The post-medieval Processional Practice of the Zagreb Cathedral and the
Paulines of the Zagrebian Diocese

Pauline Order during the Middle Ages settled down in all over Hungary,
and also in the Zagrebian Diocese. Paulines have their liturgical
provenance from the liturgy of Esztergom/Strigonium, but the area where
they lived influenced it as well. Therefore it is worthy to examine the
coincidences between the Zagrebian diocesian liturgy and that of the
Paulin order. According to this examination, this study is related
exclusively to the Post-Tridentine period.

After the rules of the Tridentine rite came out both the Zagrebian diocese
and the Pauline Order tried to find a way how to guard their tradition,
how to protest against the situation where they found themselves.
However, their way became different, this paper would like to show,
whether there are correspondences. The reason why processional practice
is in focus is caused by different things. On the one hand, the
processional practice of Zagreb cathedral is very well documented from
the Post-Tridentine period, and on the other hand, there are two
processional sources of the Paulines, one from the 17th (1644), and one
from the 18th (1753) centuries, which were not yet detailly examined.
The processional practice of Zagreb cathedral had been fully analised in
my formal research. The outline of the examination got into many
different results, here I mention the details which are essential for our
present study. The most significant feature of all the processionals in

general is, that they are very subjectives in comparison to other liturgical books of other genres. They can appear as a part of other liturgical books (graduals, missals, etc.), but they also can be executed as own portable books. Usually these books don't belong to a certain community, or church, but to a certain person, mainly to a cantor, succentor or other soloist of the certain church. Regarding to this fact, it is unusual in Zagreb, that the 9 processional of the cathedral from the 17th-18th century have the same content for the 90 percent, and their content fits perfictly to the medieval Zagrebian liturgy with some unessential changes. They contain chants for processional liturgical events, for all the liturgical year. (Temporale, sanctorale, commune sanctorum).[1]

For the purpuse to examine the parallel facts between the Zagrebian and the Pauline processional practice, the statements I pointed out in my doctoral dissertation according to the Zagrebian one should be summerized.[2] The main intention of the Zagrebian conservation was to guard the medieval tradition and to protest against the Strigonian decision of the synode of 1629-1630. As the result of this double-purpuse, next to the conservation, the step by step „destruction" can be shown on the processional liturgical content. There were chants

---

[1] VII-104 processional, Zagreb Arhiv Hrvatske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti (1697), MR 108 processional, Zagreb Metropolitanska Knjižnica (1698), II.a.25 processional, Zagreb Arhiv Hrvatske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti (1734), MR 191 processional (1742), Zagreb Metropolitanska Knjižnica, II.a.31 processional (1750), Zagreb Arhiv Hrvatske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti, Rukopisa 158 processional, fragment, Zagreb Hