private sphere of votive masses. In a roundabout way, even these could find their way to the annual cycle when being raised to real feasts, but this was by no means their planned purpose. Yet it would be a misunderstanding to suppose that those in the West were totally indifferent to tradition. Only the governing principles disagreed. For Germans, canonicity extended to the very arrangement of the cycle. In the more liberal interpretation of the French, this only concerned the repertory; if every item of the Roman heritage had a solid place in the year, this satisfied all the demands of tradition.

Bold initiatives as they were, new items and new series made further gestures towards tradition. Not every new proper is like the series of Our Lady of Snows, *Placuit divinae providentiae*, which narrates the origin of the Roman basilica *Santa Maria Maggiore* in a historical order through excerpts of its legend across the chanted genres. Many of them disguise themselves as borrowings, paraphrases, or tropes. New chants frequently begin with well-known opening words of other chants. *Domine praevenisti* is the top gradual of the year, but it lends its text to a rare Aquitanian introit for confessors. *Crucem sanctam subiit* is an office antiphon for the Invention of the Holy Cross, but it appears with a more elaborate melody as the feast's introit in early Zagreb. *Adorna thalamum* is a processional chant for Candlemas, but, with a different continuation, it heads the propers of "De Experta" in Cosenza, a votive mass in honour of the Virgin Mary finding his twelve-year-old son in the Temple of Jerusalem. The method is widespread; either the whole text is borrowed from the representative of another genre or only the incipit recalls it.

In any case, the association with an established chant has a twofold impact. It provides the recent chant with a legitimating link to its traditional model and utilizes the exegetical power of connotations that go with the latter. Transfiguration chants,

for example, masterfully evoke motifs like the light, the voice sounding from the heavens, the top of a mountain, the number three, or the adoration of the disciples by quoting or paraphrasing chants from Christmas, Epiphany, Trinity Sunday, and the ordinary season.

Ways of composing new plainchant

Both votive extensions and borrowings from other genres raise the intricate question of music. The methodological problem stems from the fact that textual witnesses far outnumber musically notated ones. Based on printed missals, we have a pretty comprehensive picture of late medieval repertoires, but only a small, uneven, and accidental percentage of the additional chants can be connected to melodies. One can never be sure if chants that do not belong to the Gregorian core repertory had melodies at all and, if they did, how uniform such melodies might have been and what was the date of their composition. In theory, five possibilities arise.

(1) In well-provided institutions, the high mass of the day was self-evidently chanted. This implies that proper associated with the temporal or the sanctoral cycle had melodies by definition. Not so with the votives. Votive masses were not necessarily low masses. Some could work as chanted high masses on weekdays, some emerged into regular feasts, and, even at the side altar of a remote chapel, singers could have assisted the celebrating priest as medieval illustrations often show it. Yet we cannot exclude that some proper were designed for reading only. Such read-only proper multiplied in the early modern era when plainchant had been pushed into the background either by low masses or by polyphony and instrumental music. Already in medieval private breviaries, several offices of saints are unique texts with no music surviving with them.

(2) Yet no text was forever deprived of a musical setting. As already emphasized, well-educated clerics could still compose plainchant in the early modern age. If there emerged a need to solemnly celebrate a previously read-only mass or office, it was easy to find an expert who could set the text to music. Pontifical services provide a fitting analogy to the phenomenon. Rites like the dedication of a church were not performed regularly, and their textbooks did not consistently contain notes. The actual celebration, however, could not do without music. For this reason, many of the chants were re-composed on an ad hoc basis, answering the requirements of a particular ceremony. Musicologists often find that notated pontificals, although providing the same texts, differ fundamentally in their melodies. This means not the accustomed, dialect-like variation of plainchant but truly distinct, unrelated melodies. The same can be shown with some modern Alleluias; it seems that pure texts could have been taken over and only locally equipped with musical notes. In sum, there is no sharp contrast between read and sung propers. What matters is if a distinct melody was an inseparable companion of a text, as it was self-evident in the core repertory.

(3) Concerning the extended repertory, a new set of propers was immediately designed for public celebration and the composition of text and music happened simultaneously. If they spread further, lyrics and melody were received as belonging together. Within this paradigm, we can differentiate between three levels of originality. The simplest way applies to those chants that cite or paraphrase pre-existent items. Paraphrases usually take an item of the same genre as their point of departure and, as the text only slightly varies, it seems obvious that they re-used the melody as well. There are, however, borrowings where the text is identical, but the genre is different. *Domine praevenisti*, *Offerentur regi*, or *Iustorum animae* are all introits derived from a widely-known gradual, offertory, and communion, and *Ioannes autem cum audisset* is based on the text of a popular office anti-

phon. Trans-generic connections are typical for the early history of plainchant. There is a whole category of responsory communions; we know at least one example of a tract gradual, and several melodic overlaps between other genres as well, especially in the Old Roman and Beneventan repertoires. So far, we cannot draw an overall picture due to the scarcity of notated sources, yet we have the faint impression that, for high medieval liturgy-makers, lifting over a melody from one genre to the other was still taboo. Later, however, this inhibition has also been suspended. In Bordeaux, we find that the Marian offertories *Recordare* and *Praeter rerum seriem*, or the communion *Ave regina caelorum* are equally reinterpreted as votive Alleluias. Doubtless, this only meant the addition of a tonally fitting Alleluia-refrain before and after the taken-over original chant.

(4) A further step to originality is if a pre-existent melody is adjusted to a new text. The results are labelled contrafacts and the method is commonly practiced already in the core repertory. The Roman introit of the nuptial mass, *Deus Israel*, is a contrafact of *Salve sancta parens*; the Marian gradual *Benedicta et venerabilis* is modelled on *Domine praevenisti*; the Michaelmas offertory *Stetit angelus* uses the same melody as *Viri Galilaei* on Ascension Day. These precedents might have encouraged posterity to make further use of such multifunctional melodies and, indeed, already the offertory of Corpus Christi, *Sacerdotes incensum*, is based on the *Viri Galilaei–Stetit angelus* doublet. In some cases, the syntactic parallelism even without notes suggests that new items were conceived as contrafacts, and the technique continued up to the 19–20th-century revival of Gregorian chant when propers of several new feasts must have been set to stylistically convincing music.

(5) Trans-generic borrowings, paraphrases, and contrafacts served the same purpose as troping; to create new pieces and still maintain the connection with the animating flow of tradition. This, however, was not obligatory and did not confine creative

energies. We know several high medieval composers of rhymed offices or sequences by their names. Some of them were influential bishops or theologians. Even in the late 15th century, an internationally renowned master of polyphony like Guillaume Dufay was requested to compose plainchant for a new Marian feast, and he did not find it beneath his dignity. Therefore, we might assume that the majority of new and especially poetic propers gained new melodies in the mass, too, contemporary with their introduction or with their promotion to calendrical rank. Both factors, nevertheless, bring up the issue of chronology.

Chronological outlines

The early 14th century proves a turn in liturgical matters. This was the time when new uses ceased to evolve, yet this did not imply the drying up of creative energies. On the contrary, fully composed propers began to flourish exactly from the period when the liturgical fabric as a whole was no more interesting from an author's point of view. In 1297, King St Louis was canonized and, in 1306, Philip the Fair acquired his cranium relic for Sainte-Chapelle in Paris. This probably contributed to the Northern French dissemination of his new mass of serial propers, *Magnificatus est rex pacificus*. Another fully composed mass, that of the Passion of the Lord or his Five Holy Wounds, *Humiliavit seipsum*, was attributed to Pope John XXII (1316–1334), and a mass against pestilence, *Recordare Domine*, to Clement VI (1342–1352) or Innocent VI (1352–1362). The latter was a response to the Black Death, peaking in Europe between 1347 and 1351. It was not the only series connected to the plague. Both St Roch and St Sebastian had fully composed masses (*Egredie Christi martyr* and *Congratulamini omnes*) that celebrated them as powerful patrons against pestilence. The mass of Roch prays for healing and the end of the epidemic, while the mass of Sebastian speaks of the plague in the past tense and the tone

of thanksgiving. A further fully composed mass, *Transite ad me*, celebrated the feast of the Virgin Mary's Visitation to Elisabeth, promulgated by Pope Urban VI in 1389 after 13th-century Franciscan precedents. Such a succession of 14th-century events points to a clear paradigm shift and suggests that serial propers were a late medieval development.

13th-century graduals and notated missals subscribe to this hypothesis. In them, we search almost in vain for the most frequent fully composed mass of all, the *Laetemur omnes* for the Conversion of St Paul. But only almost in vain, because some vestiges have survived. Although without the rest of the series, the introit is already there with musical notes in an early 13th-century missal from Mont-Saint-Michel. In this case, the series seems to have been developed from a properized introit and Alleluia, but those were surely not the products of the late Middle Ages. What is more, an 11th-century missal from Marmoutier contains the whole series of St Martin, *O beatum virum*, with its hagiographic gradual, offertory, and communion. They steadily figure in printed missals, but they were not the fruit of the 14th-century paradigm shift.

The bulk of French service books from the 11–13th centuries continues the basic Gregorian tradition. As compared to them, similar findings are rare, yet their mere existence demonstrates that extensions of the mass antiphony and even serial propers cannot be sorted out as exclusively late extravagancies. However bizarre and isolated a record of printed missals may be, a parallel of it can always emerge from the scanty evidence of early manuscripts.

We can draw a more systematic and illustrative picture from the well-documented 2nd Sunday of Lent. In the earliest “authentic” mass antiphonaries, the Sunday was left vacant. The Franco-Germanic mainstream borrowed its propers from the previous Ember Wednesday; only the gradual was somewhat variable as it had a more recent alternative in France. Beyond

this Gregorian type, we can register three properizing initiatives. They apply traditional psalm texts, hence they do not stick out from the texture of Lenten propers, but they are equally unique for their areas.

The least consistent attempt is a semi-finished series, peculiar to the Beneventan region and Dalmatia (*Dirige me*). It contains a distinctive introit, gradual, and communion, while the offertory comes from the basic repertory (the same as on Ash Wednesday), and the tract is a relatively widespread psalmic equivalent of the more popular Gospel tract of the day. The choice depends on the day's pericope, but they can occur side by side, too. There are two rival communions, one borrowed from the Friday of the 6th week, and a modern, unique one. Their competition also proves that the Beneventan series was not the product of a single compositional process. Yet the involvement of the Beneventan tradition in itself signals that this process took place before the High Middle Ages. The earliest sources stem from about 1000, and Benevento was at its golden age in the 9th century.

A perfectly arranged, fully composed series marks the Ibero-Provencal landscape (*Domine dilexi*). It covers the regions south of the Garonne and proves to be a closely related set of items of which none occurs either separately or anywhere beyond the area. The series already appears in a late 11th-century missal from the ancient Castilian monastery of San Millán, still using Visigothic script and neumatic notation. The document suggests that the Ibero-Provencal supplementation of Lent's vacant Sunday happened not much later than the Iberian churches adopted the Roman rite.

Another elaborate series marks a circle of Norman influence (*Sperent in te*). It is not necessarily assigned to the 2nd Sunday of Lent, but can be used on the last Sunday of the ordinary season as well. Unlike other Norman characteristics, it does not appear in Britain or Sicily, only in Normandy and Norway. Some of the chants, taken out from the series as a whole, exceed Normandy

and sporadically figure in its Northern French surroundings (Dol, Nantes, Soissons, Tournai). The pattern of distribution suggests spontaneous expansion and composition later than the formative period of the Anglo-Norman uses in the 11–12th centuries. Accordingly, the series is still absent from 13th-century missals from Évreux, Rouen, or Mont-Saint-Michel.

This, however, does not mean that earlier Norman liturgy-designers were uninterested in the extension of the temporal. The offertory of the vacant Saturday before Palm Sunday, *Recordare quod steterim*, is a significant marker of Anglo-Norman belonging. It is omnipresent in the British and Norman sources of the printed press period and has a few, dispersed parallels in Burgundy. Several 13th-century Norman manuscripts already contain it, but one of the earliest notated witnesses is a British-type missal of Skara, Sweden, from the mid-12th century.

The creation of new propers, therefore, cannot be forced into clear-cut chronological categories. Late medieval phenomena like the Transfiguration mass *Viderunt ingressus tuos* are counterbalanced by their archaic equivalents like the Beneventan mass of St Benedict *Vir Dei Benedictus*. After pondering geographical patterns and consulting the earliest evidence, each case must be evaluated in its own right. Yet our overall impression is that Gregorianism hallmarked an age of consolidation between both an earlier and a later period of greater freedom. By the early 14th century, the sensitivity to different layers of authority and historical background undoubtedly faded. In the previous two centuries, bold initiatives were not impossible, but they remained relatively few and isolated. Before the consolidating period, nevertheless, the mass antiphony was not regarded as a Gregorian monolith but as a prestigious yet accessible domain, open to extension and rearrangement. This is what we discover in Benevento and, indirectly, also in Rome.

The mass of St Agatha (5 February) utilizes a traditional selection of psalm texts that frequently recur in the common of

virgins. Yet its communion echoes the words of Agatha giving thanks in the prison to God for the restitution of her breasts that had been torn off by her torturers. Such a text is alien from the previous items and, indeed, from the classical Roman antiphony as a whole. Still, it is part of the Roman core repertory. It features both in the earliest Frankish and the Old Roman graduals, its occurrences evenly cover Europe, and there is no alternative for it outside of the bashful use of the Carthusians. Hagiographic propers already occur in the Beneventan missal where even the lessons may come from the lives of saints. Thus it seems that, in the crucial age when the mass antiphony began to spread beyond Italy, the ban prohibiting non-biblical propers was already lifted.

The logic of text selection circumscribes layers within the biblical material as well. As we have observed, the grandiose offertories of the autumn season represent something fundamentally different from psalmic offertories. Gospel communions build up a more numerous and consistent corpus, but they also contrast with the even more numerous corpus of psalm communions. The feasts of St Stephen and St Peter's Chains equally refer to events recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, but Stephen's introit indirectly applies a psalm excerpt to the story of the day's lesson ("For princes sat, and spoke against me"), while Peter's introit directly quotes the lesson ("the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me"). From the historical evidence, it is difficult to prove that propers with psalm texts are older than those drawn from other books of the Bible, but the compositional strategies are clearly different and non-psalmic propers in the core repertory form an obvious minority.

We can assume a prehistorical, that is, by written sources undocumented process behind the mass antiphony, analogous with what we can better follow historically in the evolution of the office antiphony. There too, the last step was a green light to non-biblical, hagiographic and poetic texts. Before that, the

discovery of new chant text resources like the cycle of Old Testament readings in the matins or the daily Gospels widened the repertoires of responsories and antiphons. Earlier times, however, treated the Psalter as an exclusive source of accredited chant texts and found it a greater challenge to select psalm verses that became charged with new meaning in the context of the day. This is what we can observe both on the greatest feasts of the temporal and in the common offices of saints. In the mass, St Lawrence's day is a good example. His vigil starts with words from Psalm 111 ("He hath distributed, he hath given to the poor") for Lawrence was the deacon and, in this quality, the financial manager of the Roman church who, after the martyrdom of his pope, distributed the treasure of the church among the most wretched of the city. On the next day, his high mass opens with Psalm 16 ("Thou hast proved my heart ... thou hast tried me by fire") as Lawrence himself suffered martyrdom on a gridiron over hot coals.

Yet on a more fundamental level, the office was a recitation of the Psalter in purely numeric order. Antiphons, versicles, and responsories have been selected from the continuous psalmody and, consequently, themselves followed numeric order. In some sections of the year, some genres of the mass bear the traits of a similar policy. Lenten weekday communions are the most famous examples, but Alleluias of the season after Pentecost still conform to the principle of psalm-sequence. According to this approach, it was not the interpretive power of psalms that mattered, but reciting psalms served as a general atmosphere surrounding the church's daily life, and singing psalms on elaborate melodies wrapped the holiest ceremonies of the mass in a holy cloud of devotion. Inconsistencies, crossings of generic boundaries, and borrowings from non-Roman traditions might have happened at an early date, but it is not unlikely that the successive stages of numeric psalmody, thematic psalm choice,

defined and undefined biblical corpora, and non-biblical texts roughly match the stages of the core repertory's enlargement.

This view is confirmed by melodic evidence. Already the basic stock of Roman plainchant is far from being homogenous. There is a great difference between the highly expressive, almost programmatic music of some non-psalmic chants, the noble but exuberant declamatory style of monumental psalmic pieces, and the astounding simplicity of others. In the communion of St Stephen (*Video caelos apertos*), one can recognize the death rattle of the martyr stoned to death and, in the communion of the 2nd Sunday after Epiphany (*Dicit Dominus*), the hiccup of the tipsy steward at the wedding of Cana. Such mannerism is alien from the day's offertory (*Iubilate*) which, however, is of extreme length, register, and power of expression already without its verses. It is in stark contrast with the short and simple chants of some ferias in Lent, or Sundays in the ordinary season. The 3rd Sunday after Pentecost, for instance, almost exclusively applies propers that do not exceed the musical requirements of essential office antiphons.

A case study: Ember Saturday canticles

The canticle of the three children provides an illuminating example of all that has been said by far. Here, the processes of composition, stylistic change, consolidation, and rearrangement emerge from the obscurity of an undocumented past and provide analogies for a better understanding of periods, mentalities, and geographical patterns in the formation and diversification of western plainchant genres.

The story begins with those uses that do not set the canticle to any music. This also means that, in this case, we do not need to conjecture any unwritten precedents; musically, everything that happened is recorded by extant sources and has been preserved at least in a few traditions. According to the uses of Lyon, Die,

and Uzès (all in the conservative region along the Rhône Valley), the whole narrative of the fiery furnace is recited as a prophecy (Dn 3:46–88), canticle included. Its introductory passage still preserves the original biblical text; other traditions slightly reordered it, inserting an earlier episode, the ruin of the servants heating the furnace (47–48), after the descent of the angel (49–50). In the primitive version of the Lyon group, the canticle itself is not yet differentiated though, as it will gain momentum in later adaptations, it organically splits into two parts. The first is a hymn of praise directly addressing God on behalf of the three children (*Benedictus es Domine Deus*), and the second is a refrained exhortation of the whole creation to join the praise (*Benedicite omnia opera*). Omitting the refrain, the latter part is also the canticle of lauds on Sundays and feasts. The two parts are connected by the verse *Benedictus es in firmamento caeli*, the last strophe of the direct praise that, simultaneously, may serve as an introduction to the exhortation.

Some uses felt the need to really sing something after such a tediously long prophecy, especially as it animated praise and praise was normally associated with singing. The uses of Bourges and Chartres appended a short and simple antiphon to it, the *Omnia opera Domini*. It is no more difficult than the motto-like antiphons of ferial psalmody, yet it proves to be an original composition for Ember Saturdays as it does not occur anywhere in the office traditions. Augsburg developed a more advanced form of the same antiphon. There, they omitted the canticle text from the prophecy, and reformulated its second part as a chant, interrupted after every third verse by the antiphon as a refrain strophe. The version is unique for Augsburg and it is one of the most remarkable proofs of liturgical continuity. It first occurs in a 10th-century missal and lasts until the early modern abolition of the Augsburg use.

These were local initiatives, independent of Rome where a more magnificent canticle evolved, opening with the verse *Be-*

nedictus es Domine in firmamento caeli. It counted eleven, highly melismatic verses of the solemn, declamatory style, divided by a long refrain of no lesser complexity, and decorated with climaxes of both register and ornamentation at specific phrases of the text. This is the default chant for Ember Saturdays in the Old Roman and Beneventan sources, and the only one recorded by those early Frankish graduals that offer any chant in this assignment. The fact that there are some early sources and several uses in the North that do not know it shows that it was a mature work of the Roman *schola cantorum*, probably the product of the late 8th or 9th century.

This monumental piece of music, however, was extremely long and difficult to perform. In Orléans and Fleury, it has been abbreviated to the opening verse. The chant did not belong to the core repertory as transmitted by the earliest “Gregorian” antiphonaries, thus it was more open to modification when the florid melismatic style began to go out of fashion in the 9–10th centuries, parallel with the tendency of associating tracts and offertory verses with penitential seasons and funeral services. The long, melismatic chant inconsistently survived in the West, but it found its safest refuge in the penitential seasons of Advent and especially Lent.

Two alternatives aspired to take its place. Defying all evolutionary assumptions, the more radical aspirant seems to be the more ancient. It was the rhythmic paraphrase of the 9th-century abbot of Reichenau, Walafrid Strabo: *Omnipotentem semper adorant*. The poem already figures in a collection of the author’s poetic oeuvre from the second half of the 9th century. The hymn was written in the style of the new wave of processional chants and litanies, associated with the Abbey of St Gall which in itself renders liturgical use likely, but there is also proof. The paraphrase appears in a 9th-century gradual fragment from Laon where it accompanies the melismatic variant and is provided with neumes, indicating the same melody that became domi-

nant in later diastematic sources. Remarkably, it was only the high medieval use of Laon that assigned the hymn of Walafrid Strabo to all four Ember Saturdays and proves to be the centre of its early dissemination in Upper France, while the chant sank into oblivion in the Swabian homeland of its author and everywhere else in the Germanic landscape or even Central Gaul.

The other competitor was *Benedictus es Domine Deus*, a more modest revision of the great canticle. It retained the solemn declamatory style and the structure of psalm-like verses and refrain, but it replaced the text of the long, second part of the canticle with the first part, and achieved the intense and elevated musical effect with the more economical tools of ornamented recitation, similar to the language of introit verses or invitational melodies. This resulted in shorter duration, the avoidance of duplicating a text already consumed in the office, and more moderate artistic requirements. Yet the text was not exactly the text of the Bible. The original was too short; some sentences have been omitted, some paraphrased, and some added from other biblical hymns of similar tone and theme like Psalm 103 or the Prayer of Tobias. With such extensions, the new canticle grew to a structural peer of its predecessor, counting eleven or twelve verses. This consolidated, musically more modest but textually more inventive form is already recorded in the margins of the first Old Roman gradual, that of the basilica of *Santa Cecilia in Trastevere*. In the established use of Rome, it replaced its melismatic rival, became exclusive for the Germanic churches of Europe, and irregularly penetrated Gaul as well. The area of dissemination suggests that it was regarded as the authentic Gregorian canticle both by German and Curial-Franciscan reformers after the turn of the millennium.

Fixing the summer Ember Days to the octave of Pentecost demanded one further improvement. An Alleluia has been composed with its verse citing the first sentence of the simpler revision. It worked as a substitute for the canticle in an East-

ertide context where the canticle itself was too much charged with penitential connotations. With the Alleluia, the creative attempts to reformulate the Ember Saturday canticle in varying literary and musical styles came to an end. By the second millennium, its liturgical portfolio was accomplished.

This, however, did not concern the arrangement. The most innovative liturgies of the 11–12th centuries, the Anglo-Norman and Ibero-Provencal uses did not want to give up any chant of such an impressive heritage. Instead, they apportioned the four possibilities among the four Ember seasons. Winter got the Germanic-Curial canticle (*Benedictus es Domine Deus*), spring the Frankish-Old Roman canticle (*Benedictus es in firmamento caeli*), summer the Alleluia (*Benedictus es Domine Deus*), and autumn the metric paraphrase (*Omnipotentem semper adorant*). Furthermore, the length of the preceding prophecy has been adapted to the differing canticles in many places. The shortest reading went with the winter canticle, a bit longer reading introduced the spring canticle, and so on. Such a regular and colourful rearrangement no more involved the composition of new items. The activity of Normans and Spaniards rather resembled the furnishing of an exhibition displaying historical objects. They simply obeyed the law that proper must be saved, but their horizon already encompassed the whole range of proper accumulated by past generations of Latin worshippers.

THE SACRAMENTARY

Canon and creativity

Before the solemn, majuscule title and the *Qualiter missa Romana celebratur* chapter of a 10th-century Gregorian Sacramentary, supposedly from Essen, there is a drawing of two pontiffs, vested in alb, tunic, chasuble, maniple, and pallium, each holding a book in his hand. They are, as their inscriptions reveal, the Roman popes St Gelasius and St Gregory, who, according to the epigram in the top of the page, composed masses in agreement under the influence of heavenly inspiration and who, according to another sentence placed between their figures, now assist at the throne of mercy. In 1500, the Missal of Segovia still ascribes nine of the ten prefaces to Gelasius, and only the tenth, that of the Virgin Mary, to Urban II, his 11th-century successor. This suggests that, although the prayers of the mass were generally attributed to Gregory the Great, medieval worshippers did not imagine such a homogeneous authorship behind the sacramentary tradition as behind the mass antiphony. They regarded two pontiffs of the patristic age about hundred years apart as equally authoritative sources of euchological texts, and considered a much later pope as someone fully authorized to continue their work.

Compared to the chants, orations show an inverse relationship between rank and costliness. They stood highest in the hierarchy of liturgical texts, representing the medium through which the appointee of God's people was entrusted to directly appeal to the Lord. The care for the authenticity of sacramentaries and the devoted copying, decoration, and handling of the manuscripts agreed with their prestige. Yet prayers were the only liturgical corpus that by definition was non-biblical, that is, lacked the authority of divine revelation. We have seen how ea-

gerly early Romans guarded the biblical purity of their worship. Unlike in other rites, eastern or western, legends or sermons could not penetrate the lectionary of the mass, chants were for a long time exclusively selected from the Psalter, and strong opposition hindered the adoption of poetic genres like hymns, tropes, and sequences. In the euchology, the established form of the Roman rite reduced the number of mass prayers known both from the Ambrosian and some Old Roman formularies, and it systematically avoided the rhetoric exuberance of the Gallican and Visigothic liturgies. Some of the concise Roman orations were true masterpieces, but technically, it was not a difficult task to meet the formal demands of the genre. Anyone with basic theological knowledge, modest literary capacities, and some liturgical expertise was able to compose a one-sentenced prayer obeying the laws of the genre. Oration were short and few in comparison with the texture of the mass as a whole, and they did not impress the wider audience very much. In this quality, they could multiply unconditionally.

Multiplication was not only possible but necessary. With regard to a mass, a triple set of orations was the basic requirement for an entry in a sacramentary or missal. To introduce a new feast or votive topic, they had to become equipped with distinct prayers. A compiler could find appropriate chants and readings elsewhere and he probably thought this strategy not only more comfortable but even more respectful. Oration, however, were rarely repeated. Certainly, many sanctoral prayers went through only slight modifications like the changing of the name of the saints concerned, but this mostly characterized those saints who were either of minor importance and a vague hagiographical profile or, on the contrary, who were too deeply embedded in tradition to update their propers. Service books, nevertheless, assigned separate entries to each. The common of saints does contain a few orations for every category but never a significant list of options. To be counted in the liturgical agenda demanded

proper orations, and new feasts of important historical figures or votives of relevant intentions were regularly provided with fresh compositions. This resulted in a huge number of orations. The comprehensive edition of mass prayers, the *Corpus orationum*, counts 6829 entries in 9 volumes without the supplements. It only contains prayers published in modern editions; it merges textual variants under one identification number, and does not include either orations preceding the collect on penitential ferias or orations belonging to occasional rites beyond the mass. Still, the quantity is the multiple of any read or chanted genre.

In sum, orations prove to be a bewildering field of research. On the one hand, sacramentaries provide the first accessible service books of the Latin rites, and some of them repeatedly enjoyed a quasi-canonical status during the history of their transmission. Essentially, or at least purportedly, the same Gelasian and Gregorian exemplars were copied throughout Europe in the first millennium, mostly intact of local peculiarities, and local peculiarities were still revised and overwritten on the basis of allegedly authentic sacramentaries in the Late Middle Ages. On the other hand, no other genre existed where change and extension was so easy, justified, and even desirable. Therefore, orations combine the antiquity and invariance of the most established pericopes and chants with the freedom of Friday lessons, Alleluias, and sequences. To isolate and interpret their categories of varying flexibility, we must understand their sources of authority, the fields to which authority did or did not extend, and the local attitudes towards parallel but equally ancient traditions and innovative attempts.

Rearrangement

A superficial look at the collects of the year's chief observances is enough to acknowledge the complete triumph of the Gregorian Sacramentary and its Supplement. The first was the so-called

Authenticum or *Hadrianum*, a copy of an 8th-century papal sacramentary sent by Pope Hadrian I to Charlemagne, and the second was its appendix, a compilation providing supplementary texts, once attributed to Alcuin and now to St Benedict of Aniane. Everywhere in Europe, there were three orations in one mass – though mainly with the Gelasian vocabulary – and the established days of the year unanimously had the same collects that we find in the copies of the authentic exemplar of Charlemagne's Palatine Library. Where it was silent, the collects proposed by St Benedict of Aniane in his Supplement were adopted. Gelasian sources were only consulted if neither the Gregorian nor the Supplement supplied an alternative. Then, however, editors were not afraid to come up with new ideas. The drive to assign distinct orations to every liturgical day of the year proved stronger than any inhibition against introducing texts of dubious authenticity.

Therefore, the first and most innocent way to deviate from the hallowed norms concerned reordering. With the collects, the Sundays after Christmas and Epiphany were the first to show any divergence. This resulted from the fact that providing these Sundays with prayers was a gradual process. The Gelasian had still nothing for the period, and the standard Gregorian had only two formularies for the entire winter season, placed between Christmas and Epiphany. The Supplement calculated for the largest possible number of Sundays after the feasts: two after Christmas and six after Epiphany, and divided its eight formularies accordingly. Here, the practicality of the Supplement inevitably conflicted with the prestige of the Gregorian since the Gregorian's second formulary after Christmas was the same as the Supplement's first formulary after Epiphany. If posterity wanted to save the Gregorian intact, it had to take away one formulary from the Supplement's post-Epiphany section and move the whole series backwards, leaving the sixth Sunday without propers. This was in fact done by a few churches in Northern

France. Others in Burgundy preferred to keep both series in the original order joined after Epiphany, furnishing the post-Christmas Sundays from the redundant orations of the previous feast and adding a seventh Sunday after Epiphany which was never to be celebrated. The mainstream option, however, was to follow the Supplement and retain only one but authentic oration for the Sunday after Christmas.

Certainly, such intricacies are difficult to follow, but their consequence is quite simple and universal. No item of the authentic repertory could be neglected, but there were occasional divergences in the arrangement if the Gregorian did not take a clear position. In matters of order, the Supplement was considered of lesser authority.

This strategy repeated itself in Eastertide and the season after Pentecost. The series of collects was identical throughout Europe, but, from the third Sunday after Trinity, a sharp divide between East and West resulted from the fact that Germanic churches left out the Supplement's traditional collect *Deprecationem nostram* or put it on the octave of Pentecost, its original place in the Gregorian, moving thus the whole series one Sunday backwards. In doing so, they obeyed the 11th-century directives of Berno of Reichenau and Bernold of Constance who argued for harmonizing propers. According to their opinions, the association of the collects with other propers of the given date was not incidental, but it followed the diligent planning of Gregory the Great. The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, for example, should coincide on the 12th Sunday with a special collect speaking about God's plentiful mercy (*abundantia pietatis*) that rewards those beseeching him beyond their merits. While churches in the West preferred the authority of the Supplement as transmitted by the earliest sacramentaries available to them, those in the East overruled their testimony, claiming the authority of Gregory the Great. Yet neither new collects were introduced nor was their sequence modified above the minimum required.

A similar shift took place in Northern France. At the earliest from the 14th Sunday after Pentecost, but typically from the 17th Sunday, several churches north of the Loire inserted two penitential mass formularies in the series of the Supplement on two subsequent Sundays, thus moving the assignments of the rest of the formularies two weeks forwards. These orations belonged to the Sundays before and after the September Ember Days, the only Sundays in the whole ordinary season of summer and autumn of which the Gregorian took note. Other traditions preferred not to interrupt the order of the Supplement and located these prayers at the end of the season on the penultimate Sunday or immediately before Advent.

As regards more radical interventions, the first Christian millennium and the High Middle Ages had fundamentally different attitudes towards the relationship of times and prayers, although they relied on the same concept of the ecclesiastical year and the same textual heritage. In Old Rome, there was a sharper contrast between the intense periods of great festivals and the relatively uneventful rest of the year. Great festivals had many prayers; not infrequently more than what could be effectively utilized. After the three masses of Christmas, the Gregorian Sacramentary listed nine extra prayers. There were seven after Epiphany, and eighteen after the octave of Easter, not to mention the additional processional prayers for the previous baptismal vespers. The Gelasian tradition typically provided two opening prayers for each mass, and distinguished the divine office of certain festivals with further orations. In return, early medieval Romans were rather careless with the ordinary seasons. In the authentic Gregorian, there was nothing for ordinary Sundays after Epiphany and Low Sunday, but the annual cycle ended with an indiscriminate pile of about 140 orations for the atonement of sins, for everyday use, and for matins or vespers.

The Roman rite of the second millennium, in contrast, developed an evener vision of the year's plan. Extremities were

levelled – not by attributing less significance to the great festivals, but by raising the dignity of smaller feasts and ordinary seasons. The priestly ideal of the day had a balanced but constantly alert mental disposition, and the corresponding routine of life involved precision and regularity in liturgical celebration. Thus, the relationship between times and prayers needed to be proportionate and unambiguous. No time was allowed to remain without its prayers, and every prayer required its precise time. Both superfluous options and indiscriminate lists were eliminated, and a one-to-one association solidified between days and their orations.

Meeting the new demands with the old repertories posed a twofold problem: that of redundancy and deficiency. For great festivals, the authoritative sources offered more than what was needed. As high medieval clerics were equally averse to neglecting certain items as to leaving their exact role undetermined, several uses tried to save redundant prayers by assigning them to secondary functions. Ascension Day, for instance, possessed two *alia* orations in the Gregorian Sacramentary. The first became the collect of the vigil in Autun and Aosta, and the second the collect of either the vigil or the octave in about thirty other places.

Certainly, not all that was redundant survived. Items primarily assigned to the corresponding functions had every chance to stay and evolve into the default oration of the day throughout Europe. The maintenance of the rest depended on two factors: the existence of unfulfilled assignments and literary quality. As for the first aspect, certain feasts like Ascension or Epiphany had neither a vigil nor an octave in the earlier period, but they both had extra orations. Introducing vigils and octaves produced new liturgical days without authorized propers which could comfortably host the surplus. The first Gregorian *alia oratio* of St Stephen Protomartyr was later very popular on his octave, similar to the first *alia oratio* on Epiphany Day, creatively reshaped by

certain German uses into the collect of St Odile, just happening to fall on the octave of Epiphany. St Lawrence, unfortunately, already had a vigil and two masses in Old Rome, but his *alia oratio* was reused in Poland for St Afra and her companions only three days before his feast.

By literary quality we mean that all these prayers were concise pieces with consistent imagery, beginning with memorable phrases. *Deus cuius Filius in alta caelorum* on Ascension Day focused on the typological interpretation of "Thou art gone up on high" from Psalm 67; *Deus qui primitias martyrum* celebrated Stephen as the firstfruits of martyrs; *Deus illuminator omnium gentium* presented Epiphany as a light festival; *Deus cuius caritatis ardore* paralleled the martyrdom of St Lawrence on the gridiron to the burning of charity. Such qualities were not self-evident in the restrained world of classical Roman euchology where most of the orations started with conventional terms, asked for moral progress and eternal salvation in the abstract, and deliberately avoided delighting the ears and fostering the imagination. Nevertheless, it was precisely the unconventional invocation and the imaginative power that favoured the survival of redundant prayers.

Supplementation

Indeed, there was a deep conflict at the heart of Roman euchology. Considering Christ's admonition against being like the heathens who think that they may be heard in *multiloquio* (Mt 6:7), i.e. their much speaking, it was problematic to pray long literary texts. For the office, the Rule of St Benedict and the use of the Lateran Basilica prescribed only the Lord's Prayer where a collect was required. Compared to them, the Gregorian preference for short and austere orations was already a compromise. It represented a unique moment of self-restriction in the history of Latin euchology, parallel to the purely psalmic language of

coeval Roman ecclesiastical chant. Prayers both before and after the Gregorian were more rhetorical. Eastern and Old Latin pieces and even those of the Roman traditions known as Leonine or Gelasian were more voluminous and imaginative, and later developments in the Western Middle Ages gradually left behind the disciplined style of the Gregorian. Moreover, the very Gregorian pieces that captured the imagination of Berno of Reichenau or Bernold of Constance belonged to a minority. They proved remarkable precisely because they revolved around a well-recognizable central motif like the Old Testament sacrifices or the abundant grace of God, and modern works praising the literary qualities of Roman orations tend to select similar minority texts.

So there was a great temptation to replace or at least supplement the highly revered but, to put it frankly, boring Gregorian repertory with more vivid and individual pieces. This could be done first where it was defective, yet the resources of supplementation depended on the domain concerned. As usual, Thursdays in Lent are textbook examples of liturgical variation, but in the context of euchology, they could not escape the season's rigour. As Lent was the most strictly controlled and uniform period of the year, radical innovation was out of the question. For the first week's Thursday, the Gregorian standard already provided a collect, but it was only a duplicate from the previous Ember Wednesday. Submissive churches in Burgundy, the Rhône Valley, Upper France, some of the Ibero-Provencal landscape, Hungary, and most of Germany followed the Roman line, and they formed the majority. Some Beneventan uses and the Carmelites borrowed one of the still Gregorian processional prayers of the Major Litanies, removing a reference to St Peter in whose atrium the original was to be performed. Trier with some northern dioceses in the Netherlands, Poland, and Sweden applied a no less simple but rare penitential prayer. Normandy, Catalonia, Saxony, Poland, and Bohemia, however, with some

bolder dioceses in Bavaria and Île-de-France avoided duplication by using a Frankish Gelasian equivalent. This by no means meant audacity or disrespect. The alternative was short, ancient, and supposed to be of Roman origin; but instead of a general theme, it focused on the theme of almsgiving; an appropriate choice for a day associated through its stationary church with St Lawrence, the supporter of the poor.

A next occasion for supplementing arose between Advent and the end of the ordinary season where some room remained for intercalary Sundays. This was a far less controlled area than Lent. Chartres, Toul, and Nevers applied here an extra collect (*Deus qui nos regendo*) that was present in certain old sacramentaries and dominated in the Beneventan region, but was lacking from the normative Gregorian redaction. Chur and Constance, however, composed an entirely new prayer (*Deus qui ore prophético*), meditating on the year's last introit taken from the prophet Jeremiah (*Dicit Dominus*). Such chant-inspired orations attested to a higher degree of autonomy, but they were not unprecedented. The Curial use of Rome itself discarded the insufficient series of Gregorian orations on Holy Saturday in favour of their Gelasian rivals when twelve readings had to be accompanied by them instead of four. These Gelasian items echoed the central themes of the preceding prophecies as well as tracts, where they appeared.

Yet as a whole, the collects of the temporal cycle provided little room for such initiatives. The chart of assignments was perfectly filled and sometimes even overfilled. With only a few exceptions, divergence resulted from the redistribution of ancient and well-established material, but even this contributed a lot to giving a shape to lasting and distinctive sacramentary traditions.

Where there was almost unlimited scope for creativity was the sanctoral and the votive cycle. There, too, the basic layer of the Gregorian tradition was nigh untouchable. For new feasts and new intentions, authors could choose between two strategies; they could either adopt or paraphrase the texts of pre-ex-

isting prayers or write new ones. Similar to chants, the decision was not obvious. Authority stood on one side as the prestige of new celebrations was effectively enhanced by old texts, and innovation stood on the other side as it was refreshing to release creative energies and colour the liturgical repertoire with recent compositions.

Parallel to the objectivity of the temporal orations, the traditional Roman euchology rarely celebrated its saints by referring to their lives or recalling their personal attributes. The concept was justified for, according to the often-cited closing verse of Psalm 67, it is God who is wonderful in his saints, and masses were offered to him, not the saint of the day. Still, hagiography was a favourite reading material and pictorial subject of the age, saints were greatly trusted as powerful helpers, and they played an emblematic role in identity formation. Hence, there was a strong tendency to highlight their function and personality against the impersonal background of the traditional prayers. Innovative prayers mostly appear on the two extremes of a scale. It was either the most important new feasts that acquired new orations or, quite the contrary, they retained the prestigious old formularies and it was the lesser feasts under looser control that allowed some literary experimentation. In both cases, the solid layer of ancient Roman observances was left intact.

St Francis was one of the most renowned saints of the Middle Ages, but his feast, being late, was self-evidently missing from the Roman heritage. About 90% of the documented uses honoured him with a collect of his own. The dominant text was conceived in the traditional style, but it discretely referred to his contempt for earthly wealth and his foundation of a religious order. The former reference utilized the vocabulary of popular Eucharistic prayers (*terrena despicere*) and the latter that of baptismal rites (*fetu novae prolis amplificas*), but their combination was unique and original. Some Polish and Czech uses had another proper prayer, equally modelled on traditional texts but

void of any personal aspects. Bordeaux used the same collect as for St Dominic, the contemporary founder of another popular mendicant order, which was also modelled on a baptismal oration from Lent, but utilized phrases of ancient sanctoral formularies as well. The remnant of the prayers, however, derived from the traditional texts of martyr saints like Lawrence, George, or Felicissimus and Agapitus, replacing only the name and changing the title of a martyr to that of a confessor, or of confessors like Eusebius and Sylvester.

The cult of St Jerome, though a Church Father, became only popular in the High Middle Ages. In the common perception, he appeared as the iconic figure of the Christian intellectual, first of all, famous for his competent translation and deep commentaries of the Scriptures. Accordingly, most of his collects celebrated him for illuminating the verity of the Holy Writ, defeating the heresies, or his mystic insights. Some of them were widely accepted, while others turn out to be local or regional compositions. Similar to the connection between Francis and Dominic, a transitional group of texts consisted of genuine items that reused certain phrases from prayers of great doctors and commentators like St Athanasius or Augustine. Yet there were still several collects that treated Jerome as a faceless confessor among many, adopting items from the common of saints derived from martyrs like Nicomedes, Lawrence, and Hermes, or confessors like Eusebius or Pope Mark.

Both Francis and Jerome, however, became universally venerated saints and were surrounded by the general interest of the Western church. Saints of minor rank and only regional significance departed more easily from the impersonal tone of ancient orations. St Odile was an exclusively German and Eastern European helper saint with a sharp profile of protecting eyesight. Without exception, the collects of her feast refer to this capacity. None of them celebrates her as a simple virgin, albeit, as has been said, one ingeniously applies an almost forgotten Roman

Epiphany prayer to her. We find similar customized collects in the masses of other holy helpers like Apollonia against toothache or Roch against pestilence, and on the feasts of national patrons like Edward the Confessor in England or Charlemagne in the Empire.

As for the votives, the Gregorian Sacramentary already contained nuptial and ordination formularies, and the Supplement had masses for kings, pilgrims, or peace. These were omnipresent and uniform up to the modern age. Due to their specific purpose and lower canonicity, they were thematically more focused and used more memorable incipits than the average orations of the annual cycle, but they still adhered to the usual limits on length and imagination. Later developments overcame both barriers. The collect of the *missa generalis pro vivis et defunctis*, allegedly of St Augustine, consisted of about 100 words instead of the usual 30, providing an illustrative sample of the much speaking condemned in the Gospel. The formulary for the gift of tears assigned one watery aspect to each prayer of the mass. The collect concentrated on drinking and thirst, evoking Moses striking the rock in the desert; the secret on extinguishing fire, associating tears with compunction and flames with hell; and the postcommunion on purity, invoking the Holy Spirit to clean the stains of guilt. Literary prayers obviously attracted medieval clerics, yet they rarely afforded the luxury of yielding to this attraction unless in the gaps and edges of the Gregorian legacy.

Replacement

More audacity was required to interfere with the established texts. No one was so reckless as to openly defy the authority of tradition, but many found a way to do so by detour. To recognize their strategies, we must treat the temporal and the sanctoral cycles separately, and remember that, until this point, we mostly restricted our survey to the collects.

The key to liberating the temporal from the overwhelming authority of the Gregorian was a generic distinction. Collects acted as inseparable mottos of certain dates, but secrets and postcommunions – and occasionally orations and super populum prayers as well – allowed for a different interpretation. As it has been said, collects focused on the day itself, while secrets and postcommunions mostly focused on the Eucharist. The current observance was specific, but the mass as such was universal. Even today, a cantor responsible for the musical programme of a mass can randomly choose a Eucharistic hymn or motet for the communion of the faithful, but must strictly adhere to the theme of the feast or the season when selecting more specific chants. For some observers, this approach might have rendered the proper prayers for offering and communion a sort of semi-ordinary; not in the sense that they were unchanging but that they were interchangeable.

The orations before the collect belonged to the fasting season as a whole or to the preceding lessons and chants. Their mere presence gave a penitential, preparatory, or vigil-like character to the mass, and they had to be related to the day's central theme, but, inside these frames, some freedom remained for reordering and replacement. On the Ember Saturday in Whitsuntide, for instance, five extra orations were needed either about repentance or the Holy Spirit. Local variants always met this requirement, but they often rearranged or replaced the Gregorian series partly or entirely. Most of the super populum prayers were already devoid of any thematic connection with the day and even the season. Their mere survival was a structural archaism, marking the ferias of Lent, and some uses were content to apply an additional prayer after the postcommunion without bothering if it was the exact same item as in the Gregorian.

This, of course, was a minority option. More than 90% of the European churches adhered to the Gregorian series of both the Ember Saturday orations and the Lenten super populum prayers.

Yet those who acted in the opposite way did consistently so. A small but determined group of eccentric churches kept on deviating from the mainstream by applying alternatives on Ember Days. However dispersed on the map, they regularly come up as headstrong dissenters in comparisons with different liturgical scopes. It is typically the second generation of European uses that prevails among them: Anglo-Norman and Ibero-Provencal churches with the German marches and Eastern Europe, albeit many ancient bishoprics like Sens, Reims, Augsburg, or Regensburg show no less independence. The same applies to extraordinary super populum prayers. It is worth emphasizing that, in these cases, differences do not stem from the simple drifting or rearrangement of the accustomed selections; the texts concerned are characteristically rare and often unique choices. Some of them, and especially the super populum prayers, tend to substitute the neutral pieces of the Gregorian with prayers in closer connection to the season. In Le Mans, Konstanz, and Basel, and some uses of Catalonia and Aragon, Monday or Tuesday of Holy Week were distinguished by a super populum prayer taking its invocation from a characteristic introit of Lent (*Reminiscere*) and combining it with the themes of passion (Christ's blood) and baptismal initiation (the paschal mystery). The Gregorian alternatives contained only faint traces of Holy Week motifs.

Cluny and Casadei, with certain old sacramentaries, recalled the day's Gospel about feeding the multitude in the super populum prayer on the 4th Sunday of Lent. Elsewhere, super populum prayers were systematically removed from Sundays, but the same text survived as a postcommunion in Lyon, Zagreb, Segovia, and Jaén. The Gregorian equivalent was perfectly neutral, having nothing about Lent. Another postcommunion, that of the Ember Saturday in Advent, anticipated the introit of the subsequent Sunday (*Memento*) in Auxerre, Regensburg, and Zagreb. Its Gregorian alternative would have been the postcommunion of Low Sunday, one of the most overused orations of the

Roman rite. Certainly, many extraordinary postcommunions derived from the repertory of suppressed *super populum* or *alia* orations. A push for avoiding duplication, however, was no less influential. The chief purpose might not have been preventing dullness; it would have needed outstanding powers of memory to be bored by an Easter communion in Advent. Yet duplicates in the Gregorian corpus gave the right to replace one of the elements; innovation did not harm the authentic repertory as none of the *propers* went lost.

Parallel to the orations and *super populum* prayers, more than 90% of the dioceses faithfully followed the order of secrets and postcommunions as proposed in the Gregorian and its Supplement, and a corresponding minority of less than 10% substituted them occasionally. Nevertheless, temporal secrets or postcommunions were approximately one and a half as many as collects, although a single one was required for a single mass from each. The explanation of the discrepancy lies in the fact that secrets and postcommunions varied more frequently than collects. Their divergence, total numbers, and proportions are remarkably parallel, suggesting that the two Eucharist-related eucharological genres were considered to be and handled as a pair.

The first secret of the year was already a duplicate; it occurred on the first Sunday of Advent and on Monday of Holy Week, too. Sens, Regensburg, Gniezno, and Kraków replaced the former with *Intende*, a secret chosen by other champions of consistent replacement, Avranches and Sarum, on the Ember Wednesday of Lent. Their preference was justified by the fact that the day's usual secret was also a duplicate; it already occurred on the 5th Sunday after Epiphany. The same Norman doublet was even bolder in the season after Pentecost when they had to face only the authority of the Supplement; they dared to replace some pieces that were unique in their position.

The circle of uses behaving alike coincided with those which proved innovative with the orations and the *super populum*

prayers. Beyond a few veterans of the Western church organization, mostly Anglo-Norman, Ibero-Provencal, and North-Eastern peripheries were involved. Certain new orations were quite original literary pieces with memorable incipits, sometimes establishing closer relationships with the given day's themes or other propers. The September Ember Wednesday, for instance, was a Christian remembrance of the Hebrew New Year and the agricultural thanksgiving festival of Sukkot. Its nonconformist secret (*Deus qui de his terrae fructibus*) referred to the gifts of the earth parallel to the Eucharistic offering instead of applying again the leading temporal secret of the Roman rite, already used thrice in the cycle.

Generic proportions in the sanctoral were reciprocal to the temporal. While, in the temporal, a relatively low number of collects contrasted a one-and-a-half times larger number of secrets and postcommunions, in the sanctoral, a perplexing quantity of collects faced a much more modest quantity of Eucharist-related orations. This is only natural as the number of collects grew almost parallel with the introduction of new feasts, but the secrets and the postcommunions were more typically taken from the common of saints. The vast majority of new collects, however, belong to the domain of supplementation and not replacement. They typically honoured new saints, unprovided with propers by the Gregorian.

From our current perspective, it is only remarkable when traditional prayers of traditional saints were modified, and this almost never happened. Among those already present in the Gregorian, Sebastian may be a good test as being both a venerated patron in early medieval Rome and a popular helper in the Late Middle Ages, especially after the Black Death. Besides his traditional Roman formulary, he had a fully composed late medieval mass of his own, but this was used predominantly in a votive context and almost never on his feast on 20 January. Only in late medieval Arles could the new mass entirely replace

the old one. But even so, we must remark that the prayers of Sebastian served as models for several other martyrs. Still in the Gregorian, his collect repeated itself on 28 August, St Hermes's day, and it became the leading collect of St Denis of Paris, himself a holy helper and probably the favourite martyr of France. Thus, even in the extremely rare case of replacing an ancient saint's collect, the Gregorian corpus suffered no loss.

Dissemination, history, and attitudes

The influence of the Gregorian Sacramentary and its Supplement can be measured by the fact that – had their copies all been lost – their basic content could be reconstructed from printed missals on purely statistical grounds. Days and observances present in every mass book of medieval Europe and agreeing in their choices of orations over 90% would provide the headings of the original Gregorian's reconstruction, and the majority choices themselves would provide the subheadings. Not only the greatest festivals but minor saints and even vacant Sundays and Lenten Thursdays would fall into this category. Choices more diverse yet still with a clear majority of over 70% would point to a younger layer that had once been missing from the authentic exemplar but was added by the Supplement at an early date. Ordinary Sundays or the most popular votive masses would belong to this category.

Such stability and uniformity at the beginning of the story stand in stark contrast to the extreme number and variety of orations at the end of it. If the basic layer of the sacramentary formed an area of outstanding authority under the strictest control, then the additional layers offered a rather open field for local and personal initiatives. But due to the relatively low liturgical profile of orations, later variation folds into somewhat different geographic and historical patterns than with chants or readings. While introits or Gospels became etched in the mem-

ory of worshippers, as to euchology, it was at most some collects that made a similarly deep impression. This was the reason why orations seldom appear in clear-cut regional distribution and were the potential subjects of radical reforms.

Wherever an oration varies, we typically find certain influential nodes with circuits of radiation around them. The nodes, however, are located relatively remote from one another. Special cases rarely stand alone; we can regularly observe coincidences in the spheres of Paris, Lyon, or Barcelona, in Saxony, Poland, or Southern Italy, but circles of such constellation are typically small, they do not stick together consistently throughout the year, and they do not include every diocese of the given region, country, or landscape. On the other hand, identical options may occur in distant places. Catalonia may agree with Upper France but not with nearby Aragon; certain English uses have relatives in Normandy but others follow the continental mainstream, and minority options may link together several French and German traditions against the majority of both countries.

Such inconsistent but not unreasonable formulas resemble the processes of organic dissemination. A few individuals of an animal or plant species can drift far away from their native land and grow into a populous colony under favourable conditions or at least survive as a small but lasting enclave. This is how trade products, technical inventions, architectural styles, or philological variants spread unless a higher authority intervenes. Strasbourg and Prague equally have magnificent astronomical clockworks; the cathedral of Burgos is a typical representative of French Gothic, while its neighbours are unmistakable Spanish; the Lindisfarne Gospels are supposed to follow a Campanian archetype. Early sacramentaries were unique combinations of the Gregorian core and the Supplement, enriched with creative additions and substitutes. In the ages when it was costly to produce new manuscripts and difficult to find reliable master copies, books could cover long distances. Specific volumes

were not necessarily intended to establish local traditions, but eventually, their peculiarities might have continued in a long lineage of transcriptions and been later perceived as local or institutional features.

Such chains, nevertheless, were more frequently broken with orations than with chants or readings. An in-depth analysis of the orations on the Saturday after Pentecost – the most variable sample in the temporal – shows that there were lasting and distinct selections in Regensburg, Sens, or Paris, but there were other places where local features continuously struggled with Gregorianism. The Gregorian had its own arrangement, and the oldest codices often witnessed to that. After the Carolingian period, every sacramentary pretended to be a faithful copy of the Gregorian. The Wolfgang and Rocca Sacramentaries of Regensburg represent one of the most enduring eccentric traditions, notwithstanding that in their titles they both claim to be written from the authentic book of the Palatine Library.

A church had to make a decision as soon as it noticed the discrepancy between its local inheritance and the authoritative version. They could prefer tradition over conformity and even confirm their independence, or they could yield to the authority considered to be higher. Rouen, for instance, gave up its special 12–13th-century set of orations for the Gregorian ones, while Augsburg changed its earliest Gregorian series to a local set at the latest in the 14th century. Utrecht wavered long and Metz still alternated the two around the turn of the 15–16th centuries. Similar decisions made on the spot and not coordinated with the surroundings probably contributed to the divergence within one and the same region. Zagreb, founded from Esztergom, maintained a specific old Hungarian sacramentary related to Regensburg, but Esztergom itself discarded it in favour of the international standard. In the distant past, the formation of sacramentary traditions might have been organic and of little

awareness, but their subsequent modifications often prove deliberate and inorganic.

The wrestling between purist reforms and rampant creativity, unifying tendencies and institutional self-esteem mostly concerned the old material. With new saints and votives, we can rather speak of various attitudes. When reading the orations of different missals or sacramentaries, one often has the impression that there were conservative traditions with a limited and recurrent list of prayers derived from the ancient common stock and progressive ones with richer and more colourful sets. Troyes and Sens lie only half a day's walk apart, yet Troyes had a very reserved sacramentary and Sens a very inventive one. Their attitudes do not concern the liturgy as a whole, for even Troyes proves very open to novelties as soon as it comes to sequences. Conservatism, of course, does not mean that no new feasts were introduced. On the opposite, Troyes, as almost every French diocese, had a plentiful sanctoral. Yet the orations of its many saints were only slightly customized adaptations from the Gregorian core repertory.

Parallel to the 14th-century advance of fresh musical compositions, we can state that, in broad terms, recent saints and votives allowed for greater freedom in composing new prayers. Innovative texts, however, are equally documented in sacramentaries before the High Middle Ages. The explanation of this prematurity probably lies in the different perceptions of canonical and votive celebrations of the same observance. Both in early sacramentaries and late missals, we can regularly observe that the same saint is first provided with his or her traditional formula and then with a more modern cycle. The consecutive masses of St Sebastian as an ancient Roman martyr and as a helper against pestilence had already been mentioned, and thus was St Barbara a universally venerated virgin on 4 December and a trusted protector against storms. In either case, they had more restrained items for the sanctoral purpose and bolder ones for

the votive. The function of such formularies was mostly distinguished by placing them in the appropriate section of the service books: the one in the sanctoral and the other among the votives. Yet several books include the two formularies in succession, one after the other in the sanctoral, maybe on the ground that it was easier to look up the saint's votives, too, according to the calendrical order. This juxtaposition surely facilitated the process of replacing old and respected propers with less prestigious but more interesting novel ones. As for the sacramentary, a sort of gradual infiltration began. The mere inclusion of a new series of orations into a book's sanctoral did not necessarily imply that it was used as the day's chief formulary, but it might have contributed to eroding resistance.

THE MASS ORDINARY

With the mass ordinary, we leave behind hard structures. A new field of liturgics opens wide with a greater emphasis on acts instead of texts and a different attitude towards selecting and arranging the texts themselves. Though still remaining within the realm of the mass, such aspects foreshadow the peculiarities of occasional rites in general. Both occasional rites and the mass ordinary are organized by a series *dromena*, i.e. of liturgical gestures, utilize an unlimited range of genres in an undetermined structure, and are essentially independent of the annual cycle. In all these, their principles sharply contrast with the strict rules governing the composition of mass and office propers. Such differences, however, do not mean a total lack of governing principles. The syntax of soft-structured rites compares to that of hard-structured rites like languages with free and bound word orders. In the latter case, the position of an item in the series suffices to define its class and function, while free word order and soft ritual structure demand other markers to identify an entity as a distinct part of a sentence.

Our first question, therefore, concerns the practical framework of rites, including the mass. We need to define a scale of liturgically meaningful activities and their typical temporal sequences. Each of them will rely on ritual codes of valid movements, spaces, objects, vestments, and ways of uttering texts. Yet, unlike the annual cycles of mass and office propers, we will never have such an overwhelming amount of regularly arranged, recurrent information to make sure that we have firmly grasped the heart of the matter. Actions have no uniform terminology, the depth and details of ceremonial descriptions greatly vary, and it is always problematic to distinguish the substantial from the accidental: the lasting functional skeleton of a rite from the contingencies of its local and temporal realization.

The second question concerns texts. Peculiarly, they may also contribute to understanding the practical process as words tend to be anchored to movements and, especially in early sources, formulas are more carefully recorded than gestures. Even without ceremonial rubrics, texts often suggest a corresponding act like the blessing over the censer suggests subsequent incensation. Moreover, liturgical texts are more constant than ceremonial rubrics and less vulnerable to historical circumstances. A kiss of peace may be delivered in several forms, through various mediums, and according to many choreographies, but the call for reconciliation remains the same over centuries.

Texts as mere texts pose heavier problems. One is their generic and ritual affiliation, the other is their level of canonicity. Ritual texts – namely the items of soft-structured rites – frequently change genres, rendering e.g. chant-texts into recited priestly utterances, or belong originally to undefined genres. They freely migrate between ceremonies or modules of the same ceremony, and never obey strict rules of number and arrangement. They figure on a scale arching from formulas that are essential for the efficacy of the rite to dispensable prayers of personal devotion, but service books might fail to inform us of which belongs to which category, and the limit of canonicity may drop or rise from region to region and from period to period.

Accordingly, the following paragraphs go beyond the question of the mass ordinary. They represent our first encounter with soft structures and serve as a case study for introducing their analysis and interpretation. The methodology of describing sequences of ritual movements and assessing codes of ritual behaviour, of extending the generic scope of liturgical texts and identifying the patterns of their juxtaposition, and the challenges of determining the most appropriate source material will apply to every rite outside the mass and the office, and indeed, to both their ordinaries. For, even within hard structured rites, the ordinary works as a bonding material. If propers resemble

the bones of an organism, they are interwoven by textures of skin, flesh, arteries, and capillaries. All of them serve a supreme purpose, yet they can equally be interpreted as micro-rites of their own.

THE MASS OF THE CATECHUMENS

The blessing of water, sprinkling, procession

It has always been difficult to define when a mass actually started. Not only was it introduced by a grey zone of preparatory rites, sometimes attached to the ordinary and sometimes not, but, under solemn circumstances, it directly continued rites that no one ever considered to be parts of the mass, although those and the mass formed an uninterrupted course of events. We summarize the grey zone under the notion of preparation and vesting for mass, while the contacting ceremonies are the blessing and sprinkling of holy water and the procession.

In the modern age, high masses on Sundays started with the sprinkling of holy water. Its emblematic chant was the antiphon *Asperges me*, in Eastertide *Vidi aquam*, followed by versicles and an oration. Sprinkling acted as a sacramental reminder of baptism thus it was limited to Sundays as little Easters (the ideal date for baptism in the Roman rite) and cathedrals or parish churches as ordinary places of baptism, exclusively owning baptismal fonts. In the Middle Ages, some other chants and a variety of prayers could also accompany the act of sprinkling, and it was associated with the more general themes of purity and sanctification. It equally introduced high masses of feasts falling on other days than Sunday and was a characteristic part of the monastic timetable, albeit monasteries did not administer baptism.

Sprinkling presupposed the blessing of holy water, an ancient and, in the majority of western uses, roughly uniform rite. It consisted of respective exorcisms and blessings for the salt and the water, their mixing, and their joint blessing. It was also called the minor or Sunday blessing of water, to distinguish it from a lengthier ceremony, the major blessing of water, only conducted once a year and mostly serving agrarian goals. As fresh holy water was a basic requirement for sprinkling and, indirectly, for introducing Sunday masses, the rite is often placed at the beginning of missals, opens their ordinary, or stands before Easter Sunday.

Sprinkling continued in a procession, charged with complex symbolism and historical reminiscences. In a monastic environment, it was more emphatic to lustrate, i.e. to visit, purify, and sanctify, the places of the estate. The train passed every site from the dormitory to the refectory and the stores of different victuals. Lastly, they arrived at the gate of the church and stopped again at the entrance of the choir screen and before the sanctuary. Service books typically offered prayers for each station, while the processions in-between could be accompanied by chants.

In a secular environment, there were fewer intermediate stations. Cathedrals usually had one smaller church or chapel in their neighbourhood that worked as a processional destination. After the sprinkling, the train went out to this station singing, saluted there the patron saint with his or her commemoration, and marched back to the main church, again singing, with the customary stops before the gate, the choir screen, and the altar. Contrary to the triumphal mood of later ecclesiastical processions like those of Easter or Corpus Christi, such events were of an expiatory character. Walking represented the pilgrimage of earthly life, and the arrival at the main church symbolized the entering of the Heavenly Jerusalem, where the mass, the Feast of the Lamb, was about to take place. Yet visiting an adjacent church and returning to the basilica also evoked the memories

of the Roman stational system. In the paradigmatic days of Rome, the pope departed from his Lateran headquarters with his entourage, met the people at an appointed church, and they marched together to the station of the day where the papal mass was offered. The sprinkling and the first part of the procession, accompanied by melismatic responsories, represented a more private affair, analogous to the pope's ride to the meeting place, while the second part with its accompanying metric hymns recalled the glorious march to the station.

Many churches utilized the regular Sunday processions as a loose domain for extending the mass propers. In the missals of Rouen, Hildesheim, or Kamień, many privileged Sundays are provided with distinct processional items. Ordinals and processionals reveal that it was so in other churches as well, even if they did not include the order of Sunday processions into their normative diocesan missals. Though the majority of processional chants derive either from the day's office or from a store of ancient penitential antiphons, typically assigned to the Major and Lesser Litanies, the opportunity inspired a secondary wave of musical composition. Due to the symbolism of pre-mass processions, such pieces preferred eschatological themes. The Compostella Missal, for instance, has a Lenten antiphon about the Last Judgement (*Cum sederit*), and one of the most popular chants of this kind was *Ecce carissimi*, a voluminous responsory personifying the Heavenly Jerusalem as an affectionate mother inviting her children.

The minor blessing of water, the ceremony of sprinkling, and the procession were subsequent but structurally autonomous movements, independent both of the mass and of each other. As witnessed by their inconsistent recording in different sections of different book types, they were not considered parts of the ordinary. Still, before a grand-scale mass, they must have been preceded by events more closely connected to the mass, the personal preparation of the celebrant, otherwise performed im-

mediately before the celebration. This, too, is inconsistently and sometimes poorly recorded, and its uncertain status between option and obligation, private devotion and public worship is mirrored by its manifold apportion in various parts and kinds of written sources. Yet even so, preparatory rites were wide-spread and lasting enough to deal with them separately.

Examination of conscience, intention, mental preparation

Technically, the first and perhaps most divergent part of the mass ordinary consists of prayers and gestures prior to the priest's ascent to the altar and his recitation of the introit. Its three basic modules are the shaping of an appropriate spiritual disposition (devotional prayers), the physical preparation (washing of hands and face, combing of hair, undressing of secular clothes, donning of vestments), and the setting of the altar (access to it, placing of the offerings, kisses, incensation). The sequence of the three parts can vary and, theoretically, each of them can be omitted, but their latency may equally result from the defectiveness of the extant sources. The most typical way of deviating from the familiar concept of mental preparation first, physical second, is the mingling of the two. In Barcelona, for instance, the vesting is surrounded by the preparatory prayers, while in Cambrai, the washing of hands introduces the mental preparation.

The most formal component of the preparation consists of a series of prayers, but especially late and detailed service books from France and Spain tend to introduce them with texts for examining the priest's conscience and rousing his intention. The examination of conscience is often headed as *Speculum sacerdotum*, a mirror of priests, and, albeit it is clearly a spiritual aid and not a ceremonial text, it tends to be rather fixed; the same prayers, admonitions, meditations, scriptural citations, mnemonic verses, and even tables or figures occur in several missals.

Articulating the priest's purpose to celebrate mass in agreement with the church's intention is also a late yet more liturgical element. In some uses, it is only a legal protestation, but, not infrequently, it takes the form of subjective prayers, sometimes preceded by poetic texts and versicles. According to the Missal of Sigüenza, the celebrant quotes the words of the prodigal son (*Pater peccavi*) from an office responsory before expressing his intention in orations. Similar prayers can easily be mistaken for apologies or texts of the mental preparation, but their position against the actual preparatory prayers and their distinctive titles reveal that they are not.

Preparatory commemorations represent a more specified form of intentional prayers. These are related to the *Memento*-s, the two petitions within the canon that beseech God first for the living and second for the faithful departed. Ancient documents testify that the priest could insert his own words or additional formularies into the Eucharistic prayer at these points. Wax tablets known as dyptychs could serve him as memory-aids and, symbolically still in the Tridentine solemn mass, the ministers discreetly withdrew from his side so that they might not hear whom he was secretly mentioning. By the Late Middle Ages, however, the canon was considered too sacred to be literally modified and there was some anxiety that the priest will be distracted or in an altered mental state in the most decisive moments of the mass. To prevent him not remembering his intention, some rubrics explicitly prescribed that *Memento*-s should be said previous to the mass, going over every possible beneficiary. A memorable list from Toulouse classifies them on the analogy of Latin grammatical cases; he must offer the mass for himself (*pro nominativo*), for his genitors (*pro genitivo*), for his benefactors (*pro dativo*), for his enemies (*pro accusativo*), for the infidels (*pro vocativo*), and for the departed souls (*pro ablativo*).

We can isolate four types of mental preparation in the strict sense: one defective, one short, one psalmodic, and one aug-

mented psalmodic variant. (1) The defective type is peculiar to France and only provides prayers for the private devotion of the celebrant. (2) The short variant includes an invocation of the Holy Spirit by means of a familiar commemoration with hymn, antiphon, versicle, and oration. (3) The psalmodic type is the most wide-spread and can be classified according to structural patterns and the number of psalms included. In terms of structure, the aesthetically less elaborate pattern merely juxtaposes psalms and orations, (4) while the more elaborate type assigns the psalms to the opening part of a larger structure that resembles commemorations or modules of sacramental rites. In the latter, the psalms are framed by antiphons and followed by a series of versicles (*preces*), in Hungary also a litany, and orations. Generic overlaps can lead to a merging of modules, e.g. in Laon where the preparatory psalm is identical with the *Iudica* (Ps 42), otherwise emblematic of the access to the altar, or in Prague where the closing oration already belongs to the washing of hands. Some parts, e.g. the invocation of the Holy Spirit can occur in the same form, yet in a later part of the preparation, too.

The number of psalms ranges from three to ten, five being the most typical, and four of them occurring almost everywhere. The psalms involved are selected by two themes: their relationship with the Temple and the altar, and their penitential character. The latter motif, however, always remains subordinate and mostly restricted to the closing *De profundis*. Still, penitential concerns are underlined by the antiphon, if there is any, given that the most popular antiphons are the same as those customarily recited before and after the seven penitential psalms (*Ne reminiscaris, Intret in conspectu*). Along with the doxology, each psalm can be followed by short prayers like the Hail Mary, or the *Deus propitius esto mihi peccatori* in Trondheim.

In case of augmentation, the usual structure of psalms and orations is prepared by invocations, enriched by versicles, or supplemented by other prayers and chants. Popular items are

the office-opening versicle *Deus in adiutorium* and some liturgical poems in honour of the Holy Spirit (the hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus*, the sequence *Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia*, or the antiphon *Veni Sancte Spiritus*). Nevertheless, the most popular addition is a series of versicles, also known as preces. The number, choice and order of verses tend to be fixed and are peculiar to the given diocese or religious order. Sometimes the augmented form resembles a minor hour of the divine office, consisting of an opening versicle, hymn, antiphon, psalms, chapter, responsory etc. In such cases it proves to be a stylized terce in honour of the Holy Spirit, as normally terce preceded the high mass of days in ordinary and festive seasons.

Beyond the mental preparation for mass, the communion of the priest and the thanksgiving after mass may also include lengthy private prayers in a highly emotional language. Some of them are recurrent, but plenty of them seem to be unique or at least the property of a limited group of uses. As some service books emphasise, special indulgences were secured by popes for those who recited them, yet it is the very necessity of indulgences which testifies that they were habitually neglected in practice. In the majority of traditions, however, the corpus of such prayers splits into two distinct categories: one of them is a historically solid, probably obligatory series that is specific to the related tradition, and the other is a loose appendix of additions. Such prayers are only loosely connected to precise functions. Their stock is variously distributed among the different modules of the preparation, and some of them may appear even later, after accessing the altar or in peculiar positions during the mass. Yet the effort to preserve their text, to trigger their spiritual message, and, above all, to keep them prayed is manifest from their enduring and far-reaching transmission.

Vesting

The second component is the physical preparation, namely the gestures of preparing the priest's body for the sacred action. The donning of vestments is its most emphatic part, but there are several other movements that must not be underestimated. A salutation is said when entering the sacristy, profane clothes are taken off, the hands and sometimes also the face of the priest are washed and dried, and his hair is combed. All these are associated with purification as, in a medieval context, combing often meant the removal of dandruff and perhaps lice.

Sources do not agree on the schedule of vesting. The modern ceremonial of pontifical high masses preserved the ideal that, under solemn circumstances, sacred vestments should lie prepared on the altar, and donning them should be a public affair, accompanied by the recitation of the terce. The Missal of Ávila provides two and not perfectly identical sets of vesting prayers, one before, and another after, the access to the altar. In Metz and some other uses, even ordinary priests processed to the altar in alb and stole, and only put on the chasuble, the definitive garb for offering mass, after having arrived at the altar. All these facts suggest an ambivalence between the symbolically right order of accessing the altar first and donning the vestments second and the more reasonable and time-sparing practice of acting in the opposite way. In Beauvais, the very vesting can be interrupted by elements of the preparation of the gifts; the priest places the host on the paten and pours wine and water into the chalice. It was, however, most probably a concession for private masses when no melismatic chants were sung before the Gospel, which was, also for Beauvais, the regular time for preparing the offerings. Yet in the majority of cases, the donning of the chasuble marks the end of the vesting module and takes place before leaving the sacristy and accessing the altar.

Similar to the prayers of mental preparation, vesting prayers may also complete a number of introductory texts. The aesthetics of compiling such a literary fabric is usually the same; first, some poetic overture is needed like the aforementioned responsory of the prodigal son, a chant invoking the Holy Spirit, or psalmody, and last, the essence of the module closes the structural unit in the form of orations directed to the immediate goal. First comes the right disposition, then the bodily actions imbued with profound spiritual meaning. The two ends may be connected through transitional items. A single versicle is the simplest solution, but they easily multiply into more versicles or explicit preces, introduced by a *Kyrie* and a *Pater noster*. This pattern can equally apply to an entire module like the mental preparation or the vesting as a whole, and to sub-modules like the donning of a single garb. Curiously, the Trinitarian Missal takes the vesting prayers first and adds verses mostly of Psalm 42 one by one after each, until it comes to the major vestments of the stole and the chasuble, donned during more usual combinations of petition, versicle, and oration.

In this sense, the introduction of vesting may resemble that of the mental preparation with its psalmody or invocation of the Holy Spirit. It seems that it was indifferent if such a characteristic series of items was placed before the preparatory prayers or the vesting, or if two analogous but distinct selections preceded both. In Cosenza and Pécs, vesting started with Psalm 50 (*Miserere*), in Laon with Psalm 42 (*Iudica*), in Troyes with *Veni Creator Spiritus*, and in Autun with *Veni Sancte Spiritus*. All these continued with a versicle or an entire preces and ended up in one or more orations. The concluding oration or series of orations have forerunners in the pre-mass apologies that already appear in some sacramentaries of the first millennium.

As to the texts accompanying the vesting itself, differences arise both in their genres and dimensions. Some uses prefer a short, formulaic uttering for each gesture. Such formulas are

typically derived from the psalms and do not address God directly, but comment on the parallel action by interpreting it as a spiritual deed, a bodily expression of moral duties, or the re-enactment of precedents from salvation history. Other uses have orations, addressing God and ending with regular conclusions. They can also vary from short prayers of a single sentence to long and flamboyant ones like those in the Missal of Barcelona. If the wording is not closely connected to the actual garb or gesture, the same prayer or formula can be assigned to different functions. The oration *Interiorius et exteriorius*, for example, was recited both in Liège and Viborg, yet in the former, it accompanied combing, while in the latter the washing of the priest's face. As praying the whole series proved often impractical, some books offer the auxiliary solution of saying only a single prayer before vesting or supplementing the series of prayers with the continuous recitation of a psalm.

Such texts were probably known by heart and recited as a daily routine of clerics. Hence, their selection and arrangement are informative of enduring traditions, be they the distinctive uses of institutions or the fashions of special periods or ecclesiastical circles. Doubtless, a high percentage of them was widespread throughout Europe and remained popular until the modern age, yet a considerable number is unique or known only by a narrower cluster of traditions. Their collection and comparison promise to be instrumental in classifying mass ordinaries. Distinctive texts often mark an entire series as the entries have a tendency to assemble into lasting sequences, typical to regions or networks of institutions.

Most of the vestments are familiar to the modern reader. The priest put on an amice, alb, cincture, maniple, stole, and chasuble. The detailed regulation of later sources also prescribes the way of putting on every garb. The amice, though worn on the shoulders, symbolized the helmet of salvation thus the priest put it first on his head, prayed the corresponding formula, and

only then let the cloth down, arranged it on his shoulders, and tied its laces. Ideally, the cincture was handed over by a server from behind. Stole and maniple were decorated with a cross and the priest had to kiss it before donning them. Similar rubrics about crossing oneself, kisses, and specifying how the given piece should be handled regularly supplement the prayers.

The local nomenclature of customary ecclesiastical garments enables philological distinction, e.g. *humerales* or *amictus* (*galea*, *umbralis*, *ephod*), *cingulus* or *zona* (*succincta*), *phanon* or *manipulus* (*mappula*), *casula* or *planeta* (*cappa*), *tunica* or *subtile*, and the grammatical endings of even the same roots often wavers between *-us*, *-a*, and *-um*. We may notice that in some Iberian uses *tunica* meant *alba* and not the garb of the subdeacon or one of those of a bishop. It varies whether the maniple or the stole is donned first, and, as mentioned above, both mental and physical preparation can be interrupted by some elements that already belong to the preparation of the altar.

A further aspect is the symbolic value attributed to each garb. Liturgical writers frequently commented on them, and the Missal of Ainay, Lyon's Benedictine monastery, even lifted such commentaries into its ordinary. Yet already the texts disclose associations and etymologizing that rouse specific moral or theological themes. For instance, many authors assumed that the maniple was originally a handkerchief to wipe sweat or tears, thus they associated it with earthly fatigue or partaking in Christ's passion. Others, on the contrary, thought that it was a shield, worn on the left hand of a spiritual warrior. In the psalms, however, *manipulus* denotes a bundle of reaped wheat so it could apply to the fruit of good deeds, taken as harvest into paradise. The stole on the neck resembled the yoke of oxen, recalling Christ's words about his sweet yoke and light burden, but the Latin word *stola* literally meant gown, evoking the image of a joyful assembly dressed in festal robes.

Bishops and abbots wore more than simple priests. Their extra attire consisted of episcopal stockings and footwear (*caligae, sandalia, calcei, peduli*), girdle (*balteus*), pectoral cross (*crux, pectorale*), gloves (*chirotecae*), mitre (*infula, mitra, cidaris*), ring (*anulus*), and crosier (*baculum*). Above these, they put on the tunic of subdeacons (*tunicella, subtile*) and the dalmatic (*dalmatica*) of deacons under the priestly chasuble, expressing that a pontiff represents the entirety of clerical functions. In service books, the corresponding prayers are inserted between the regular vesting prayers; footwear before all, girdle after the cincture, tunic and dalmatic after the stole, pectoral cross after the maniple, and the rest after the chasuble. Such texts, too, tend to work as coherent cycles, but, due to their fewer sources and the high medieval internationalization of pontificals, they can be less safely linked to distinct localities.

Even ordinary priests and monks could wear extraordinary vestments according to the peculiarities of their respective use. Some Benedictine sources provide a special formula for the scapular before the washing of hands. In Barcelona, Orléans, Rouen, or Tournai, a surplice (*superpellicium, rochetum*) was worn under the amice. In Northern France, wearing it might have resulted from the first part of the offering, the preparation of the gifts on the altar, that occasionally took place before the vesting, but a rubric from Braga suggests that the surplice ranked among the default clerical dresses and remitting it was only a practical concession. The Tarragona Missal adds an extra prayer for donning the cope after the chasuble. As the same book has special prayers for the tunic and the dalmatic as well, we may assume that it aims to provide a comprehensive list of vesting prayers instead of implying that a cope was put over the chasuble.

Sometimes, a sense of form required a closing unit at the end of the series. Most typically, it relied on a similar stock of orations that crowned the mental preparation or the psalmody, and the text recited for the chasuble often shared the function

of a vesting prayer for a specific garb and a conclusion of the whole process. In Schleswig, preceding versicles laid emphasis on it, while in Auch, a blessing was said at the very end.

Access to the altar

The third and last component of the preparatory rites is the access to the altar and its preparation for the sacrifice. Its parts were the entrance procession, the confession with absolution, a series of versicles that immediately preceded the ministers' ascent to the altar, subsequent orations, and kisses. In Grenoble and a few other uses, the confession worked as part of the preparation and took place before the entrance procession. Its typical position, however, was between the entrance and the ascent. Incensation and, in some uses, the preparation of the offerings followed; the priest placed the host on the paten and poured wine and water into the chalice, but the exact place of these gestures varied on a large scale, and the action, at least semantically, already belonged to the offertory rites.

The entrance of the celebrant was primarily associated with the emblematic Psalm 42 (*Judica*), framed by its verse *Introibo ad altare Dei*. The most common way of reciting the psalm was after having arrived at the foot of the altar, as in the modern Curial use, but not infrequently, it accompanied the entrance itself; the priest began the psalm already in the sacristy and recited it during the procession. The *Introibo* is usually understood as an antiphon, as it indeed is in the office of Michaelmas or Dedication, returning – though not indispensably – after the psalm. It is, however, never sung and may also take the form of a versicle, i.e. a verse-response structure. This is a recurrent pattern. Several texts of antiphons, responsories, or chants of the mass propers reappear in the context of the ordinary or other occasional rites, yet they are typically recited in prose. One way of adapting them to this new, silent and exclusively clerical environment was that

they became reinterpreted as versicles, intoned by the celebrant and answered by the sacred ministers or the altar servers.

Less frequently, true versicles or psalm excerpts started or accompanied the entrance procession with a more explicit reference to wandering. "Conduct me, o Lord, in thy way" from Psalm 85 (*Deduc me*) or "Shew, o Lord, thy ways to me, and teach me thy paths" from Psalm 24 (*Vias tuas*) prove relatively rare but stable components of certain Spanish and Hungarian traditions.

Between the psalm and the confession, a set of further versicles may be inserted. Some elements are widespread, while others are special; some uses have a longer series, while others retain only the opening formulas or borrow a shorter selection. They are akin to the preces of the divine office, especially those of prime that, as the usual opening of daily works, provided an apt analogy for setting about any activity of great importance. Texts invoking the Holy Spirit could equally appear in this position, either with the more general function of introducing the mass as the priest's foremost duty or with the narrower focus of fostering his examination of conscience.

Semantically, such preces and invocations already belong to the confession, an integral part of prime and compline as well. As the confession's immediate preamble, the most popular text is the versicle *Confitemini* which makes use of the double sense of the Latin word; instead of "Give praise," it means here "Confess to the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever." At some places, especially in Northern France, Burgundy, and Spain, a priestly apology is added, variable in its precise wording, but typically containing the words *ego reus* or *ego peccator*. No less is the text of the confession variable. Even in the sources of the same use, plenty of variants may occur from very short ones to those that list all types of sins and invoke a host of intercessors. It is, however, often difficult to reconstruct the exact wording. Many missals only hint at the confession by incipit or

a rubric and, in such cases, one has to look for the full text in related breviaries or rituals. Other auxiliary sources can be the seven penitential psalms or the Ash Wednesday and Maundy Thursday ceremonies.

Both the confession and the following absolution (*Misereatur*) were said twice; first the confession of the celebrant with the absolution from the servers, then vice versa, followed by a single sacramental absolution on the part of the priest (*Indulgentiam*). The two absolving formulas are ubiquitous, but their precise wording and extent are no less colourful than those of the *Confiteor*; the additions and insertions resemble the techniques of troping. In Strasbourg, Basel, and Chur, not only the ministers received absolution, but another absolution was administered to all the faithful present. In some dioceses of southern Europe (mostly in Burgundy), a stylized satisfaction followed the absolution, consisting of a penitential formula, the Lord's prayer and the Hail Mary. Some items of the following preces can also be interpreted as an acknowledgment of guilt or a firm resolution to improve.

The ascent to the altar consisted of a series of versicles in front of the steps and another series of orations recited during and immediately after the ascent. Here, some texts of the mental preparation or the prayers before confession may return again, thematically connected to the invocation of the Holy Spirit or to prayers for spiritual fitness and purity. Many of them are also familiar from prime or, more precisely, from the ensuing chapter office. This section seems rather malleable and extensible. As we have seen, it partly works as an aftermath of the confession, but special devotions, especially to the Virgin Mary, may also be expressed in its context.

The versicles at the foot of the altar are manifold and not at all indispensable. However, we can find them in the majority of sources. The most representative ones are *Deus tu conversus*, *Ostende nobis*, *Sacerdotes tui*, and, in Germany, *Non nobis*

Domine. Among the orations, the most popular is the ancient *Aufer a nobis*, but it can be followed and even replaced by others. If it is so, the alternatives come from the same base of penitential and invocative orations as the aforementioned preparatory prayers. This steady recurrence of the same sets of items highlights two characteristic phenomena. First, it makes obvious that soft structure implies a looser relationship between the practical framework and its textual furniture. Both the series of ritual activities and the repertory of items are rather constant, yet their connection is often accidental. Second, we may observe a renewed effort to save propers. Preparation for the mass was a highly respected but still optional rite with its rich and moving texts at the risk of falling into disuse. A logical solution was to steal at least some of them into the mass ordinary.

After having ascended to the altar, the priest performed gestures of salutation, mostly kisses. They were not restricted to the kissing of the altar and the saluting of the relics buried beneath its table, though they regularly occurred during the *Oramus te* oration, immediately joining *Aufer a nobis* that was said during the ascent. In Sarum, the kiss of peace, namely the reconciliation of the sacred ministers was anticipated here, obeying Christ's warning that you should let thy offering before the altar if not reconciled first to thy brother. In several churches, the priest kissed the crucifix (this gesture was more widespread and equipped with a more uniform formulary) and sometimes the Gospel book, too. Instead of the Gospel book, the missal or sacramentary could be opened at the picture of crucifixion before the canon and the kiss delivered to the feet of that image in a similar fashion. Some books prescribe to kiss also the *sedes maiestatis*. It was most probably the picture representing the Father on a throne on the recto page besides the crucifix.

Formularies accompanied both the kiss of the crucifix and the book. That of the cross frequently comprised a full commemoration with antiphon, versicle, and oration, while that of

the Gospel meant mostly a single sentence. In Meissen, Chur, Vienne, and the Abbey of St Emmeram, Regensburg, the priest prayed the introducing verses *Domine labia mea aperies* ("O Lord, thou wilt open my lips"), borrowed from the matins, and probably signed his lips before commencing the introit.

Incensations

Before entering into ceremonial and textual details, it is worthwhile to consider the symbolic power of incensation. Its meanings can partly be derived from prayers and commentaries, while other components are rather implicit; they result from the physical attributes of the process. They involve heat, smoke, good scent, and upwards motion. Liturgical writers and already the Scriptures, especially the Psalms, Isaias, and Revelations, associate heat with burning love and the purifying force of a melting furnace. Intense prayers and good deeds ascend from it as pure and fragrant offerings to the Lord. Yet smoke both covers things and leaves its smell on what it has touched. Therefore, it can evoke the cloud of divine presence and serve as a tool for handing over sacred qualities. Swinging the censer provides a sense of direction to the act; incensation can be addressed to a well-defined target. The close connection of incense with liturgical worship lends honouring character to incensation. Persons and objects who are incensed share in the attributes of holiness; it can express, confirm, or even constitute sanctity.

Offering incense was a basic level of cult and priesthood in the Old Testament. Albeit the altar of incense was inferior to the altar of holocaust, it stood in front of the Holy of Holies, and burning incense was a characteristic duty of not only priests but even angels. In the Apocalypse, the smoke of incense ascends up before God from the hand of the angel and, in Luke, the angel appears to Zachary on the right side of the altar of incense. Offering mass meant the fulfilment of animal sacrifice in medieval

thought, but it was still desirable for Christian liturgy to act on every level as the antitype of the Mosaic cult. When a church was dedicated, incense was burnt on its main altar prior to its consecration, the deposition of the relics, and the first mass offered on it. Priests, therefore, who identified themselves as the kohens of the New Testament, readily worshipped as burners of incense before entering the eucharistic celebration.

Ceremonially, there were three occasions of offering incense in the Roman mass: the first after ascending to the altar, the second before reading the Gospel, and the third during the offertory. The incensation of the altar before the introit is relatively rare in medieval sources, although there are several instances of it. It seems that the restriction allowing incense at the offertory but not at the introit – typical to funeral masses in the modern age – reflects a once prevailing custom. Where the incensation during the introit was practised, it proved to be a simplified form of that during the offertory.

After ascending to the altar, the servers provided the thurible to the priest on the right side, lifted the censer's dome, and offered him the open incense boat, asking for his blessing. He put grains of incense on the burning charcoal and blessed them with a short formula and the sign of the cross. Here, the ceremonial stressed the honouring aspect; the smoke was swung against the altar's horizontal and vertical surfaces, the altar cross, and the priest. As all of them were already consecrated, incensation held here the meaning of greeting and respect, similar to the previous kisses.

Before the Gospel, the celebrant put incense in the censer and blessed it in a similar way, but no immediate incensation followed. Under solemn circumstances, a procession with the Gospel book left the sanctuary or at least the vicinity of the altar. The book was carried by the deacon or the subdeacon, while the censer was brought at the head of the train. In this context, the Gospel, representing Christ risen, proceeded in smoke, recall-

ing the pillar of cloud in the desert, the smoke covering mount Sinai, or the cloud hanging over the Tabernacle and later filling Salomon's Temple after its consecration. After having arrived at the ambo or lectern, a saluting incensation of the book followed, but, after the reading of the Gospel, neither the deacon was incensed nor did he incense the celebrant. Only sporadic remarks from Montearagón and Sigüenza suggest that something like this happened.

During the offertory, the priest put incense in the censer in a well-tryed manner. A specific form of incensing the gifts followed, often illustrated with pictures in late medieval and modern service books. The offerings were not honoured with the customary swinging movements directed towards them, but, according to the detailed rubrics of the Roman Missal, the priest drew three crosses with the thurible over them and then described three circles around them, the first two clockwise, and the third counter-clockwise. Such movements resemble a target cross; lines at right angles to one another define the precise object of consecration, and circles determine the radius of its efficacy. This is by no means mere speculation. Both the spatial concept and the vocabulary of offering show deep concern at demarcation either on the level of offerings (the Eucharistic species from other donations) or the attendants (the initiated faithful from catechumens). It is telling that the closing oration of the process already terms the gifts *secreta*, the selected ones. After these, the priest incensed the altar just like before the mass. A routine incensation of the celebrant ensued and, in this case, it expanded to the incensation of the ministers, the clergy, and the congregation. It is probable from continuous practice and medieval illustrations that a fourth, honouring incensation could take place during elevation, although it must have been the duty of lower-ranking altar servers without any text and so service books typically leave it unmentioned.

From a textual point of view, respective formulas belong to the call for blessing, the blessing itself, the process of incensation, and the priest while receiving the incense himself. The call was analogous to other calls before small-scale blessings, administered to lectors of the mass, the office, and the monastic meal. For objects, including the grains of incense, the characteristic formula was *Benedicite pater reverende*, for the convent only *Benedicite*, and for readers *Iube domne benedicere*, but the categories of lifeless and living objects did not necessarily split, and there existed other formulas as well. *Benedicite* was quite common. Mostly in Spain, several sources ask for the blessing of incense with *Iube domne benedicere*, and some French uses apply unique wordings like *Benedic domine* (Tournai) or *Benedic hoc incensum* (Grenoble).

The blessing itself may take various forms. The difference does not concern only the wording but also the genre which can range from regular orations to short biblical citations. The first category stresses the effective, sacramental nature of the speech act, endowed with the capacity of transforming a profane thing into a holy one, while the latter treats the ritual gesture as already sacred, articulating its function by summoning biblical precedents. The two extremes are connected by texts put in the imperative or optative mood, suggesting ritual efficacy, yet utilizing poetic language and colourful imagery, more appropriate to comment on the act than to transform it. Most of the formulas use the third person singular, either for the incense ("may this incense be blessed") or for God ("may the Lord bless this incense"). Regular orations appeal immediately to God so that he may bless the incense. One popular formula (*Ab illo benedicaris*), however, addresses the incense directly in a versified form, combining the style of rhymed blessings for readers with the approach of some exorcisms that speak to lifeless materials like water, salt, oil, or ashes, in the second person singular.

Formulas during the incensation and the receiving of incense played a different part. Along with many other texts, they aimed to help mental concentration and to prevent the priest's attention from wavering (*evagatio mentis*). We can recognize increasing care in the Middle Ages that the celebrant's mind be continually occupied and the parallel ceremonial act duly interpreted. Some blessings worked as accompanying texts as well, while others were first of all accompanying formulas, and only secondarily adopted as blessings. Apart from a few excerpts like *Dirigatur Domine* from Psalm 140 which compares evening prayer to incense ascending to heavens, blessings and accompanying texts could be exchanged. The themes they roused were more important than the exact functions they filled. Similar to phenomena already observed, some of the formulas derived from chants, especially those with angelic or sacrificial themes. A part of them has also been versiculized, i.e. transformed into a verse-response structure.

Several texts associate incense with the fire of love, the removal of evil smell, or, markedly before the Gospel, with heavenly inspiration. More ingenious prayers represent the act of incensation as a sort of sacrifice (*munus, oblatio, sacrificium*). The ordinaries of Chartres and Sens adapt a well-known prayer from the offertory rites (*Suscipe sancta Trinitas oblationem incensi*) and, in Minden, another offertory prayer, *Veni invisibilis sanctificator*, served the same purpose. Some uses, mostly in the vicinity of Paris, borrowed more daringly a motif from the canon about the sacrifice of Abel and other figures of the Old Testament (*Deus qui suscepisti munera pueri Abel*). A prayer from Carcassone (*Fac me quaeso Domine fungi sacerdotio*) emphasized the priestly nature of offering incense. Others like Aix, Auxerre, or Messina went on to highlight its angelic qualities when referring to St Michael or Gabriel, standing on the right side of the altar of incense (*Per intercessionem, Stetit angelus, Deus qui miro ordine*), or the angel with the censer in the Apocalypse

(*Ascendat fumus aromatum*). Texts recited by the priest when receiving incense shyly emphasized his personal unworthiness (*Non nobis Domine*), but we know of a prayer from Spoleto that interpreted the situation as a self-offering; when the ministers were incensed, they offered their own bodies as sacrificial gifts with a short prayer (*Suscipe corpus meum*).

Books most frequently provide such formularies in an offertory context. This may express the eminence of the rite as the primary occasion for offering incense as well, and as the situation when the meanings of greeting, sanctifying, sacrifice, demarcation, and the descent of the cloud of divine presence coincide. Yet it may also come from the fact that the textual sequence of call, blessing, and filling the intervals of the altar's and the celebrant's incensations recurred regularly. If they did not, it signalled a special case of properization. As there were more formulas at hand, each of high moral, theological, and aesthetic value, the designers of liturgies might have been prone to saving them. Hence, they dissimilated the three incensations providing each with a different or at least partly different set of prayers, or they offered more variants for the same purpose. In particularly abundant sources, these might overlap with texts for blessing the incense on Holy Saturday or in general.

Kyriale

The term Kyriale aptly describes the five chants of the mass with unchanging texts. By the High Middle Ages, they underwent considerable properization which manifested itself in a multiplicity of melodies, meticulously assigned to different ranks and categories of celebrations, and extensive troping, especially with the *Kyrie*. By the dawn of the modern age, the musical composition still flourished, but tropes were only sparsely retained by some French and English dioceses. Both tendencies render an originally unchanging part into a changing part and thus they

logically belong to the domain of propers. As fields of poetic and compositional activity, melodies and tropes for ordinary chants represent an important output of medieval art, yet, from a strictly liturgical perspective, they will always remain secondary. Similar to the loose domains of Alleluias, sequences, and versified offices, ordinaries were allowed to conform to the latest fashions and did not behave as lasting, trustworthy markers of uses. As melodies became more and more complex and numerous, the custom evolved that the ministers recited them in silent prose, parallel to the chant of the choir. The intonations of the *Gloria* and the *Credo* by the celebrant and the *Ite missa est* or *Benedicamus* by the deacon were exceptions; these are typically recorded with musical notation in the service books. The subsequent summary, therefore, mostly deals with gestures attached to or performed during the singing of the Kyrieale.

(1) Even the post-Tridentine ceremonial preserved some ambiguity about the *Kyrie*. In low masses, the celebrant said it in front of the middle of the altar, alternating with the ministers, while, in solemn masses, he said it on the epistle side, i.e. on the right, facing the book. Among the missals we processed that provide any detail, seven sources opt for the middle, and only the late Calahorra Missal prefers explicitly the epistle corner. The Missal of Córdoba specifies that the priest should recite it when moving from the right to the centre; the first three “Kyrie” invocations in the epistle corner, the following three “Christe” underway, and the last three “Kyrie” arriving in the middle.

Kyrie tropes that endured up to the age of the printing press typically figure in one block as a collected chapter of missals. They concentrate in Northern and Central France and in Britain with some outposts in the East like Gniezno, Poznań, and Regensburg, and in the South like Agen, Béziers, Viviers, and Messina. Besides the tropes, a few sources double the verb “*eleison*” (have mercy) or attach the Greek “*imas*” (upon us) to it.

(2) As we have seen in the *Qualiter missa Romana celebratur* rubric, the *Gloria*, i.e. the angelic hymn was an episcopal prerogative in the early Roman liturgy. The once popular trope *Sacerdos Dei excelsi* invited the bishop to stand before the holy altar and solemnly intone the praise of the eternal king. The late rubrics of Sigüenza preserved a similar practice, although not as an episcopal function but as an instrument to signal high feast rank. On great solemnities, servers in copes went to the priest and, in a gentle voice, addressed him with the words "Let it please you, reverend father, to sing the angelic canticle" (*Placeat reverende pater*).

They are again Spanish missals and some late books from the South like those of Aosta and Cosenza that specify the performance of the *Gloria*. The priest should intone the hymn from the middle of the altar with extended hands, immediately joining them and bowing his head for the opening "Deo." Minor inclinations accompanied the clauses "adoramus te," "gratias agimus tibi," "suscipe deprecationem nostram," and every uttering of the name of Jesus Christ. Lastly, he crossed himself when finishing the chant with "in gloria Dei Patris." In Calahorra, the priest struck his breast thrice when uttering the threefold "tu solus." According to the patterns of performing *sui generis* litany-like chants like the *Kyrie* and the *Agnus Dei*, the clergy sang also the *Gloria*, the Creed, and the *Sanctus* alternately in two half-choirs, and the ministers might have done the same in some traditions, even if the rubrics rarely document such nuances. In Viborg, the usual first incensation was postponed to the *Gloria*, probably because enough time remained for it after having finished the text in prose; the interval during the introit and the *Kyrie* was already busy with prayers at the foot of the altar. This is another example of the effort to fully occupy the priest during celebration both with mental and ceremonial tasks.

For the *Gloria*, the number of long-lasting tropes is considerably lower than for the *Kyrie*. The most popular one is *Spiritus et*

alme, mostly inserted into the basic text of the ordinary with red letters. Missals from Amiens and Laon preserved three tropes, and Roskilde six, but even these are mostly modest additions.

(3) The *Credo* was the latest addition to the Kyriale, not even mentioned in the ancient ordinaries and having considerably fewer melodies than the rest. It has always been a challenge for liturgists to determine the occasions when it should or should not be performed. The two factors of its inclusion were feast rank and an association with doctrine. Sundays, the feasts of the Lord, and those of the Virgin Mary self-evidently had a Creed. Among the saints, singing a Creed was a special feature of the feasts of the apostles as par excellence preachers of the faith. In many books, even the heading is *Symbolum apostolorum*, although the text is undoubtedly the Nicene Creed. Their group could naturally expand to the evangelists, and then incorporate the Church Fathers and the Doctors of the Church. Later, however, the notion of apostolicity absorbed other saints like Mary Magdalene who brought the good news of Christ's resurrection to the disciples as the *apostola apostolorum* or St Martin of Tours on whose head, according to his legend, the Holy Spirit descended in the form of a fiery globe, similar to the tongues of fire that sat upon the apostles on the first Pentecost.

Ceremonially, the intonation and the performance of the Creed resembled those of the *Gloria*. The extant rubrics are of uneven precision, but those that have survived confirm the early modern practice. Kneeling accompanied the clause "et incarnatus est," honouring the mystery of the incarnation. The theme was emphatic in the context of the mass which was itself a re-enactment of the incarnation under the Eucharistic species. There was, however, an ancient Christian rule of abstaining from genuflection in Eastertide, and the late books of Toledo and Córdoba subscribe to such a distinction. They also prescribe crossing oneself for "crucifixus etiam." Bowing of the head accompanied the words "simul adoratur." Like the sign of

the cross, this too resulted from the representational character of medieval worship. Parallel physical gestures joined every verbal expression of reverence like "Come, let us adore and fall down" in the invitatory Psalm 94 before matins or "and, falling down, they adored him" in the Gospel of Epiphany. In the end, the ministers made the sign of the cross on themselves for the final "et vitam venturi saeculi" clause.

(4) Among the ordinary chants, the *Sanctus* was considered the most ancient and universal. Its Hebrew model, the thrice-holy hymn cried by the seraphim in the vision of Isaias was widely recognized. Medieval worshippers occasionally associated it with the eastern orbit of Christianity. The ordinary of the famous Sacramentary of Gellone from the 8th century writes the *Sanctus* in Latin but with Greek letters. Some westerners might have been aware that eastern and oriental rites had the *Sanctus*, too, but the immediate reason was most probably the other thrice-holy hymn, the *Trisagion*, that sounded in Greek first and only second in Latin on Good Friday. A Beneventan missal from Dalmatia even replaces the *Sanctus* with the *Trisagion*, although puts the abbreviation S. S. S. before it. In the Old Roman gradual of *Santa Cecilia in Trastevere*, the opening phrases of the *Trisagion* figure as one of several *Sanctus* tropes, contracted into "Sanctus Deus fortis."

Rubrics are few, as usual, but those at hand support the early modern practice. There was a profound inclination for the opening section, and straightening up with the sign of the cross for the *Benedictus*. Some sources suggest that the priest should strike his breast thrice for the threefold "Holy" at the beginning of the chant. The splitting of the chant into two halves of equal weight, a *Sanctus* before the elevation and a *Benedictus* after it, appeared at first in polyphonic settings of the 15th century. It was, however, only a practical concession to distribute music symmetrically over the quiet canon, and liturgical sources do not reckon with it.

Very few *Sanctus* tropes have an established place in mature missals. Those that survived are exclusively Marian items and feature Norman (Coutances, Hereford, Salisbury, York), Scandinavian (Lund, Strängnäs), and monastic uses (Vallombrosa and the inclusive Benedictine Missal).

(5) In musical terms, the *Agnus Dei* was related to the *Sanctus*, and their performance was similar, too. Rubrics describing the appropriate gestures are more plentiful here. Besides the always substantial Spanish sources, the scribes of some Italian, German, and Polish books also felt the need of specifying them. This might have originated from the fact that the *Agnus Dei* sounded after the consecration of the host and so the priest must had to take care of the Eucharist. The ministers bowed before the altar profoundly and struck their breasts for the three petitions, but the celebrant's thumbs and forefingers already had contact with the Sacrament and thus had to avoid touching any other thing or being separated from each other. This demanded special caution. The penitential beating of the chest was conducted with the three lower fingers, avoiding any contact of the canonical digits and the chasuble. Moreover, the *Agnus Dei* was originally a *confractorium*, a litany that accompanied the breaking of the host. Some rubrics like those from Aix and Sigüenza assumed that the priest held the broken host between the fingers of his left, while he recited the text of the chant and struck his breast with his right hand.

No tropes survived into the age of printed missals. Textual changes primarily concern funeral masses. Then, the petitions "have mercy upon us" (2×) and "grant us peace" were substituted by a range of petitions for the dead. The most popular substitutes were "dona eis requiem (sempiternam)," as in the Tridentine Missal, but "indulgentiam" and, after the last "sempiternam" phrase, "locum indulgentiae," and "locum indulgentiae cum sanctis tuis in gloria" were also popular endings in France and Catalonia.

(6) Early polyphonic ordinaries from the 14th century like the Mass of Toulouse, the Mass of Tournai, and the epoch-making Mass of Notre Dame by Machaut treat the *Ite missa est* as a sixth part of the cycle. They are lively and often virtuoso compositions. Truly, the *Ite missa est* repeated the melody of the first stanza of the *Kyrie* and was a field of troping activity already as a plainchant genre. The dioceses of Jaén, Regensburg, and Salisbury preserved rich collections of its tropes, while Aquileia, Calahorra, and Pamplona had more limited sets. Both the melodies and the tropes stressed the similarity between the *Kyrie* and the *Ite missa est*.

The concept was not absolutely alien from liturgical experience. As observed before, the dismissal formulas, along with the intonations of the *Gloria* and the *Credo*, ranked among the textually constant yet musically modestly varying components of the mass. They were reserved for the priest and the deacon. Cantors were not allowed to sing them, thus it still took centuries for polyphonic settings to incorporate their words. Missals that arrange intonations for the *Gloria* and the *Credo* according to different categories of occasions have a tendency to add the *Ite missa est* and, for penitential seasons, the *Benedicamus Domino* and, for funeral masses, the *Requiescant in pace* as well.

Readings, chants, and the Gospel

From the collect to the Gospel, the mass consisted of an uninterrupted series of propers. One-half of the changing items belonged to this section. Still, it was adorned and supplemented with unchanging parts, demonstrating that, except for the central Eucharistic prayers and some chants, the ordinary worked as a troping of the core of the mass, and not as a peer of the propers. Volume clearly marked the limit of canonicity. Only the propers sounded aloud. The ordinary, however elaborate it was, went on silently or in a low voice. Four drives may be

detected behind such supplements: the need to apologize and prepare oneself before an eminently sacred act, to make use of its sacramental power, to frame it, and to fill the intervals when the priest was unoccupied.

The apology is a classical term of liturgical scholarship for prayers that stress the indignity of the minister and beseech God for the forgiveness of sins and spiritual fitness. 20th-century authors often saw apologies as the distortions of communal worship into private moralizing or symptoms of neurotic religiosity, and indeed, some ordinaries like the infamous *Missa Illyrica* from the early 11th century are so exuberant that they obscure the very structure and proportions of the mass. Yet, established apologies of the Middle Ages remain between the confines of balance and sobriety. They serve as respectful stops or invocations before ceremonial summits, slowing down time and preparing the soul like musical interludes. There were four such major culminations in the Roman mass: the already discussed ascent to the altar, the reading of the Gospel, the Eucharistic action, and the communion of the priest.

Another aspect of these culminations was that they worked as fountains of sacred energies. Kissing the altar and the crucifix was not only a greeting gesture but also an occasion to come into close contact with their holiness. This is obvious of the fact that later kisses in the mass typically follow a descending order of hierarchy; the most sacred object is kissed first, and then its sacramental charge is handed over to lower-ranking objects and persons. Divine manifestations in the consecrated space of the church and the altar, God's word, the offerings, and the Eucharist meant an ever-intensifying scale of encounters. All of them had to be approached in awe, yet all of them provided an abundant source of grace. It was desirable to expressly acknowledge the grace that sprouted from each divine manifestation and to direct it conceptually towards the beneficiaries of the mass: the

servers, the congregation, the sponsors, and those for whom the mass was offered.

The mass, however, was not an abstract theological issue. Ceremonial summits demanded framing like every high point of aesthetic or social value. Apologies before the summits, and blessings or thanksgiving formulas after them, proved a natural tool to enclose them in a niche of texts and gestures. From this perspective, theological meaning and sacramental function were of minor importance. What really mattered was the principle of putting something before and something after the holiest events.

Lastly, it is important to remember that singing and reading were not priestly duties. Under solemn circumstances, the celebrant was idle from the beginning of the lesson to the end of the Gospel. From the 11th century, he read the corresponding texts silently, but they took much less time than their parallel audible performance. The priest's mind, as already stated, had not to wander about. Even in the modern age, decrees repeatedly ordered that sacred ministers were prohibited from praying their breviaries during the lengthy chants of solemn masses, and it is always the laws by which we can presume the nature of crimes committed. Many medieval uses anticipated the first part of the offertory rites, the preparation of the host and the chalice, to the time of the interlectionary chants. Yet the inactivity of the celebrant during the propers also provided an opportunity to save preparatory prayers that had been neglected before the mass. Voluminous texts had little chance to survive in a devotional context. Lifted over into the thick of the ordinary, they had better prospects.

In the solemn form of the Curial mass, the reader of the lesson received a mute blessing. This was not administered before but after his service as the lector of the apostolic passage, and the blessing was purely ceremonial. The subdeacon knelt before the priest with the lectionary in his hands, the celebrant blessed him with the sign of the cross, and the subdeacon kissed the priest's

hand laid on the top of the book of epistles. The only evidence for textual formulas accompanying these gestures comes from Évreux where the subdeacon said *Benedicite sacerdos* and the priest blessed him with the words *Benedictus sis et benedictus sermo oris tui*. As a rule, the nearby minister gave thanks with a quiet *Deo gratias* after the lesson. Most probably, this was a widespread custom, but not every source refers to it explicitly.

We can observe a remarkable tendency in Spain and some sources of the Beneventan region for postponing lengthy preparatory prayers to the time of the *Gloria*, the lesson, or the interlectionary chants. We can easily imagine the situation on the basis of modern Byzantine practice that assigns page-long prayers to every chant of the choir. A booklet of a few pages can hold all the loud parts of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, while the parallel texts recited by the priest silently at the altar require a considerably longer volume. In Castile, the probably longest preparatory prayer of the entire Roman rite (*Summe sacerdos*), commonly attributed to St Ambrose or Augustine, has a regular alternative room during the *Gloria* or the interlectionary chants. Beneventan sources apply shorter penitential prayers or the popular apology *Ante conspectum divinae*, but they differentiate between the *Gloria* and the gradual, recommending distinct orations for each. Books from Albaneta (a priory subject to Monte Cassino) and Verona extend the method to the lesson as well; they list a series of items from the same stock that supplied the preparation.

All these, however, are sporadic, regional developments. What is really common to all western traditions is the framing of the Gospel. The deacon may start his service with an apology before receiving the blessing of the priest. The favourite one is *Munda cor meum*, known from the Roman Missal, which asks for the cleansing of the deacon's lips on the analogy of the prophet Isaias whose mouth has been cleansed with a live coal, taken by an angel from the altar burning before the heavenly

throne. The apology was widespread but not universal. Missals from the central and north-western regions of Europe, for example, do not seem to know of it although they carefully record the subsequent blessing.

Munda cor meum lived in several variants, and it had a few alternatives. Before the blessing, *Domine labia mea aperies* could take its place in a few uses, especially in the wider Lyonnaise region. After the blessing, the deacon recited the apology *Conforta me rex sanctorum* in some southern dioceses or its abridged version, *Da mihi sermonem rectum*, in York and Scandinavia. Both were paraphrases of the offertory *Recordare mei*, recalling Esther's prayer before she intervened before the Persian king for her people. Sparsely, there existed other apologies as well, and a 13th-century record from Zagreb suggests that the pre-Gospel apology could grow into a short penitential preces and an invocation of the Holy Spirit with the same themes as those before the ascent to the altar. As the position of the apology was unfixed and so it was not necessary to start the Gospel immediately, other prayers, otherwise said after the Gospel, could act as its introductions, too. The same *Pax Christi* formula that the priest had recited when kissing the Gospel book at the beginning of the mass could repeat itself when he kissed it after the Gospel. A Beneventan source from Dalmatia presupposes that a kiss was also delivered by the deacon with the same formula as an introductory greeting before reciting the Gospel.

In contrast with the apologies, the blessing was obligatory. It consisted of a call and the administration of the blessing itself. The regular call was *Iube domne benedicere* like in matins or before the monastic meal, less frequently *Benedicite*. Later sources emphasize that "domnus" refers to the priest and "Dominus" to the Lord, thus the deacon says the former and the celebrant the latter when he offers the mass without the assistance of sacred ministers. Medieval books, however, often fail to discern, and capitalization did not yet serve to signal rank or holiness. The

answer to the call may diverge. In France and Spain, *Dominus sit in corde tuo* was the most popular. It was identical to the blessing of a preacher before his sermon in the same territories, but it had several various endings (“*evangelium pacis*,” “*eloquia sua sancta*,” “*in salutem credentium et audientium*” etc.). In Cambrai, the ending asked that the Lord may also remove the spirit of conceit from the deacon. This was a contamination of the usual blessing with *Dominus custodiat introitum tuum*, a formula for the weekly change of readers in monastic communities.

The traditional dialogue before the pericope and the title of the passage were everywhere uniform. The deacon drew a cross with the thumb of his right hand on the opening initial or the cross before it and signed himself only on his forehead (Hereford), on his forehead, mouth, and heart (Saint-Brieuc), or even crossed himself in addition to the three small crosses (Cuenca). Many books remark that all must bow their heads for the name of Jesus, or, as in Braga, bow for the name of the Virgin Mary and kneel down for that of Jesus. When the passage was over, the deacon signed himself with the sign of the cross and kissed the text according to some French and Spanish rubrics. Then, he carried the Gospel book to the priest or the highest-ranking prelate who was present and offered him the opening cross or initial for kissing. After that, he often kissed the hand of his superior. In masses without a deacon, the celebrant directly kissed it after the reading. The gesture often involved the *Pax Christi* formula, but others like *Osculum pacis* or *Pax tibi* also appeared.

Other closing texts in a low voice range between short thanksgivings, said by the nearby server, like *Laus tibi Christe* or *Deo gratias*, and blessings that mobilized the sacramental power of the Gospel or directed it to the absolution of venial sins. These prove to be the most divergent texts of the whole module. There are more ingenious Biblical thanksgivings like *Hosanna Filio David* (Spain), *Benedictus qui venit* (York), or *Sit nomen Domini benedictum* (Autun), salutations of the Gospel that typically be-

gin with the word *Ave* (Ibero-Provencal uses, Troyes, Langres), and demonstrative acclamations starting with the phrase "This is the holy Gospel/law/word" in the corresponding grammatical numbers and genders, mostly in France. In Northern France and Bordeaux, a short confession of the faith may answer such acclamations or even substitute them (*Credo et confiteor*). Those formulas that take the form of an absolution mostly occur in the South and resemble the rhymed blessings of the divine office (*Per evangelica dicta, Verba sancti Evangelii, Verba Evangelii, Per Evangelii verbum*). Their rather juridically formulated equivalent, however, *Per istos sermones* concentrates in Germany and Hungary, though it appears sporadically throughout Europe and with various additions.

Missals from Spain and the southern and western provinces of France often provide a special blessing for the preacher. The text is nearly identical to one of the pre-Gospel blessings. This simplicity is due to the fact that the sermon was not an integral part of the mass. Preaching needed special authorization; without that, it was a prerogative of bishops. When a sermon was still delivered, it could happen in different contexts both inside and outside the mass, but, in any case, it too was surrounded by a series of prayers; the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the Prologue of the Gospel of John before the sermon, and the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the general confession of sins, and the absolution of the people after it. By the Late Middle Ages, we can only observe remnants of this extensive frame in the Holy Week ceremonies of some French cathedrals.

THE MASS OF THE FAITHFUL

The offering of the people and the bidding prayers

After the Gospel and, if it was also said, the Creed, the sacrificial part of the mass began. The offertory was its most complex part. In the established Roman rite, the texts of the offertory rites were nearly as long as the Eucharistic prex so that some sources, especially in the Germanic realm, prefer to call them *canon minor*. The ceremonial of the offertory even surpassed the complexity of the subsequent parts. In a few minutes, several ministers handled a number of sacred vessels and utensils, and the flow of events was minutely arranged in the elaborate spatial structure of the sanctuary and the altar. Moreover, unlike the canon, the offertory was not an exclusively clerical affair. At least theoretically, the people liberally brought forth their material gifts and laid their petitions before God.

We know from St Jerome that the deacon proclaimed by name those laymen who sponsored the mass by offering gifts, and also the largesse of their donation; they might have even been applauded by the congregation. A 4th-century critic like Pope Innocent I did not take sides against the practice itself, but he proposed to transfer the names to the canon, where we find both the *Memento*-s of the Roman mass and the *post nomina* prayers of the Hispano-Gallic rites. Later ecclesiastics abandoned the nomination and the announcement of exact sums, but the *oblatio populi*, the offering of the people continued. Writing to Emperor Otto III around 1000, Pope Sylvester II refers to it as an Italian custom, that time already strange to northerners, and, still in the mid-16th century, missals from Cosenza in Calabria, Die in Southern France, and some Spanish dioceses provide rubrics and formulas for taking over the gifts from the faithful.

The regular place of the reception was before the washing of hands and, if there was one, incensation. Most sources put it after the offering of the Eucharistic bread and wine so that the offering of the people seems to be an addition to the primary, sacramental offering. In Cosenza, however, the offering of the people immediately followed the quiet recitation of the offertory chant by the priest; hence the sacramental offering was part and, indeed, the fulfilment of the whole process. The priest or, under solemn circumstances, the deacon took over the gifts with the words *Centuplum accipias et vitam aeternam possideas*. It was a universal formula, but it had some alternatives and supplements, too. The recipient went to the right side of the altar, its lowest grade, or any other convenient site of the sanctuary where the faithful were allowed to enter. He had to touch each offering with his right hand as a sign of acceptance, and those who offered kissed it. This typically happened through the medium of a vestment; either the priest wrapped the end of the stole around his hand or he took off his maniple and presented it for kissing. Then he blessed the giver with the sign of the cross silently or uttering a simple benediction of the usual stock. Having received all the gifts, he went back to the altar, sometimes adding a final oration that the gifts might please God or for the benefit of the donors.

The sources do not specify the nature of the gifts, but subsequent blessings of bread suggest that it played a prominent role among them. In some uses, it was a no less regular Sunday ceremony than the blessing of water. It could equally take place before and after the mass, but some southern sources definitely present it as part of the offering of the people, probably because loaves of holy bread for human consumption had once been considered the remnant of the bread chosen for consecration. This, however, was probably an already forgotten link by the High Middle Ages. The texts were the same as outside the mass and, as we will soon see, this point of the mass worked as an overall

interruption, hosting every kind of communication between clergy and laity. Early Christian documents and archaic blessings attached to the end of the canon postulate that consumable agricultural goods other than bread had once been also offered. High medieval commentaries, however, speak rather of gold, silver, and – especially in masses for the deceased – of candles, and there is a clear historical tendency to remove the blessings of victuals from the Eucharistic context.

In the same regions, bidding prayers in the vernacular (*preces dominicales, recommendationes*) might have followed the offertory chant on Sundays. Missals do not record them, yet they frequently figure in rituals, leaving no doubt about their consistent use in France, Britain, and Spain until early modern times. Structurally, they are parallel to the solemn intercessions of Good Friday and – in ancient sources – Holy Wednesday, putting forth a series of general petitions in a lowering order of hierarchy. After having listed a range of intentions from the state of the holy church to those in deadly sin, the usual combination of psalms, preces, and orations followed, sometimes with a general confession and absolution. At the end of the bidding prayers, the priest published the feasts and fasts of the ensuing week along with other tidings and measures of public interest. All these meant that, at least in Southern and Western Europe, the offertory was a momentum when earthly persons, things, and aims legitimately crossed the frontier between the profane and the sacred.

The offering of the priest: from gestures to texts

From the priest's perspective, the offertory rites started with a saluting *Dominus vobiscum*, *Et cum spiritu tuo*, and *Oremus*. As no oration followed, this was an unfinished call, mostly understood as an appeal for prayer in general or a frame that rendered the whole subsequent process a sort of nonverbal prayer, expressed

in bodily gestures. Modern historians were tempted to explain the opening *Oremus* as a fossil of solemn intercessions, yet medieval authorities applied it to the secret, the most ancient and once exclusive oration at the end of the offertory rites. In this view, all other texts prove to be tropes interpolated between the secret and its invocation.

By the High Middle Ages, reading the chanted propers by himself was a self-evident duty of the celebrant, thus first he recited the text of the offertory, parallel with its singing by the choir. Then, or only after receiving the offering of the people and saying the bidding prayers, he turned to the sacrificial preparation. It consisted of three main parts, the centre being the oblation of the holy species in the strict sense, surrounded by their practical arrangement before and the apologies of the celebrant after it. If there was incensation, it confirmed the oblation before the apologies.

By practical arrangement, we mean as a first phase the spreading or unfolding of the corporal and the presentation of the sacred vessels, the paten and the chalice. As objects in direct contact with Christ's flesh and blood, these enjoyed exceptional esteem. Women, laymen, and lower-ranking clerics were prohibited from touching or even cleaning them. It was part of the ordination of subdeacons that they solemnly laid their hands on the sacred vessels, and even of acolytes that they first touched the cruets of water and wine. Similar to other manifestations of divine presence, the installation of the holy vessels prepared for the mass evoked the image of the Tabernacle. Either on a credence table or the altar, they were covered under a tent-like veil, with the corporal, placed in a burse, on its top.

Putting up this tent could already belong to the preparation for mass or the offertory rites. The empty chalice stood below, a folded napkin, the purificator, over its rim, and the paten, a small metal plate with the host on it, protected by the pall. Before the modern era, the pall was not necessarily a small square

of stiff linen; it could equally be the end of an oblong corporal folded back to the vessels, raising the analogy of Christ's wrapped-up burial shroud. These all were covered by a coloured, silk veil. Up to recent times, the veil did not only denote the relatively small, square chalice veil but also the longish humeral veil, worn by the subdeacon on his shoulders when bringing the vessels to the altar, and during the canon when he hold the paten in his right hand behind the priest. It served both as a shawl, respectfully concealing the sacred vessels, and as a wrapper, avoiding direct contact between the sacred objects and his bare hands.

These had to be brought to the altar in a procession. With this, the second phase of practical preparation began, including the spreading of the corporal (somewhere already during the Creed or the first washing of hands, peculiar to certain uses, and pontifical masses in general), the unpacking of the chalice set, the laying of the paten with the host on the altar, and the pouring of wine and water into the chalice. Ideally, many of the tasks pertained to the sacred ministers; the deacon was responsible for handling the corporal, the vessels, and pouring the wine, and the subdeacon answered for bringing the set to the altar, wiping dry the inside of the chalice, and pouring the water. Ancient people normally drank wine with some water, but the mixing of the two in the mass soon acquired deeper meaning, evolving into one of the offertory's momentous acts. On the one hand, they became naturally associated with the blood and water coming out from Christ's opened side according to St John's Gospel (cf. *Ex latere*). On the other hand, wine as the nobler drink was interpreted as his divine nature, while water represented mankind. Their mixing, therefore, developed into an allegory of Christ's incarnation and the blending of humane nature with divinity (cf. *Deus qui humanae*). Such considerations gave the grounds for blessing the cruet of water, a symbol

of mankind that in fact demanded blessing, and not blessing the wine that was *holy per se*.

Technically, the priest's duties began with putting the paten with the host on the corporal. Then, the wine was poured into the chalice, sometimes after spilling a few drops to the ground, the water was blessed, and a small quantity was poured into the chalice. Finally, wine and water were carefully mixed together, avoiding that any separate drops remained adhering to the inner surface of the vessel. The usual medieval arrangement was that the host stood closest to the priest in the axis of the corporal, and the chalice behind it in the middle, but commentators insisted that the authentic Roman custom was to put them side-by-side, the paten left and the chalice right. They argued that blessings in the canon always start with the body and continue with the blood, and transversal crossings also proceed from left to right. Moreover, the soldier's spear opened Christ's right side, from where blood and water, shortly to be contained by the chalice, came out.

If the preparation is the material side of the offertory, the oblation is its spiritual side. The vessels and the species are already there. The rites are about separating the gifts from their earthly surroundings by gestures of lifting, placing them back on the sacred surface defined by the corporal, and – in the case of incensation – by marking and demarcating them by the means of incense. All these happen in a framed structure. At first, both the paten and the chalice are crossed and lifted and, at last, both species share in a final blessing again. In-between, parallel gestures concern first the host and second the wine. The priest lifts the paten with the host, describes with it a sign of the cross, lets the host slip down to the corporal, and puts the paten aside on the right side or hides it below the corporal so that its thin edge may show. Apart from any symbolism, direct contact with the corporal indicates that the host irrevocably went over to a domain of sacrifice. The chalice is uncovered, always indicating

openness to sacramental influence, and similarly lifted. A cross is described with it, and it is emphatically placed back to the corporal. It seems that nothing substantial happens, the chalice returning to its former position, but this is only due to the fact that, for fluids, direct contact with the corporal is impracticable. A desirable analogy between the preparation and the oblation of the two species fails on either side. In the phase of preparation, putting the paten on the corporal is naturally a less remarkable event than pouring the wine and water into the chalice, while, in the oblation phase, wine and water cannot be poured out on the corporal to stress their transference from their normal container to an emphatically sacrificial domain.

Some mass ordinaries aim to compensate for the insignificance of the host's preparation as compared with that of the chalice by anticipating the oblation of the host. In such uses, the Roman Curial use included, preparation and oblation do not split. The host is immediately put on the bare corporal and the paten concealed, then wine and water are poured in, mixed, and lifted; the offertory constitutes a single, uninterrupted process for either species. It is, however, only the above-described difference between preparation and oblation which explains the anticipation of some offertory rites into earlier parts of the mass, as was the case in many traditions. In those, the preparation of the gifts and especially that of the chalice might have happened either before the mass or during the interlectionary chants, engaging the priest in the meantime and making the offertory rites shorter. The symptom of this approach is the presence of offertory prayers, particularly the blessing of water and formulas for pouring in wine, before the Gospel in some mass ordinaries. Yet sometimes, this seems to be only a concession for non-solemn masses, celebrated without the aid of sacred ministers who were authorized to handle the sacred vessels. The actual oblation, centred on the lifting gestures, could never come before the offertory.

As it has already been said, crosses and circles described with the censer still confirm the marking and demarcating aspect of the oblation phase. After the incensation, however, the priest's personal preparation follows. It consists of three bodily acts: the washing of his hands, his profound inclination in front of the altar, and his appeal to the ministers or all the faithful to pray for him so that he may worthily offer the sacrifice. He performed the call turning from the altar to the congregation and then turning back in a full circle. This was the only place in the mass when he did so. Otherwise, he always kept contact with the altar and described semicircles to the right and backwards. The primary meaning of such gestures is almost obvious. Washing hands expresses purity, profound inclination means humility, turning outwards a need for intercession and the gathering of joint spiritual power, and making the only full circle in the mass a total change of ritual status, the "entering into consecration," as some old rubrics put it and as in some basilicas the priest might have really disappeared behind the screen and the curtains of an altar canopy. It was only in this secluded state of both him and the gifts when he recited the "seclusion prayer," the secret, crowning the offertory rites.

According to the high medieval ritual tendencies of allowing no gesture without a formula and engaging the priest's mind permanently, the sequence of acts between the *Oremus* and the secret attracted texts. Before that, the offertory rites might have resembled the Holy Saturday blessings of the paschal candle or the baptismal font where the texts are periodically interrupted by silent operations. Moreover, the very ceremony of offering became more nuanced or farced with additional gestures, attracting additional texts. Such were additional crosses with or over the gifts, their extra elevations, and, first of all, apologetic and summoning gestures performed in a bowing posture or with eyes lifted and arms open. The corpus of registered orations and formulas for the offertory rites amounts to over 150 items,

some of them having remarkable variants. This is an enormous sum for a ritual of a few minutes, suggesting a total lack of order and cohesion, but it can still be interpreted with the help of statistics, mapping, and insightful analysis. It is important to note that the set of offertory prayers is rather loosely arranged within the ceremonial frame and the frame itself is relatively loose. Most of the texts are not firmly and still less exclusively attached to certain gestures and the sequence of gestures may also be subverted.

From a textual point of view, only four items are historically constant and practically ubiquitous: *Suscipe sancta Trinitas* in various functions, ranging from the opening petition through the lifting of the gifts to the profound inclination, *Orate fratres* asking for the intercession of the bystanders, *In spiritu humilitatis* primarily during the profound inclination but practically almost anywhere else, and *Veni sanctificator* as a calling down of the Holy Ghost, said with arms open after the oblation or before the entire process. The next group of texts is widely known, but they only characterize specific landscapes of the continent. The psalm excerpt *Lavabo* during the washing of hands only appears in South-eastern Germany, Poland, and Bohemia; the *Ex latere Domini* formula for mixing wine and water does not come forth east of the Rhine except for Hungary and Poznań, and the *Deus qui humanae substantiae* oration, serving the same purpose, is totally lacking from the central areas of France. A third group consists of typically local choices. *Grata tibi sit* for the oblation of the host is a clearly Ibero-Provencal item; *In pace factus est* for hiding the paten beneath the corporal is characteristic of Saxony, Poland, and Denmark. Texts featuring in the low quarter of the statistics are not necessarily regional. Some of them appear in sparse but proportionate patterns which may equally signal remnants of once popular pieces (e.g. *Calicem salutaris*) and fashionable novelties of the Late Middle Ages (e.g. *Veni Sancte Spiritus*). The fourth and last group contains unique or sporadic

items. *Oblatus est quia ipse voluit*, for instance, is peculiar to Pécs and Zagreb in Hungary for placing the gifts on the corporal, but even these uses differed in assigning it to the deposition of the host or the chalice.

Similar to other extensions of the mass ordinary, many of these texts are adaptations of established liturgical items, making the most of the inspiring tension between their original and modified assignments. *In spiritu humilitatis*, for example, is an antiphon of the first Sunday of Lent to the canticle of the three children, applying sentences from the prayer of Azarias in the fiery furnace. Transferred into the ordinary, it qualifies the mass as God's burning presence and asks for the immunity of the celebrant and the acceptance of his offerings in such a divinely perilous situation. As the prophet puts it: "Which of you can dwell with devouring fire; which of you shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" (Is 33:14) *Deus qui humanae substantiae* used to be an ancient Christmas oration, meditating on the union of human and divine natures. During the infusion of water, it ingeniously applies the motif of incarnation to the blending of the two fluids. *In pace factus est* derives from the matins of Holy Saturday where it refers to the holy sepulchre. In the context of the paten's concealment under the corporal, it allegorizes the linen cloth as Christ's burial shroud.

Towards a typology of offertories

From a ceremonial point of view, it is worth setting out from the basic gestures. In the phase of preparation, they are the opening apology or solemn summoning gesture, the unfolding of the corporal, the placing of the paten on the altar, the infusion of the wine, the blessing of the water, and its partial pouring into and mixing with the wine. In the phase of oblation, they are the lifting of the offerings, their placing back on the corporal, and putting the paten aside or hiding it under the corporal. In

the phase of the apologies, we find the washing of hands, the bowing, and the full turn with the call for intercession. The basic gestures may be supplemented with additional gestures like describing crosses with the offerings before elevating them or divided by additional gestures like the opening of arms for inviting the Holy Spirit after the oblation phase has ended.

Texts assigned to these may vary in terms of mere existence, stability, and freedom. Not every gesture is equally equipped with formulas. There occur some prayers for spreading the corporal, placing the chalice back to the altar, or covering the gifts after oblation, but they are by no means omnipresent. Yet we hardly know a tradition without providing the priest with something to say during his profound inclination. The stability of a gesture, however, is not equivalent to the stability of a text. As we have seen, a text can be stable without clinging to a specific gesture and, vice versa, a gesture can be stable without attracting a specific cluster of texts. This is especially true for texts with general themes of offering, invocation, and unworthiness. On the other side, some texts are semantically anchored to certain functions. Formulas mentioning objects like the chalice and the host or deeds like the washing of hands cannot easily migrate from one assignment to another, nor can those that are charged with unequivocal symbolism like the aforementioned prayers for pouring water or hiding the paten. Certain texts sounded twice, only changing the words that referred to the host or the chalice, or once for both, substituting them with a term referring to the gifts in general.

Therefore, a successful analysis must equally take into account the texts, their functions, and their positions in the ritual sequence. We can productively classify offertory rites according to their first significant texts, indicating at once their first significant gestures. *Ex latere* is the most widespread opening formula of Western Europe, probably spreading from Central France. It accompanied the infusion of wine and water to the chalice

which could already happen before the offering in a strict sense. In Portugal, a call for blessing went before it (*Iube/Benedicite*), apparently said by the minister handing over the cruets, while it was consistently introduced with the versicle *Ostende nobis* in Hungary.

In the Netherlands, Normandy, Brittany, and their north-western French neighbourhood, the offertory similarly began with infusion, but there it was accompanied by the verses of Psalm 115 *Quid retribuam* and *Calicem salutaris*.

In the Ibero-Provencal landscape, pouring wine and water into the chalice was accompanied by the formula *Hunc humiliat et hunc exaltat*, an excerpt from Psalm 74 as it continues with the clause "For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup of strong wine full of mixture." It had *In tuo conspectu* as an almost inseparable concomitant, a prayer for the unfolding of the corporal which might occur both before and after the infusion. Sparsely, it appears outside the Hispanic regions but still in the Mediterranean: in a Beneventan missal from Dalmatia and, in the slightly different function of covering the host, in Sicily (Messina, Palermo).

Acceptum sit, however, is a distinctive mark of German origin, although it also appears in some archaic Italian sources. It served as a sort of epiclesis at the beginning of the offertory rites, performed parallel with a sign of the cross, the opening of arms, placing the host on the corporal, or taking the chalice in the celebrant's hand. Such ceremonials presuppose that the infusion has already taken place or happened immediately before this invocation. There were some substitutes for the item, but we can safely state that opening the offertory with a solemn summoning gesture is a mostly north-eastern feature. *Veni sanctificator* stood in this position in Liège, Kraków, Gniezno, the Teutonic Knights, Skara, and Uppsala.

It is often difficult to distinguish between invocation and apology. The two gestures might have faded into one another;

crossing oneself (a gesture of undertaking a duty) typically continued in opening the arms and lifting the eyes (summoning the Holy Spirit), and ended in putting hands together and bowing profoundly (expressing humility). This, too, was a German feature, indicated before all by the presence of *In spiritu humilitatis* at the beginning of the offertory instead of its end. Cluny preferred to anticipate the washing of hands as well, and so did some dioceses in the North Rhineland (Münster and Cologne) and Denmark (Roskilde and Lund). There, the offertory started with *Lavabo*.

A third and last possibility was to open the offertory rites with the oblation of the host. The characteristic first gesture of this type was the lifting of the host still on the paten while praying the *Suscipe sancte Pater* oration, directly followed by the placing of the host on the corporal and the concealment of the paten under it. This method hallmarks Italy, Provence, and the wider sphere of influence of the Curial use. *Suscipe sancta Trinitas* works as its sporadic alternative outside of Italy. It is peculiar to short and rather primitive offertories, sometimes associated with masses for the dead or monasticism. In the function of elevating the host, it was a marker of the Cistercian, Dominican, and Carmelite uses.

Although the majority of offertories can be easily classified according to these conditions, several mixed and isolated cases remain. Nothing prevented institutions or even individuals from fostering their devotion through borrowing texts from alien traditions or compiling unique selections of the common textual and ceremonial store. Due to the contrast between modest stability and frequent use, the transmission of the offertory proves somewhat paradoxical. As a daily routine of priests and altar servers, it tended to be stable. They were habituated to the gestures and knew the texts by heart for it was impossible to look at a book during such an intricate ceremony. As a consequence, offertories from the same use but different ages show

remarkable continuity. Still, they were open to novelties. Hitherto silent gestures might have acquired prayers or formulas, and pious insertions appeared within the established frames. Or, on the contrary, oversized ancient offertories became shortened and rationalized; both developments are familiar to comparative research.

On the other hand, offertory rites do not prove to be inalienable constituents of local uses. The monks of Bursfelde, although fully embracing the propers of the Roman Missal already in the 15th century, persisted in celebrating their distinctive offertory. Münster and Cologne, in contrast, preserved their distinctive propers up to the 18–19th centuries, but they adopted the Curial offertory as soon as the 17th century. The Gniezno Missal of 1555 promptly provides two minor canons: one according to the manner of the Roman church (“more Romanae ecclesiae”) and another according to the ancient custom of the diocese of Gniezno (“iuxta antiquam consuetudinem dioecesis Gnesnensis”). The offertory, no matter how elaborate it was, kept on being a trope between the secret’s introductory dialogue and the secret itself.

Prefaces

The preface escapes classification. It remains undecided if it belongs to the ordinary or the propers, being too changeable for the former and too unchanging for the latter. It was an integral part of the core of the mass but open to innovation.

In the High Middle Ages, variation concerning the use of prefaces depended on two factors: the liturgical assignment of their basic set and the acceptance of further prefaces. Gregorian authorities said that beyond the common preface only nine, and later ten, proper prefaces were authentic; those that are practically universal from the 11th to the early 20th century. Scholars and rubrics referred to a decision of Pope Paschal II, the immediate

predecessor of Gregory the Great, who allegedly ordered that only these must be observed. Yet, even restricted to this narrow repertory, two rival concepts competed. The first and more influential may be termed the seasonal approach, and the second the festive approach.

For the seasonal approach, proper prefaces characterized periods of the annual cycle, assigned to the seasons, weeks, or at least octaves after Christmas, Epiphany, Ash Wednesday, Passion Sunday, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsun, and Trinity Sunday. Saints had the common preface except for the Virgin Mary and the apostles. The distinctive traits of this concept are triple: the general use of the Easter preface until Ascension Day, the singing of the Lenten preface on Sundays of Lent before Passiontide, and, most remarkably, the overwhelming presence of the Trinity preface, expanding to the ordinary weeks after Pentecost and sometimes to Advent and the entire winter season before Lent.

We can first recognize the festive approach from its more extensive use of the common preface. For this concept, the common preface is not one of eleven options, assigned primarily to sanctoral feasts, but the default one throughout the year. Similar to the *Communicantes* and *Hanc igitur* parts of the canon, insertions only distinguish privileged days to which the texts directly pertain, while weekdays and ordinary Sundays are immune to their use. The symptoms of this concept are the following: the limitation of the Lenten preface to the weekdays of Lent on the ground that it speaks of “corporale ieiunium,” bodily fasting which was suspended on the Sundays of Lent; the restriction of the Easter preface to the octave or sometimes also the Sundays of Eastertide (which were in fact repetitions of the Easter liturgy); and the presence of the common preface all over the ordinary Sundays.

It was an unusual extension of the seasonal concept when the Christmas preface lasted until Candlemas (Würzburg, Zaragoza, València) and, vice versa, an extension of the festive concept

when the preface of the Holy Spirit only distinguished the vigil and the first three days of Whitsun without its full octave (Laon, Sigüenza, Plasencia). In Augsburg, Sundays of Lent were exempt from the Lenten preface but, instead of its common alternative, they had the Trinity preface like ordinary Sundays.

The geographical distribution of the two attitudes almost perfectly matches the spheres of Gregorian influence and its lack as observed in other cases. Germany is the heartland of the seasonal approach and France of its festive rival. Transitional areas like the Netherlands, Lorraine, present-day Switzerland, and Italy waver between the two options; Scandinavia, the Baltic, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Britain, and Iberia mingle them according to the season in question.

The east-west boundary proves the sharpest with the Lenten preface. France has it only on weekdays, and so do most of the Iberian churches, Poland and Bohemia. Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Britain, Italy, and Hungary have it on Sundays, too. Spain, however, is divided between a major, French-like party and a minor, Romanizing fraction preferring the Gregorian, seasonal approach. The border regions are merging; Utrecht and Tournai, Geneva and Lausanne go with the West, while Liège and Cambrai, Trier and the Rhineland go with the East. Sweden (Uppsala, Strängnäs) in the North and the Norman churches of Italy (Cosenza, Messina) in the South depart from their surroundings by joining the western group.

The festive approach to Eastertide is much more limited. Here, the Easter preface covers the whole season not only in the aforementioned eastern block but in Spain and Bohemia as well. Reducing the proper preface to the octave and the repeated *Resurrexi* Sundays is a minority phenomenon in the North-West of France, only documented in Salisbury abroad.

The relationship between the Trinity preface and ordinary Sundays is delicate. It is ambiguous what a use really means under ordinary Sundays. The notion can extend from the Sundays

after Pentecost or Trinity to those after Epiphany. Advent and Septuagesima may or may not be involved. In some traditions, November (mostly referred to as the history of *Vidi Dominum*, when the books of the prophets are read in matins) is more ordinary than other months. It makes an exception as falling outside of a period conceived to be a season of the Trinity. Other traditions differentiate between Sundays of a privileged status, being the opening Sundays of new histories in the matins, and more ordinary Sundays which easily yield to coincident sanctoral feasts. Those raise a further problem. Although Sundays in a liturgical sense could fall victim to sanctoral feasts, they retained their Sunday character to a certain degree; there was a distinction between the same sanctoral feast when falling on a weekday or a Sunday. On the other hand, the liturgy of a Sunday, meaning its propers, could have been postponed and observed on a weekday. In this case, the ferial date partially retained its weekday character despite the Sunday propers.

Accordingly, the general rule that the East is seasonal, preferring the Trinity preface, and the West is festive, preferring the common preface, applies to ordinary Sundays as well. Britain goes with the East, Poland and Prague with the West, and Italy is divided, reflecting dissent in the reception of Gregorianism. The Gregorian party, however, is extremely colourful. Uses like Zagreb, Strängnäs, or Salisbury opt for the general use of the Trinity preface both in winter and summer, while Lund and Roskilde keep it only for summer and sing the common preface in winter. Chur, Strasbourg, or Olomouc take November out of the control of the Trinity preface, while Merseburg, Vic, or Coutances differentiate between normal Sundays and Sundays of new histories. The average German uses have a Sunday (*dominicalis, dominicaliter*) and a weekday melody (*ferialis, ferialiter*) both for the common and the Trinity prefaces. If the propers were said of a temporal Sunday, they chose the Trinity preface and, if they were said of a feast, they chose the common

preface. The melody varied according to the date. On a de facto Sunday, they sang the preface *dominicaliter*, even if it was a saint's day with the common preface. Yet they sang it *ferialiter* on a weekday, irrespective of whether it was the Trinity preface in the context of Sunday propers or not.

It seems that there was some hesitation until the early modern period. An early 14th-century missal of Esztergom still labels the common preface as "dominicalis," while its direct descendants in the 15–16th centuries switch over to the Trinity-preface-save-November version. Supporters of the Sunday use of the Trinity preface from the 11th-century treatise of the *Micrologus* to a 15th-century missal of Riga quote the authority of Rome, but Roman Missals both immediately before and after Trent still assign the common preface to Sundays. The variety is confusing and does not fit either into reasonable geographical or historical patterns, but the underlying concept seems clear enough. There is an ordinary substratum of the year, marked by the common preface, and a more customized stratum is layered on it, marked by the Trinity preface. This latter association may derive from votive Sunday masses, celebrated in honour of the Holy Trinity throughout the year, and also from Trinity Sunday, opening the summer season. Although the customized stratum gradually prevailed, some protected reserves allowed the substratum to show. Wintertime, November, new histories, and temporal propers transposed to ferias equally provided an opportunity to safeguard the memory of this common substratum.

The other factor of variation, the acceptance of further prefaces, is easier to grasp. High medieval missals contain no more than one to three additional prefaces on average. Only two French uses stand out of this field: Cluny with 13 and Tarentaise with 8 additional items. Other representatives of the established Roman rite do not even come near these numbers. Yet even Cluny or Tarentaise is extremely modest if compared to the about 300 prefaces of the contemporary Ambrosian Missal.

Extra prefaces stem from two sources: old and new. Similar to the Milanese rite, the Roman rite of the first millennium handled the preface as equal to other propers, assigning one to each mass formulary. The famous and influential *Supplementum* to the Gregorian Sacramentary contained a collection of more than 220 prefaces as its second part, and many old sacramentaries followed its line. The creative epoch of Germanic liturgy-making in the 9–10th centuries liberally borrowed even from the Ambrosian repertory, and Beneventan sources preserved this openness as long as they were copied. Hard-line Gregorianism gained strength only from the late 11th century, not independent of anxieties about the canon's authenticity to which the preface served as a prologue.

Some of the relatively widespread additional prefaces were remnants of former abundance. The nuptial preface (*Qui foedera nuptiarum*) was part of the authentic copy of the Gregorian Sacramentary, although it did obviously not rank among the Pelagian nine. It mostly survived in the West, but it can be found sparsely all over Europe. The second most popular extra preface distinguished the feasts of certain apostles (*Qui Ecclesiam tuam*) or worked as a singular substitute for its common alternative which was in the plural. Albeit widely known in ancient sources and shared with the Ambrosian rite, it only survived in the East: in Hungary, Germany, Italy, and around Lyon. Other instances are sporadic, some with Ambrosian background; extra prefaces for Christmas, Dedication, the dead, about the Virgin Mary, All Saints, and Maundy Thursday survived primarily in France and the Beneventan region. Some were only adaptations of the basic Gregorian set. The regular Christmas preface befitted Corpus Christi as well, and it was adjusted to the feast of Transfiguration by changing only one word. The Easter preface turned into a preface for the dead by omitting the opening reference to the season and maintaining the second phrase on Christ's victory over death.

As for novelties, the ban was cautiously lifted from the 14th century onwards. The third most popular extra preface already belongs to the mass of St Roch against pestilence. Some new prefaces honour local patrons like St Antoninus in Plasencia, relatively late saints like St Francis of Assisi, or saints whose cult became only popular in the Late Middle Ages like St Jerome. In Arles where we can compare the printed missal to its 13th-century handwritten predecessor, such prefaces turn out to be recent additions. Yet pure statistics will never reveal the true nature of the accession. As in the 20th-century editions of the Roman Missal and the missals of some religious orders, modern compositions and items restored from an ancient stock appear side by side, and only careful analysis can detect their actual origin.

The canon of the mass: from texts to gestures

The direction of the canon's development is opposite to that of the offering. If the latter was a series of acts, gradually troped with accompanying texts, the former was essentially a text, troped with accompanying gestures. As for the offering, the backbone of the rite is made up of subsequent movements related to the preparation, the oblation, the apology, and later, at less predictable points, the epiclesis, while a variety of prayers and formulas join them in highly divergent order. With the canon, the core is an almost immutable sequence of prayers and formulas, surrounded by a considerably more variable set of movements. There were periods, however, when the canonicity of the canon had not yet reached the degree which it had in the High and Late Middle Ages, and textual troping could supplement ceremonial troping even within the sacred confines of the Eucharistic prex. Accordingly, the variation of the canon has two main aspects. It can be analyzed on the level of adding or removing some texts and, on a rubrical level, of specifying the gestures that accompanied its narration. The first, textual ap-

proach further splits into two aspects. We can rightfully speak of an earlier, extensive phase of supplementing the primitive canon with additions and of a later, reductive phase of establishing its *textus receptus* through the elimination of unauthorized clauses.

Medieval authorities were not naive about the evolution of the eucharistic prex. They all knew that the text as they used it was the product of an ancient literary gentleman and a long line of later contributors. An early Hungarian sacramentary and a Pauline missal identify the principal author with a certain Clement from Alexandria. The Missal of Segovia and the related Ritual of Mexico assign each section to different popes. Based on a statement of Gregory the Great in his Dialogues, liturgical commentaries attribute the canon to a certain *scholasticus*, and they carefully note the popes who added this or that sentence to the original text. In this, they anticipate modern scholarship which seeks to uncover the primordial form of the canon in the patristic period and identify the stages, authors, theological, and literary concepts of its early development. When comparing the canon's Roman line of transmission to parallel witnesses like its first quotations from the 4th century, the Ambrosian and Ben-eventan redactions, the Bobbio Missal from Southern Gaul, the Stowe Missal from Ireland, or the Poitiers Pontifical, we equally find that there are central parts shared by all and more malleable parts allowing creative intervention. This was the usual fate of consecratory prayers. One could freely add new scenes from salvation history to anamnestic lists enumerating biblical precedents and new intentions for which or new beneficiaries for whom the consecration was performed. The difference was that the canon slowly acquired a unique status among consecratory prayers. It grew into a text of outstanding efficacy; powerful but perilous like a magic spell. As such, it no more allowed the same freedom of extension as its lower-ranking relatives.

Yet in this mature state of affairs, it would not have been feasible or even possible to reduce the canon to its primordial form.

Some additions had long since been made; these gained fresh authority from being attributed to early Roman pontiffs. Pope Clement was thought to be responsible for “*una cum famulo*,” Alexander for the words of institution, Siricius for the “*Communicantes*,” Leo the Great for “*Hanc igitur*” and “*sanctum sacrificium*,” and Gregory the Great for “*diesque nostros*” and the addition of the Lord’s Prayer at the end. Some proved dubious; they were common enough but experts with purist tendencies questioned their authenticity, and criticism led to a divide between more restrictive and permissive traditions. Such disputed parts were the “*et omnibus orthodoxis*” after the names of the pope and the bishop, the “*pro quibus tibi offerimus*” before the equivalent phrase in third person, or the insertion of Christ’s birth and death among the mysteries of his passion, resurrection, and ascension.

Some were ultimately rejected; these fell into disuse or at least were ousted from the canon and transferred to less controlled parts of the mass ordinary like some apologetic prayers before the canon, special commemorations of the living and the dead with the celebrating priest himself, secular rulers, sponsors, and benefactors, the inclusion of local saints or those on whose feast the mass was offered, devotional prayers during or after the elevation of the host and the chalice, or words accompanying the strike of the priest’s breast. Uses, however, were not unanimous in rejecting them. In the Ibero-Provencal landscape and some churches of North-Western Europe, prayers before entering the canon remained quite popular, and even some of the devotional additions inside the canon survived.

This purging of the canon proved to be a gradual process. In certain early sacramentaries, we find considerably more insertions in the canon which, by the age of the printing press, withdraw to Spanish and Southern French territories. In the meantime, we can observe two intermediary solutions. The canon was prayed silently but with real exhalation and moving of the

lips. For the medieval mind, only this meant actual utterance. In contrast, some books remark on the devotional additions that they must not be uttered physically but only thought of (*in corde, mentaliter*). The other solution was to resettle such tropes instead of eliminating them. Detailed commemorations may be anticipated before the mass, and removed elevation prayers may reappear before the communion.

When, how, and how many times the offerings should be signed with the sign of cross was already a debated issue in the 8–9th centuries, as attested by *Ordo Romanus* VII and some early sacramentaries. The debate was still not settled in the age of the Gregorian reforms, and divergence continued until the abolition of local uses. The number of crosses always had to be odd: one, three, or five. It was not indifferent whether and which crosses occurred over both species and separately over the host and the chalice. The places for authentic crosses were those where the phrase ‘to bless’ (*benedicere*) or any of its derivatives literally appeared or demonstrative pronouns pointed at the sacred gifts: “haec dona” (3×), “benedictam, ascriptam” (5×), “benedixit” before the consecrations of the host and the chalice respectively (2×1), “hostiam puram” (5×), “sanctificas, vivificas” (3×), and “Per ipsum” (5×). As with the incensations, this already suggests a double meaning for such crosses. On the one hand, they operated as a gesture of blessing, evoking Christ’s cross as the fountain of every sacramental power. On the other hand, they worked as a target cross, specifying the precise object of the parallel words. Most of them, however, seemed somewhat redundant after the moment of transubstantiation, now identified with the delivery of the words of institution. Along with the non-linearly proceeding text, they required special interpretation. According to this, the canon was a sort of sacramental standstill with the words of institution at its heart, radiating its validity both before and after the transubstantiation.

In either sense, crosses belonged to the sacramental aspect of the medieval ceremonial, but it is the representational aspect that accounts for gestures such as inclination, kisses, raising the eyes, lifting the gifts, stretching out the arms, or beating the breast. The precaution of not losing a single morsel of the host or of not letting an insect fall into the precious blood led to other measures, such as the tight closing of the thumbs and forefingers after the consecration or the careful covering of the chalice after each sacramental act. Nonverbal additions did not harm the efficacy of the text, thus they were freely augmented throughout the Middle Ages. Inclinations went together with every directly beseeching phrase and especially the word *supplex* and its derivatives, literally meaning 'bent' or 'bowed.' Kisses of the altar accompanied the words of acceptance and mentions of the altar itself. There were elevations of the two species respectively after their consecration and a further elevation at the end of the canon. For the first, bells were rung and candles lit either on or besides the altar (*Sanctus* candle) or in the hand of the servers (torches or twisted candles known as *intorticia*). The priest might have raised his eyes in the person of Christ before the consecration; he stretched his arms in the form of the crucifix while evoking Christ's passion, and slightly raised them when mentioning his ascension. He struck his breast for "Nobis quoque peccatoribus" and uttered only these three words aloud. From the very reason of textual restraints, the canon became an eminent domain of what we had called ceremonial troping, and this dense and varied series of elaborate gestures evolved into a sort of sacred dance. Beyond the different attitudes towards textual additions, it was primarily such rubrics that contributed to the variation of this least variable part of the mass, and the experiment of classifying the vast rubrical evidence points to the new direction of encoding choreographies, that is, acts instead of texts.

Variants of the canon

Before turning to the *Te igitur*, the Eucharistic prex in its proper sense, we must first consider the transitional zone between the preface and the canon which presented itself as an appropriate time for priestly apologies, already in the magnetic field of the canon but still void of its restrictive influence. Parallel with the singing of the *Sanctus* by the choir, the celebrant had the time to perform them after reciting the text of the thrice-holy hymn himself. These prayers and gestures drew from the usual store of apologies. Some of them were already familiar from the access to the altar, the reading of the Gospel, or the offertory. Here also, the priest might have bowed deeply, signed his lips and heart, and kissed the missal on the pages of the crucifixion and the *sedes maiestatis*. Even if the rubrics did not specify these movements, the prayers spoke of the opening of the mouth (*Aperi Domine os meum*) or used the same formulas we had registered at the kissing of the missal before the introit (*Adoramus te Christe; De sede maiestatis*). Other texts recall the great apology of the offertory (*In spiritu humilitatis*), utilize penitential formularies, or invoke the Holy Spirit.

From the perspective of the attending clergy, the quiet canon inspired further additions. Unlike other silent parts, there was no proper chant to cover the canon acoustically. In the modern period, it was customary to play the organ during or after the consecration; *per l'elevazione* in Italy and *élévation* in France were established musical genres. Eucharistic motets with texts like *Ave verum corpus* or congregational hymns – especially in Eastern Europe – served the same purpose. Their medieval precedents are rarely registered in official service books, but some sources from Northern Italy (Modena, Verona) provide a long series of psalms, versicles, and orations in favour of the priest while he is engaged with the canon. The Missal of Gniezno from 1555 recommends antiphons for diverse intentions, also followed

by corresponding versicles and orations: against drought, disease, and pagan intrusion. They not only filled the time, but channelled the sacramental power of the canon to actual necessities. Such sporadic records suggest that intercessory prayers for the celebrant and supplications for current needs might have been regular concomitants of the canon, but they rarely rose to the level of being included in service books. We must always keep in mind that, even today, a ceremony is by no means limited to the texts we can find in its official script.

In ancient sacramentaries of the Gregorian type, high medieval missals, and liturgical commentaries, the canon is divided into 5–15 partitions. The 13 partitions of the Roman Missal issued after Trent have preserved a clear and proportionate articulation, suitable for an attempt to overview the possible variants, both textual and ceremonial. Dividing further only the first partition, we will summarize the varieties that distinguish particular traditions of performing the canon in the following paragraphs under 14 headings. As, unfortunately, only about a dozen of late Spanish and Italian missals describe the duties of the deacon, the subdeacon, and other ministers, we mostly focus on the priest's parts and do not dwell on the peculiarities of more elaborate solemn or pontifical celebrations.

(1) *Te igitur* has no textual variants at all. The opening posture of the priest diverges. A profound inclination with joined hands is the most widespread, and it is this bowed position from which he kisses the altar for the words “*uti accepta habetas.*” Yet, mostly in the South, he had been already in this position while reciting the *Sanctus* and any apologies before the canon, and he stood upright for the opening words. In such cases, he straightened up while extending his arms, raising his eyes to heavens, casting them down, and joining his hands again. This was the same epicletic gesture of invoking, collecting, and concentrating heavenly energies that, in some places, we had formerly observed as a part of the offertory.

He could continue either in a bowing or an upright position but, in any case, he bowed again for the word “supplices,” and kissed the altar for “uti accepta habeas” with his hands resting on it. The kiss itself was obligatory, but its precise place varied. Northern French, Anglo-Norman, and Breton missals prefer a kiss on the right side of the offerings, but kisses on the left or in the middle are equally recorded. Some sources add that the place where the kiss should be given must first be signed with a cross, drawn with the thumb or the three upper fingers of the priest’s right. Every medieval rubric that details the way of signing the gifts says that the crosses must be performed with extended thumb, index, and middle fingers and bent ring and little fingers. It was the same three fingers with which he crossed both gifts thrice for the words “haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata.” This was a universal, unvarying gesture, firmly established already in the earliest sacramentaries.

(2) *In primis* had no ceremonial variant. It was everywhere recited in the classical *orans* posture, with raised and extended arms, although, as we will soon see, it is not always clear to what height the arms were raised and how wide they were extended. In return, the section had a considerable number of textual variants. They all resulted from the intercessory nature of the text; after mentioning the Church in general with the ruling pope and local bishop in particular, many felt the need of specifying further beneficiaries or providing alternatives if a pope, bishop, or abbot was himself praying these words.

Instead of the bishop, the abbot is commemorated in the books of exempt monastic communities like Monte Cassino, and early sources may contain an extra formula for the local or the entire Benedictine congregation. The noun “antistite” may be replaced with “archiepiscopo” in Esztergom or “episcopo dioecetano” among the Pauline friars. The most popular addition referred to the king. By the printing press period, he was included practically everywhere outside the Papal States, although Du-

randus in the late 13th century had still noted that this was only a recent tradition. Mentioning the emperor, however, proved to be a characteristic of Metz only. In the next most popular addition, the celebrant prayed for himself, usually with the phrase “et me indigno famulo tuo.” This could either be a substitute for “papa,” “antistite,” or “abbate” if the hierarch was personally offering the mass, as in the missals of Cosenza, Montearagón, and the papal court at Avignon, or an extra clause for the celebrating priest, as in Le Puy. Canons from the Beneventan and Campanian regions typically contain an even longer, apologetic insertion for the forgiveness of the priest’s vices. The final clause beginning with “et omnibus orthodoxis” was deemed unnecessary by certain authorities and, indeed, it is missing from some early sacramentaries and only later added to the text of others. By the High Middle Ages, however, it counted as universal.

(3) *Memento Domine* was the commemoration of the living, the first of two parallel commemorations in the canon. They posed the same ceremonial questions, one concerning the priest’s posture, and the other the way of pronouncing the names. Continuing the theme of the previous partition, the commemoration of the living was said with arms extended, but for the actual commemoration of the names of those for whom he was praying, the priest joined his hands before his breast. In some places, he raised his joined hands to his face, in others he was at least allowed to do so, but some missals definitely advised him against this habit. Some sources also say that he closed his eyes or hint at this fact when saying that he opened them after the commemoration. For uttering the names, the Germanic and Italian policy was to pronounce them quietly yet with exhalation and moving lips. In the West, however, it was forbidden to name them with physical speech; rubrics warn that they should only be recalled by a mental act of memory, never interfering with the monolithic text of the canon.

Despite such precautions, commemorating the living was a momentous part. In early Christian history, great controversies arose about those whose names should be registered on or deleted from the diptychs that served not merely as memory aids for the commemorations but also as symbols of ecclesiastical communion. Sources from Southern Italy, both from the Beneventan region and the Norman churches of Calabria and Sicily, explicitly prescribe the recitation of such lists, and a Dalmatian missal still uses the phrase “whose names are written among us.” Extensions other than names were also popular. The Stowe Missal once enumerated all ranks of church officials and various intentions, and this custom did not entirely disappear. Petitions for the celebrating priest, his relatives, benefactors, or those who had asked for his prayers may occur in relatively late codices, especially in Italy. The Missal of Grenoble remarks that it is superfluous to add “atque omnium fidelium Christianorum” after “omnium circumstantium,” yet it was a fairly common supplement both east and west from the strictly Gregorian circle of Germanic traditions. “Pro quibus tibi offerimus,” on the other hand, is missing from the earliest evidence, and Cistercian books insist on leaving it out.

(4) *Communicantes* started with a small genuflection (*parum flectat genua*) or, as its modest alternative, a bow of the head, primarily in Northern French missals. Neither the precise form nor the function is perfectly clear. Later we will encounter rubrics that speak of genuflections to the earth (*usque ad terram*) which suggests that, similar to the twofold inclinations, there was a distinction between the major and the minor (maybe curtsy-like) bending of the knee. As the sources containing this small genuflection regularly fail to mention any reverence to the subsequent holy names of Mary and Jesus, we may assume that this knee bend served as an anticipated homage to them. Its supposed equivalent, the small inclination for the holy names is surprisingly rare. Besides the Roman Missal and its

late Spanish relatives, it only figures in England. The modern practice of bowing first slightly in the direction of the book and second deeper to the crucifix is not documented; instead, rubrics prescribe a continuous bow during the seven words from Mary to Jesus. In the Abbey of Ainay in Lyon, and Grenoble, the priest also crossed his lips while finishing the enumeration of saints with Cosmas and Damian. In North-Eastern Europe and sporadically in Normandy and Brittany, he strengthened himself with the sign of cross for the final phrase invoking divine protection. In the wider vicinity of Cologne, he raised and extended his arms for the *Communicantes*, suggesting that he had kept his hands joined since the commemoration of the living. Elsewhere, too, the section was continued with extended arms after the opening reverence. The canon contains five *Per (eundem) Christum Dominum nostrum* conclusions, the first occurring at the end of this part. On the model of other orations, the Roman lineage of rubrics warns that the priest must join his hands for them.

The traditional series of saints consists of the twelve apostles and twelve Roman martyrs. The litany-like list, however, provided a natural opportunity for adding highly venerated saints. The Ambrosian canon has an outstanding number of further names, and early sacramentaries often include local patrons. Hilary, Martin, Benedict, or the four Church Fathers, and Vincent are quite regular even in 16th-century missals. *Ordo Romanus VII* formulated it as a rule that a special clause should commemorate the saint on whose feast the mass was celebrated, and equivalent formulas survived up to the printing press period but only in the South and the West. They are totally lacking from the central, Gregorian regions, and some directives stress that it is illegitimate to add anything beyond the authentic twelve plus twelve. The other debated question is that of the “amen” after the conclusions. According to some theorists, none of them must be

answered before the canon is over, yet the only recorded service book conforming to this opinion is a Pauline missal.

(5) *Hanc igitur* served as a sort of epiclesis within the canon, expressed through summoning gestures rather than words. There were no textual variants save the “*Quam tibi offerimus*” insertions which in ancient sources may appear beyond the octaves of Easter and Pentecost as well. This was the time for lighting a special torch or candle, well known from medieval illustrations and symbolizing the thickening presence of the Holy Ghost. Two rival postures belonged to the section. The typical and probably more ancient one is a bent position with joined hands, ranging from profound inclination to a small bowing of the head. In Normandy and its surroundings where a middle inclination was customary, it was always associated with looking at the altar cross. The other option was spreading the priest’s hands over the host and the chalice, peculiar to the South and the West with such borderlands like the Netherlands and Geneva. It did not necessarily exclude a parallel or previous inclination if the celebrant stood far enough from the altar; the use Utrecht, for example, combined the two. In Auxerre, the priest placed his palms crosswise over the gifts. In England and a few French dioceses, a sort of intentional visualization took place; rubrics ordered the celebrant to direct his eyes on the host. All of these gestures were descending movements, emphasizing separation and close bodily contact with the Eucharistic species. At a loosely defined point after them, the priest might have straightened, drew back his hands, and extended them again. In Riga, he crossed his breast while asking for deliverance from eternal damnation; a similar cross accompanied his asking for divine protection in the previous part which also proved to be a characteristic of the Baltic shores and the North Sea. Yet in the majority of Germanic sources, we learn nothing about an erect position and the following rubrics confirm that the priest remained bowed all the time. Accordingly, Spanish books that

prescribed the spreading of his hands over the gifts do not speak about their drawing back before the next partition.

(6) *Quam oblationem*, too, was textually invariable. This was the latest point for the priest to straighten up (Germany) or draw back and extend his hands (Spain). From an *orans* posture, he signed both species with a cross thrice for the words “benedictam, adscriptam, ratam” and then twice, the host and the chalice separately, for “corpus et sanguis.” This rule was universal, and the blessings were, as usual, performed with the three upper fingers. Some obscurity surrounds the subsequent movements. Rubrics are not always clear for the modern reader, but it seems that if the hands were not yet drawn back, they were here lowered directly on the gifts with open palms joined or crosswise. Especially Northern French, Polish, and Bohemian evidence suggests this possibility. In Spain and the North of Germany, however, the celebrant raised his arms. It was possibly a more emphatic *orans* posture than simply extending his hands before his breast in the line of his shoulders as rubrics say that he should raise them upwards (*in altum, sursum*) or even to heavens (*in caelum*). In England and some Mediterranean uses, he raised them performing the same series of epicletic gestures as in the beginning of the canon; standing erect and then bowing with hands extended and joined, eyes directed to heavens and immediately cast down. A final bow also befitted the name of Jesus Christ at the end of the section.

(7) *Qui pridie* and *Simili modo* were the central parts of the canon, containing the words of institution for the flesh and blood of Christ respectively. As the most powerful texts in the mass of which the whole canon derives its authority, they were extremely well provided with rubrics, while the rite itself was relatively uniform. Despite some ambiguity about retaining or omitting the conjunction “enim” in the formula of the bread’s transubstantiation, there were no textual variants. The ceremonial involved the cleansing of the fingers before touching the

host, the modest lifting of the bread and wine for the words narrating that Christ took them in his hands, small signs of the cross when he blessed them, the elevations and depositions of the host and the chalice, and reverences (inclinations or genuflections) before and after them. Regular directives instruct the priest about the precise, quiet, and continuous delivery of the words of institution, and the joining of his thumbs and forefingers after the consecration of the host.

Further information concerns gestures of devotion and representation, some of which became increasingly popular, but others were widely condemned. The controversies resulted from the fact that the sanctity of the moments of consecration inspired additional gestures, but it equally alarmed rigorists who strived to prune such offshoots. The priest started in an erect position, and it seems that he remained so in many uses. In the South and the West, and also in Poland, Scandinavia, and some northern uses of Germany, he raised his eyes to heavens when Christ did so and cast them down immediately, but we learn nothing of this in the central regions. In some Mediterranean dioceses, he leaned over the altar, often resting his elbows on it, recalling the leaning position at the supper on the evening of Passover, and performed the holiest words in close physical contact with the respective substance. All of these became established parts of the early modern ceremonial in Italy and Spain. Meanwhile, the same sources warn that the priest must neither figurate the form of the cross with his head while uttering the formula of consecration nor breathe on the substances, pronouncing each word like a single impulse of exhalation. Such exaggerations of an almost magical character might have been rare abuses. But these books also note that the priest must not strike his breast, what he positively did in Le Puy and Gniezno, pretend fraction when he mentions Christ breaking the bread, which was a custom of Reims, or kiss the host before elevation, as we read it in a rubric from Meaux.

(8) *Simili modo*, the formula containing the transubstantiation of the wine, repeats most of the aforementioned phenomena. Only two aspects deserve special attention: that of the canonical digits and the protection of the chalice. As it has been stated, blessings in the Middle Ages were typically performed with the three upper fingers of the right hand, but it was universally observed that thumbs and indices must not be separated after the consecration of the host. The small cross over the chalice for the word “*benedixit*” was the first place where the two rules contradicted. Missals from Grenoble, Braga, or Cahorra preferred Eucharistic precaution, saying that, from here on, benedictions should happen with the lower three fingers. Sarum, Viviers, Ávila and many other uses, however, made an exemption for the benedictions and said that the celebrant must carefully rub his canonical digits over the chalice but continue to perform the crosses with the usual fingers. Sources with this regulation are older, more widespread and numerous, thus it seems that, for the medieval mind, the upper three fingers were almost inseparably associated with the blessing capacity of priests. It was Eucharistic precaution, too, that accounted for varieties in the covering of the chalice and the degree of its elevation. In a few churches, mostly in the Ibero-Provencal landscape, the priest lifted the chalice covered with a secondary pall, while others, especially the English churches, fixed the extent to which the chalice was raised at head height, apparently to prevent its tipping.

(9) *Unde et memores* is still famous for the fact that the celebrant stretched his arms crosswise in certain religious orders retaining their rites up to the modern age. In reality, this has once been the most commonplace position on the continent. Yet, some uses, especially in Northern Germany, Poland, Spain, and Languedoc, associated it exclusively with the words about the Saviour’s passion. For them, it was part of a representational series of artistic arm movements. They set out from an *orans*

posture, and then formed a crucifix while saying “tam beatae passionis;” they made the arms lowered while mentioning the hell, drawn back into the initial posture for the resurrection, and raised high for the ascension, recalling that Christ was carried up to heaven lifting up his hands. An even smaller cluster of archaic uses kept on in the *orans* posture, but this could equally denote the simple extension of the hands before the breast and a more theatrical gesture of raising them upwards or to heavens as observed before the consecration. Considering the geographical dissemination of these options, we can conclude that this broad *orans* posture was the original one, probably for the entire canon, the narrow *orans* posture being its more restrained alternative. Parallel with a tendency for allegorical interpretation and dissimilation, the broad posture transformed into a perpendicular. If the consecration evoked the last supper, the next part must have symbolized the passion narrative, and it was desirable that each prayer after the consecration sounded in a position of its own. The crucifix form, however, inspired a more nuanced elaboration of the allegorical aspect, manifest in the “apart, down, back, and up” arm movements. At the end of *Unde et memores*, five crosses were universally signed on the perfect analogy of *Quam oblationem*: three over both flesh and blood and other two separately over the holy bread and the chalice of eternal salvation.

In this part, minor text variations multiply. Early sources often add the verb “sumus” after the opening phrase, the adjective “catholica” may qualify “plebs tua sancta” in Nevers and Gnienzo, and there are some changes in word order. Yet medieval authorities only attach importance to the inclusion of Christ’s nativity and death among the principal acts of salvation history. They are relatively frequent in early documents, in some later erased, and sparsely survive as fossils in Châlons, Metz, and a few southern churches.

(10) *Supra quae propitio* had a double interpretation. From an allegorical perspective, it symbolized Christ hanging on the cross, as the former part had represented his crucifixion and the next would represent his death. Accordingly, some uses continued to recite it in the crucifix position. Yet more frequently, the priest raised his arms in the broad, high *orans* posture, probably personalizing Christ praying on the cross and, indeed, some sources explicitly call this section *oratio*. This choice also contributed to the dissimilation of gestures. From a representational perspective, however, the section's central theme was God looking down on the sacrifice of his servants with serene countenance. According to this interpretation, the priest spread his hands over the sacrifice and raised his eyes to heavens or, expressing God's acceptance of the gifts, leaned over the altar and looked at the holy species. In either case, the whole text was said in the same position. No clear-cut geographical patterns emerge, but gestures of acceptance were more widespread in the central, German and French territories and gestures of praying on the peripheries. Looking up to the heavens was peculiar to Gaul north of the Loire, looking at the gifts occurred sparsely but only in France, and leaning over the sacrifice was a German, mostly Saxon characteristic. The text was uniform, although some of the earliest sources like the Bobbio and Stowe Missals or the Poitiers Pontifical consistently have the clause "sereno vultu aspicere dignare et acceptu habere" instead of the common variant.

(11) *Supplices te rogamus* allowed two interpretations as well, but here, allegory and representation converged. The priest deeply bowed before the altar, crossing his forearms (*manibus cancellatis*) on his breast. Only Roman Curial rubrics and some of their late Spanish equivalents change this to inclination with joined hands. Polish sources say that he should hold his hands crossed on or before the altar; directives the practical meaning of which we could not yet decipher. The profound inclination

could either express that Jesus, bowing his head, gave up the ghost or, taking the literal meaning of “supplices” seriously, illustrate it with a bent position. Moreover, crossing the forearms on the breast introduced a hitherto unknown element into the code of postures, thus building up a three-part series of arm movements for the parts after consecration: stretched for *Unde et memores*, raised to heavens for *Supra quae propitio*, and crossed on the breast for *Supplices te rogamus*. The subsequent gestures, as kisses and crosses in general, were universal. The celebrant kissed the altar while mentioning it (“ex hac altaris participatione”) and performed three blessings; first, he signed the flesh and the blood while naming them and, last, he crossed himself for the word “benedictione.” At this point, it is more regularly noted that a cross should be drawn with the thumb where the lips of the priest are going to touch the altar, and small differences concern the number and place of kisses. In the South, giving three kisses was quite popular, both in a “middle, right, left” or a “middle, left, right” order. If only one kiss was given, it could equally be performed on the right (see the precedents under *Te igitur*) or on the edge of the altar in the middle. The only remarkable textual variant is that the missals of Messina and Cosenza identify the mediating angel (“per manus sancti angeli tui”) with Michael the Archangel.

(12) *Memento etiam* comprises the commemoration of the dead who were once written on the second tablet of the diptychs. The section is perfectly parallel with the first *Memento*, both with regard to the dilemmas around the physical uttering of the names and the position of the hands, yet it is this place where the function of the letters “N. et N.” and the condition of the eyes are more thoroughly discussed. Detailed Hispanic rubrics warn that, although the priest closed his eyes for the commemoration of the living, he must not do so for the dead as now he already contemplates the incarnate Christ before whom it is not respectful to close his eyes. The equally meticulous

Missal of Grenoble says that he should close his eyes anyway. Still there, and in the nearby Lyon, too, he finished the sentence with a small genuflection that might have served as an apology for breaking eye contact, like altar kisses begged pardon every time where the priest turned his back to the altar.

Textual variants deserve more attention. Medieval scholars remembered that once a special clause commemorating the celebrant himself, *Memento mei quaeso Domine*, preceded the commemoration of the dead, and this was the explanation of why the conjunction “etiam,” (also) was inserted in the latter. Yet such clauses, albeit truly present in some ancient sources, had entirely disappeared by the High Middle Ages. Supplements specifying the departed beneficiaries were more enduring. A phrase for all the departed souls (“et omnium fidelium defunctorum”) sporadically survived in France and Portugal. Sources from Provence and Southern Italy include the priest’s relatives, the benefactors, and those who asked for his prayers. The longest supplements featured the Beneventan region, praying for those whose names were written on the diptychs, the sponsors of the mass, or those resting in the graveyard.

(13) *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* were the only three words of the canon which were spoken in a loud voice, accompanied by a strike of the priest’s breast and simultaneously his small inclination. He only raised his voice slightly, took care that his canonical digits do not touch the chasuble, and extended his hands for the rest. French sources often allow him to strike his breast thrice, but it was only a devotional concession and never a rule. Some books positively forbade it, mostly outside France.

As for the texts, further names, especially female ones, may join the list of saints, but here even the Ambrosian tradition is more restrained than before in the *Communicantes*. In agreement with the eight martyrs and seven virgins enumerated in the common version, certain Mediterranean sources add “martyribus atque/ac virginibus.” Albeit some doubts have already

emerged about the legitimacy of saying “amen” after conclusions within the canon, here the rubrics unanimously emphasize that it must not be said, arguing that the next and final partition starts with a relative clause. As its opening “Per quem” refers to Christ, named in the previous conclusion, they are not to be separated. Grapes and beans on St Sixtus’s day and the oil of the sick on Maundy Thursday were blessed after this partition.

(14) *Per quem haec omnia*, the closing section had approximately as many rubrics as the consecration. To understand its diverse and intricate regulation, it is worth recalling here the Old Roman order of solemn papal masses. Once it was the archdeacon who lifted the chalice wrapped in a napkin (*mappula*), and held it before the pontiff who signed it thrice and finally touched its rim with two of the oblations. Accordingly, the chief motifs of the high medieval ceremonial were elevation, covering, crosses, and touching. Since in non-pontifical masses all the four were done by a single priest, they must have been completed in staggered intervals. As a result, he first signed the gifts thrice, then uncovered the chalice, crossed its rim five times with the host, and finally lifted either the host or both species. Ultimately, he finished the canon, raising his voice, with a chanted “Per omnia saecula saeculorum.” The first three crosses and the uncovering were almost universal apart from some north-western traditions (Verdun, Thérouanne, York) where the crosses were performed over the already bare chalice, and the priest signed himself too for the fourth time in Italian uses of Norman background (Messina, Cosenza).

The custom of signing the rim of the chalice with the host evolved from touching it to the vessel, but high medieval discipline was averse to putting the Eucharist at risk of crumbling. Therefore, actual contact was only imitated by five crosses over the cup. They happened in various ways. In several conservative churches, the priest performed all the five indiscriminately. In others, and this was the most popular option in the South, he

divided them into a “three plus two” structure on the analogy of the five crosses formerly during *Quam oblationem* and *Unde et memores*. Unlike there, however, the text here did not justify any such distinction and the priest completed the last two signs over the empty corporal. Some German traditions preferred a “four plus one” or “two plus one plus two” pattern and even five crosses at five different spots. Without getting lost in the details, we can state that it was typical either to intensify or diversify the process. Intensification meant that the crosses were performed in a narrowing focus, approaching and penetrating ever deeper into the cup of the chalice. Diversification meant that they were performed over various parts of the chalice and the corporal.

As for the closing elevation, three main variants existed. Certain uses, chiefly in the Northern Rhineland, still retained the original custom of touching the host to the chalice or keeping it over the cup. They might have slightly elevated both while doing so, but the rubrics are silent on this. An explicitly small elevation took place under both species in most of the Italian and Hungarian churches, and in a few churches of Normandy, Southern France, and Iberia. In Sigüenza, the celebrant did it with bowed head, his elbows resting on the altar. In the North of France and sporadically in the South and Spain, too, the elevation was definitely high, but it only concerned the host and was performed with the right hand. The posture after the elevation also varied. After putting the host back on the corporal, some Spanish and Northern sources prescribe inclination or genuflection with hands on the altar, but French sources that previously opted for a high elevation of only the host with the right hand continue with hands extended.

While the text of this last section was fairly uniform, certain Ibero-Provencal uses seized the opportunity of having reached the frontier line of the immutable canon and attached trope-like appendices to “omnis honor et gloria” like “virtus et potestas” or uncommon conclusions.

From the Our Father to the kiss of peace

According to an often-quoted passage from a letter of Gregory the Great, the Lord's Prayer formed a part of the canon, acting as a seal of authentication on it. Preceded by the invitation *Praeceptis salutaribus*, the Our Father was recited aloud by the priest alone on tones of its own which varied, parallel to the prefaces, according to the rank of the day. The choir or the congregation joined only the final clause *Sed libera nos a malo*. After that, the priest continued in a quiet voice with the embolism *Libera nos quaesumus*, broke the host in two, and dropped a small particle of it into the chalice. When it was introduced in the 7th century, the subsequent *Agnus Dei* also served as a *confractorium*, namely, a litany accompanying the breaking of the hosts.

The fraction ranked among the most fundamental movements of the mass. From the representational perspective, it enlivened Christ breaking the bread and, from the allegorical perspective, it symbolized the death of Christ whose body was broken for the human race. The ensuing mixing (*commixtio*), that is, letting a particle of the Eucharistic bread fall into the chalice, was a reminder of the ancient ecclesiastical practice of leaven (*fermentum*). Already in the primitive church, bishops expressed unity with each other and the clergy of their dioceses by preserving particles of the freshly consecrated host and sending them to their colleagues or subordinates who, after performing their own consecrations, received and mixed them with their Eucharistic wine. Later in Rome, the emphasis shifted from social community to temporal continuity. In papal masses of the Old Roman period, a particle of the Eucharist was regularly put aside and saved for the next celebration so that the church was never deprived of Christ's bodily presence and liturgies formed an unbroken chain. Yet the older emphasis on belonging together did not entirely disappear as the *commixtio* immediately followed the celebrant's call for reconciliation and,

in the established medieval and modern practice when only the main host was broken, the *Agnus Dei* already accompanied the exchange of peace.

Most of the texts of this section belonged to the core of the mass and were perfectly uniform. Moving away from the Lord's Prayer, however, the canonicity of the texts decreased and we encounter more and more divergence. No variance was tolerated for the *Pater noster* and its introduction, but, similar to the canon, ceremonial additions were acceptable. The same applies to the embolism where only the list of saints could be discretely extended, especially in early sources. The formula for mixing was a more recent but universal phenomenon. Like the offertory texts that later connected to ancient but formerly silent operations, they were more open to textual variation. Lastly, some extra formulas and prayers for peace could follow the call for reconciliation, but they were only minor, optional developments of limited dissemination.

After the last section of the canon, the priest placed the host on the corporal, covered the chalice and, making reverence, sang the concluding "Per omnia saecula saeculorum." He either joined his hands or put them separately on the altar for the opening invitation, but always continued with hands extended, and some rubrics note that, while praying the Our Father, his eyes must have been directed towards the Sacrament. We learn from Grenoble that a stylized raising and deposition of the host and the chalice could display the words "heaven" and "earth," a gesture still observable in the use of Lyon. In Poland and occasionally in Hungary, the priest struck his breast as a sign of contrition when asking for the forgiveness of trespasses.

An elaborate series of gestures accompanied the embolism, centred on the paten. After the Lord's Prayer, the priest took it in his hand and, having listed the saints, slid it under the host. The common feature was that, for each saint's name, he touched the paten to different parts of either the host and the chalice or

his own body. In Montearagón, as in the modern Roman practice, he held it in his right vertically on the altar, then crossed himself with it and kissed it. In Agen and Astorga, he held the paten above his right shoulder and then contacted it first to the host and, second, to the chalice. In Aix and Auxerre, he touched the paten to the base, node, and rim of the chalice, and finally his lips. In Norse countries, it was more characteristic to touch the paten to the celebrant's body. This meant more than signing himself in the said manner or kisses. Beyond these, the priest touched the paten to his eyes and drew small crosses with it before his face and on his breast as well.

As the fraction was a more traditional part of the mass, it did not allow such a variety of local customs. Yet sources providing minute ceremonial details reveal that it could be realized in several different ways. In Rome, the priest laid the two halves of the host on the paten before dropping the detached third particle into the chalice. In Córdoba, Sigüenza, Burgos, Aix, and Vannes, however, he held both halves between the canonical digits of his hand and – maybe as a remembrance for the obsolete *confractorium* function – he kept them in his hands while reciting the text of the *Agnus Dei*, too. In Pécs, moreover, the host was not broken in two but in four, and it was the fourth part that served as the particle. It seems a fairly universal habit to sign the chalice thrice with the particle before letting it fall in the precious blood. For these, the celebrant raised his voice again and sang the call for the exchange of peace parallel to the three crosses. While the choir began the *Agnus Dei*, he continued quietly with the formula of the *commixtio*, dropping the particle into the chalice.

There were two basic variants for the mixing formula. The austere, matter-of-fact *Fiat commixtio* might have been gradually replaced by *Haec sacrosancta*, its longer, more verbose alternative. By the late Middle Ages, the latter was the more widespread, concentrating in France, Britain, and Scandinavia, while the

former occurred less frequently and gravitated towards the conservative Germanic territories. In sources of Italy, Spain, and the North-East, nevertheless, they appear simultaneously or one after the other, and there are several amalgamated textual variants as well. It seems that, in the early modern period, calling the gesture consecration or even sacrosanct raised theological objections. As a result, some books changed the wording to the plain "commixtio," and one early source even deleted the noun "consecratio." The sole really particular formula was *Sancta cum sanctis*, reminiscent of the call for communion in the Mozarabic and Byzantine rites. In Reims, it began a longer text and came after *Fiat commixtio*, while in Burgos it only comprised these three words and sounded thrice before *Haec sacrosancta*. Yet in both cases, it took the leading role as the actual mixing formula and rendered the more usual option an auxiliary oration.

In solemn masses, the call for reconciliation manifested itself in the physical exchange of peace. After reciting the *Agnus Dei*, the celebrant took the peace from the altar and handed it over to the deacon who passed it on to the lower-ranking ministers so that the peace descended in a hierarchical order to the clergy attending in choir, the lay dignitaries present, and perhaps all the faithful. Variation consisted of two factors: the way of taking and handing over the peace and the text of the accompanying formula.

The peace was the Lord's peace (*Pax Domini*) hence it must have derived from an object representing divine presence. Christ incarnate in the Eucharist was the most obvious choice and, in Meaux, indeed, the priest carefully wiped his mouth with the sleeve of his alb, kissed the consecrated host, and turned to embrace and kiss the deacon. It was the body of Christ which was first kissed in several other uses, too, but caution and respect worked against such directness. Several churches replaced the Eucharist by utensils which were in the closest contact with it. In them, the priest kissed the base of the cup, the paten, the

corporal, or the altar. Others opted for symbolic representatives like the altar cross, the relics, the book, or a paxbrede (*instrumentum pacis*). This latter could be any wooden, brass, or ivory plate representing the Saviour and had the advantage of easily passing on from one person to another.

The opening words of the formulas ranged from *Pax tecum* through *Pax tibi* and *Pax Christi* to *Pax vobis*, the address “frater” (brother) being the most common addition. Others tended to include the whole ecclesiastical community in various forms, typically in the West. *Pax tibi frater et Ecclesiae sanctae Dei* was the most popular phrase in France; it was moderately known in Germany and Spain, too, but appears only sporadically in northern and eastern sources which prefer simpler formulas. Texts of a transitional category were used either as short prayers before or after the kiss of peace or as substitutes for the usual formula. Most of them ask for the perseverance of Christ’s peace in the hearts of the faithful like *Pax Christi et Ecclesiae Dei abundet in cordibus nostris*, or highlight mutual love and togetherness like *Habete vinculum pacis et caritatis*, peculiar to the Germanic landscape and Eastern France.

Devotional prayers for peace, however, formed a clearly different category. They did not accompany the act of embracing one another or kissing the instrument of peace, but served as a confirmation from the priest’s part during which the peace was being exchanged. As a rule, the priest said these prayers bowed before the altar, and often kissed the altar, the chalice, or the host before them or for certain words explicitly mentioning the peace. The layout of the service books seldom separates them from the subsequent prayers preparing the communion, but they are thematically distinct. In funeral masses where there was no kiss, such prayers for peace were regularly omitted, while the pre-communion prayers were left intact. In this function, *Domine Iesu Christe qui dixisti apostolis tuis* was almost universal. If any others acceded, they mostly joined as additions. Such was

Domine Iesu Christe qui es pax vera in Iberian and French uses, or *Qui es omnium Deus Dominator* in the region of Reims, and some others too, particularly in Northern and Central France. Other texts of similar purpose are not orations but formulas applying chant texts. *Da pacem Domine* is a regular antiphon from commemorations for peace, and *Fiat pax* is its obligatory versicle. In Évreux, the responsory *Pater peccavi* – that had been popular in the Spanish variants of the preparation for mass – evoked here the words of the prodigal son just before embracing his merciful father.

Communion

The apologetic aspect of the liturgy periodically intensifies before great encounters with the sacred. The access to the altar, the reading of the Gospel, and the consecration were three such theophanic encounters, all inspiring new texts and gestures which heavily contributed to the diversification of the Roman rite. The fourth and most direct encounter is communion. Although, in the Western popular perception of the High Middle Ages, the elevation began to evolve into the most remarkable moment of the mass, this could only happen because lay people rarely took the Eucharist; they preferred spiritual communion which they achieved through visual contact. Eastern and Oriental rites still express that consecration is directed at and fulfilled in the communion. By pure ritual means, it is difficult to determine when the consecration takes place, but the curtains are drawn and the royal doors closed when the priest enters the holy of holies to receive the body of Christ. In the Roman rite, there were three types of texts for the communion of the priest, both formally and thematically: apologies before, short formulas and salutations during, and thanksgivings after it.

Apologetic prayers took the form of regular orations and naturally occurred before receiving the Eucharist. Rubrics do not

specify the details of their performance; if there are any, they say that the priest must bow before the altar. The most popular such orations were *Domine Iesu Christe Fili Dei vivi qui ex voluntate Patris*, often attributed to St Augustine, and *Perceptio corporis*. The latter could also occur after the communion, with slightly modified wording. As both prayers were directed to the Son, an unconventional formulation in traditional Roman eucharology, many uses felt the need for a previous prayer to the Father. This need was met by *Domine sancte Pater omnipotens aeternae Deus da mihi corpus et sanguinem* with the heading *oratio ad Patrem*, while the next prayer had the title *oratio ad Filium*. Their belonging together is underlined by the fact that some sources attribute the former to St Augustine, too. Occurrences of the oration to the Father thicken in Northern France, but it appears practically everywhere in Europe outside Italy, Germany, and Hungary. Unlike the main oration to the Son, *Perceptio corporis* mostly refers to both kinds, but, especially in the South, it only mentions Christ's body, and this seems to be the original variant. The asymmetry can be explained with the help of some old sacramentaries and the use of Prague where *Perceptio corporis* formed a pair with *Communicatio et consecratio sancti sanguinis*, a prayer also directed to the Son but mentioning only his blood. In Kraków, this latter equally survived, but it was modified to include both kinds. Further prayers were of local significance. *Domine Iesu Christe Fili Dei vivi propitius esto mihi peccatori*, for instance, featured the Beneventan region, *Deus Pater fons et origo totius bonitatis* was an Anglo-Norman choice, and *O lux divini amoris* a Catalanian peculiarity.

Short formulas and salutations accompanied the very act of taking the Eucharist. They interpreted the current situation by applying appropriate biblical phrases to it, or extended the apologetic aspect to the immediate moments before communion. Some texts came from the Psalms. The most popular series of versicles consisted of *Quid retribuam*, *Calicem salutaris*, and

Laudans invocabo (Ps 115:12–13; 17:4), based on the phrase “I will take the chalice of salvation,” and weaving on the motif of calling upon the Lord’s name. *Panem caelestem accipiam* (“I will take the heavenly bread”) was simply a paraphrase to fit both species, but, in Elne and València, *Panem angelorum* (“Man ate the bread of angels,” Ps 77:25) served as its more creative equivalent. Other texts came from the Gospels. *Domine non sum dignus*, quoting the words of the centurion of Capharnaum (Mt 8:8), was ubiquitous but with several variants and trope-like additions; in certain French and Spanish uses, it could sprawl into a voluminous oration of half a page. *Deus propitius esto* recalled the words of the publican (L 18:13), and *Domine si vis* those of the leper (Mt 8:2). Sometimes, non-biblical exclamations could close the series like *Domine noverim me noverim te* in Poland and Czechia or *Ecce Iesu benignissime*, characteristic to Lorraine and Hungary.

Still before communion, greetings beginning with *Ave* (“Hail”) formed a distinct genre. The pair *Ave in aeternum sanctissima caro* and *caelestis potus* for the two kinds respectively concentrated in Spain, Lorraine, and the surroundings of Paris, but they are documented in every other region. A 12th-century record from Hungary suggests that once they could also figure in the canon as the priest’s salutes during the elevations, but late medieval missals consistently cleansed the text from them. Older sources show that these salutations were open to redrafting, influenced now and then by processional chants on Palm Sunday like *Ave rex noster* or *Salve rex fabricator mundi* (a verse of *Cum audisset*). A few uses like Reims, Trier, Regensburg, Viborg, Pamplona, or the Carmelites retained such variants up to the printing press period.

Finally, the priest uttered short formulas immediately before taking the host and the chalice. More detailed rubrics speak about reverences before and after this, and some of them add that he should make the sign of the cross vertically with the

paten or the host and the chalice before touching them to his mouth. The usual texts were parallel blessings for the two species formulated in the optative that the body or blood of Christ might save the communicant's soul for eternal life; only the verb "custodiat" was frequently replaced by synonyms like "conseruet" or "perducat." The same formulas put in the second person served the purpose of administering communion to the people, but, from the High Middle Ages, this typically happened outside or after the mass, if it happened at all. Textual variation went in two directions. The first was verbosity, extending the basic formula to include the priest's sins and unworthiness, the desired spiritual consequences, or the congregation present and sometimes also the departed souls. The second was dissimilation, preferring different formulas for the two species. This was far less typical, but it could provide some refuge for archaic texts like *Corpus et sanguis* in Northern France or the above-cited *Communicatio et confirmatio* in Italy, Poland, and Czechia.

After communion, both orations and biblical formulas may appear, and some of them intermingle with the prayers of saying farewell to the altar (*recessus altaris*) or the thanksgiving after mass. Unlike the preparatory prayers before communion that can be safely distinguished from the prayers for peace on the thematic ground, texts of the recess from the altar are often indiscernible from those concluding the communion of the priest. Technically, it was the communion, the postcommunion, and the *Ite missa est* that separated them, but there were many overlaps and, unfortunately, mass ordinaries seldom record the exact place of the propers or provide rubrics for this part; in several cases, we cannot precisely determine when the prayers were performed.

From a ceremonial point of view, there was more opportunity to recite texts parallel to actions in this section than earlier. Besides the immediate moments after the priest's communion or the administering of the Eucharist to the faithful, the ensuing

purification was a complex procedure. The celebrant collected the fragments with the paten and let them fall into the chalice. The subdeacon or the server in charge poured wine in the chalice, the priest rinsed the vessel and drank the ablution, that is, the profane fluid dissolving the possible remnants of the Eucharist. After that, he cleansed his fingers over the chalice with wine and water and drank the ablution again. Lastly, he wiped the chalice dry, reassembled the set, and covered it either with the corporal or a separate veil. Due to the well-known tendency for combining every gesture with a text, these inspired an abundance of prayers.

Quod ore sumpsimus and *Corpus tuum Domine quod sumpsi* were universally accepted items directly after communion and for the ablutions. Others characterized certain regions. Many of them were borrowed from already existing assignments; votive postcommunions like *Haec nos communio*, thanksgiving prayers after a meal like *Agimus tibi gratias*, or the Corpus Christi collect *Deus qui nobis* are only peculiar in this specific function. Prayers for the washing of hands before the mass or the offertory may return at the ablutions as well. *Anima Christi*, a prayer popularly attributed St Ignatius of Loyola for he put it as a motto before his Spiritual Exercises, was in fact an Ibero-Provencal thanksgiving prayer after the communion of the priest and is already documented in the early 14th century.

Certain orations conformed to the structure of commemorations, following a chant text and a versicle or preces. Versicles were selected from the common stock (e.g. *Ostende, Domine exaudi*) or the established repertory of Corpus Christi. The hymn *Iesu nostra redemptio*, the antiphons *O sacrum convivium* and *Benedicta filia*, and some other proper chants transposed in a new context might take the role of the opening item, frequently one after the other. *Benedicta filia* was a German and Eastern European marker, similar to the antiphon *Lutum fecit* that paralleled the ablution of the fingers with the healing of the man

born blind and his washing in the pool of Siloe (J 9:11). *Qui manducat* in Southern France recalled Christ's words that those who eat his flesh and drink his blood will abide in him (J 6:57), while the responsory *Vidi Dominum* in Auxerre and Kraków interpreted the mass as a face-to-face encounter between the Lord and his servant Jacob (Gn 32:30). In France and Spain, *Nunc dimittis*, the Canticle of Simeon, likewise utilized the theme of eyes seeing the Lord's salvation (L 1:30). Any of these might detach itself from the commemoration structure and accompany certain acts as their respective formula. Even a repeated *Agnus Dei* or an anticipated, triple *Deo gratias* could work as formularized chant texts after the communion.

Dismissal

After the purification, the celebrant turned to the mass book, read the text of the communion chant in a low voice, and recited the postcommunion aloud. Then the deacon or, in low masses, the priest himself sang the dismissal formula: *Ite missa est*, *Benedicamus Domino*, or *Requiescant in pace*, and the people responded either with *Deo gratias* or, to the last one, with *Amen*. Tropes and varied melodies notwithstanding, these texts were constant; it was the dismissal formula that marked the end of the mass. We may classify further components according to their place and their texts. Ceremonially, some texts and gestures still belonged to the space of the altar. In this respect, there was not much room for additions and the only items consistently belonging to this category were the *Placeat* oration and the final blessing. After leaving the altar, everything should count as parting and thanksgiving. Yet parallel to the preparation for mass and the access to the altar or the prayers at the foot of it, there was much overlap so that the same stock of items, motifs, and themes appear simultaneously still at the altar, before its steps, during the exit, and in the sacristy. Accordingly, we must adopt

a somewhat artificial division in grouping certain phenomena to the dismissal and others to the recess or the thanksgiving.

Beyond tropes and melodic variants, there were two sorts of extensions for the dismissal formulas. On some solemnities, in Eastertide, and the octave of Easter, the *Ite* or the *Benedicamus* acquired an “alleluia” or more. Their usual number was one or two, but, in some places, three distinguished the greatest feasts, and Prague even had a five-part “alleluia,” probably for Holy Saturday. On the analogy of the office hours, a few German uses added the prosaic clause *Fidelium animae* to the *Requiescant*, the concluding formula of funeral masses.

While the clergy or the congregation sang the usual response, the priest turned back to the altar and, bowing, prayed the *Placeat* as a farewell apology. It was an almost obligatory piece already in early books, approximately on the level of the most widely accepted offertory prayers. As a sign of its high status, several books put the prayer in the first person plural, instead of the original singular befitting a private apology. Similar to other texts that combined apologetic and intercessory motifs, the *Placeat* produced several variants, elaborating on the invocation of the Holy Trinity, the conclusion, the terms detailing the priest’s indignity, or the list of intercessors and desired effects. As usual, Central European churches tended to adhere to a more disciplined variant, and bold supplements proved more typical in the South.

The last text that was necessarily linked to the altar was the concluding blessing. This was not an ancient and obligatory element of the mass, and this fact is equally reflected by its position after the dismissal, its delivery in prose, and its almost limitless textual variation. The Carmelite use was still famous in the 20th century for omitting it, although the order’s medieval service books may contain a final blessing and, even in the modern age, it was a tolerated appendix.

Indeed, the variation of the blessing fits into the broader context of confirming benedictions after diverse sacerdotal ceremonies. Unlike the solemn, triple blessings performed by bishops, these were short and simple formulas, never addressing the Godhead in the manner of orations but directed either to the addressees in the second person or invoking the Holy Trinity in the third person optative. They obligatorily contained a sign of the cross parallel with the naming of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, performed over the persons or objects to be blessed, and the usual response was "amen." The most commonplace wording was *Benedicat vos omnipotens Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus*, sometimes with minor insertions like "omnipotens" and "misericors," or major ones like "divina maiestas et una deitas." Another well-known formula began with the words *Benedictio Dei omnipotentis*, but it was less popular after the mass. In Germanic territories, however, *Caelesti benedictione* might often replace its more straightforward equivalents and, in the South, the rhymed blessing *In unitate Sancti Spiritus benedicat vos Pater et Filius* took its role, modelled on the blessings over the readers in matins and before a meal.

Although the Roman rite of the modern period took it for granted that only pontifical blessings were introduced by vesicles and funeral masses had no blessings at all, medieval evidence challenges both claims. Besides the universal *Dominus vobiscum*, the verses *Sit nomen Domini* and *Adiutorium nostrum* often preceded the final blessing, mostly together but occasionally only one of them, and there was no word of pontifical celebrations in such cases. These verses regularly prepared minor administrations of sacramentals; in this quality, they staged the final blessing at the end of the mass as an additional sacramental which substituted for the communion of the faithful, an obviously more abundant but, for the time being, unused resource of graces. In certain Spanish and Italian churches, neither were funeral masses deprived of a last blessing. Most of the rubrics

seem to be aware that in such masses all graces must be withheld and concentrated on the dead, but the final blessing is treated as a concession after the strictest confines of the mass, so that the simple ones may not be offended (*ne scandalizentur simplices*). Mediterranean churches used the rhymed blessing *Deus vita vivorum* or its close variants in this capacity.

Recess from the altar and thanksgiving

Still standing at the altar, the priest might have read the Prologue of John's Gospel, what the modern period knew as the Last Gospel, and, kneeling or bowing before the altar, said some commemorations in honour of the Virgin Mary or the local patron saint. These already belonged to the phase of exit, a gradual process that consisted of parting gestures and, regardless of its spatial arrangement, can be better described in thematic and textual than ceremonial terms. Four types of themes or text structures may appear in the sources in varied order and assigned to different locations, but their most typical and, intrinsically, most logical sequence is this: (1) Last Gospel, (2) commemorations, (3) psalmody, and (4) devotional prayers.

Our first record of the Last Gospel comes from the early 14th century, yet its recitation was probably already earlier a devotional practice. By the printing press period, it proved almost universal. It is more consistently documented in France and Spain, but it pops up occasionally in every other region and we must always keep in mind that French and Spanish ordinaries are more detailed on average than those in Germany or the northern and eastern countries. That the Prologue was already part of the recess is stressed by the fact that, in French traditions, the priest typically took off his chasuble before reciting it.

Other ceremonies around the Last Gospel were mostly parallel with the way how the day's Gospel had been read in the respective use. Where noted, we learn that the priest signed

the altar or the book with a cross, and then signed himself on his chest, or on his forehead, lips, and chest. For the clause “*et Verbum caro factum est*,” he knelt, similar to the mentions of the incarnation in the Creed and otherwise. After the Gospel, the subdeacon or the server next to the priest answered either *Deo gratias* or other customary responses according to the habit of the local church. The only true peculiarities highlighted the Marian aspects of the incarnation theme. In Île-de-France, the usual reply to the Gospel’s title, *Gloria tibi Domine*, expanded into the four-line concluding doxology of Nativity hymns: *Gloria tibi Domine, qui natus es de Virgine* etc., while, in Le Puy and Arles, the rhymed blessing *Ille qui natus est de Virgine* followed the response, equally borrowed from the Christmas season.

The Prologue of John itself was traditionally the Gospel of the third, high mass of Christmas Day. Like other biblical citations at the end of the mass, it gained fresh significance from its new context within the mass ordinary. The phrase “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us” referred to the here and now, the Eucharistic incarnation of the Word on the altar. Besides, it had a sacramental aspect as well. Like the blessing after dismissal, the Last Gospel worked as a formula confirming the beneficial impacts of the mass. Gospel beginnings were typically performed in the capacity of powerful enchantments towards the four cardinal points in processions against lightning, storm, or agricultural pests, and that of John the Theologian, the most respected of the evangelists, was considered the most powerful among them. It regularly concluded rites like matrimony, baptism, the churching of women, the visitation and anointing of the sick, or the blessings of bread, wine, and even ships and instruments of navigation. This sacramental aspect was underlined by the fact that in Salamanca or Plasencia, a final sprinkling of holy water confirmed the dismissal.

Commemorations followed the model of the divine office. Matins and vespers were typically concluded with a series of

antiphons, versicles, and orations in honour of the Trinity, the Holy Cross, the Blessed Virgin, Peter and Paul, local patrons, all saints, and for diverse necessities, first of all, peace. Parallel commemorations might have appeared in the mass, too, especially during the offering and the canon. After the Lord's Prayer, one for the recovery of the Holy Land was especially popular. Such commemorations acted as supplements to the main topic of the celebration, similar to the multiplication of collects and other proper orations. They often intermingled with the psalmody module to be discussed below, but they are clearly recognizable by their different emphasis.

Instead of themes directly connected to the offering of the mass like apologizing, meditating on the mysteries, or thanksgiving, they focus on saintly persons or pious intentions. Items of the Virgin Mary were extremely popular, and the antiphon *Salve regina* with its accessories played a prominent role in rites closing the mass, too, sometimes echoing the Marian connotations of the Last Gospel. Honouring the Trinity, local patrons, or all saints was less frequent than in the office hours, but they still occurred. Prayers for the dead, however, consistently appear in the sources, often marked by the presence of Psalm 129 (*De profundis*). Other popular supplements begged for peace, the forgiveness of sins, against adversities, for the church and the king, and against their enemies and persecutors. All these intentions channelled the power of the mass just offered towards concretely formulated purposes.

Texts about the Eucharist or for the welfare of the celebrant and the maintenance of the mass's spiritual effects formed a transitional category. The former ones honoured the Most Blessed Sacrament just embodied in the mass with the usual commemoration of Corpus Christi or one of its close variants, typically consisting of the antiphon *O sacrum convivium*, the versicle *Panem de caelo*, and the oration *Deus qui nobis sub sacramento mirabili*. These latter prayed for perseverance in good

works and the grace of good death, or they meditated on the dignity of priesthood so that the unworthy holder of this high office might not waste the graces lavished on him, put on righteousness, and remain the pure Temple of the Holy Ghost. Such desires were still formulated in the frames of commemorations, but they already anticipated the themes of the psalmody module more closely connected to saying mass.

As a reminder of the analogue section in the access, we call the central part of the recess from the altar psalmody, although its most characteristic element is not a psalm, but the Cantic of the Three Children. Usually accompanied by the antiphon *Trium puerorum*, it likened the priest offering mass to the Hebrew youths descending to the fiery furnace. As those were saved from the devouring flames, so the priest too escaped having seen God's face, albeit no man shall see him and live, and he is like a refiner's fire. After it, however, actual psalms followed. Those beginning with *Laudate* or *Lauda* (Ps 116, 145, 148, 150) gave voice to general thanksgiving, while others like *Conserva me* or *Dominus regit me* (Ps 15, 22) belonged to the celebrant's personal perspective. In Northern and Eastern Europe, *Nunc dimittis*, the Cantic of Simeon was often delivered in this function. In Southern France and Spain, the *Te Deum* could join or entirely replace the psalmody, or, quietly recited by the priest, accompany the exit procession (e.g. Toledo, Braga) or the putting off of liturgical vestments (e.g. Marseille, Aix). Canticles and psalms acted as the head of a commemoration structure. Most typically, the continuation consisted of preces, that is a triple *Kyrie*, Our Father, and a series of appropriate versicles, and an oration or a series of orations finished the module. A certain liturgical sense of form demanded a closing unit, and this was met by formulas like *Benedicamus Domino*, *Fidelium animae*, *Divinum auxilium*, or *Precibus et meritis*, borrowed from the divine office.

Devotional prayers built up the fourth and last category. Many of them bore the title "prayer after communion," and

did not necessarily rank among the mass prayers. In other sources, they may join the ordinary, but, more frequently, they are rather collected in a separate block at the beginning or the end of service books, signalling a less official status as compared to the recess from the altar. In fact, the term “thanksgiving after mass” in the strict sense only applies to them. Such prayers are frequently distinguished by rubrics containing the term *post missam* or *post celebrationem missae* and emphasizing that it is not obligatory to complete them, though highly commendable and indulgences are awarded for it. Similar to a considerable group of preparatory texts before the mass, they were very long and tended to use subjective, emotional language. With these, the orderly and concentrated realm of communal celebration melted into the more relaxed domain of private piety.

A FAREWELL TO FOOTNOTES

This book was conceived in a time of information revolution. Writing it has been made possible by the digitization of old service books, enabling a quantitative breakthrough in the field. Yet its special contribution hopes to be the structured view of this vast evidence and a cultural-historical interpretation of its evolution and diversity.

These days, a new paradigm is emerging in processing sources and drawing conclusions from them. This poses a challenge to traditional referencing. On the author's side, there is still a temptation to accumulate references. Both primary sources and modern works are easily accessible, online catalogues and bibliographical software help the work of academics, and there is great pressure to demonstrate one's expertise by ostentatious notes and bibliographies, and fierce competition to collect and exchange quotations. On the reader's side, however, there is a growing perplexity at the sight of all that immense scientific production. As the literature becomes more and more sophisticated, fewer and fewer people have a chance for a calm and devoted read. Besides their natural advantage in retrieval capacities, digital resources are developing fast both in their coverage and accuracy. For pieces of exact information, even the most committed scholars prefer browsing the internet instead of opening a register. This strange situation may lead to works containing hundreds of pages of supplements which will probably never be consulted by anyone.

Facing all these prompted us to rethink the function of a genuine book. This volume is to be read and not consulted. We decided on an unprecedented interplay of print narrative and digital documentation, relieving the first from the burden of minute details and the second from lengthy explanations. Every factual statement of the above synthesis rests on hundreds of

records, carefully entered in the eponymous database (usuarium.elte.hu). As of 2023, it contains more than 1,300,000 data items, each linked to a specific page of more than a thousand early prints or manuscripts. Every processed source has its full bibliographical description and index, and, for each record, the relevant page can be displayed with a single click. Each source is linked to the verified or assumed locality of its use, thus appearing in the broadest geographical context on the map, and each of the analyzed texts figures in the widest context of its genre's or ceremony's statistics. The reader, therefore, can comfortably trace back any – at first sight careless – mention of a diocese, monastery, religious order, assignment, liturgical item, or ceremonial gesture to the photograph of the very page from which the information derives.

Any further conclusions are the author's own interpretations. Certainly, his views owe much to previous reading and mirror the predispositions of a secularly trained but traditional-minded Catholic intellectual in 21st-century Hungary, but he sincerely strove to hear the fading voice of ages past as preserved on the pages of ancient service books. By not quoting any secondary literature, he by no means wanted to neglect his colleagues but rather to admit his inadequacy to recapitulate all their achievements. The forthcoming *Brill Medieval Latin Liturgy: A Research Guide*, to which he is a modest contributor, will certainly supply substantial bibliographies.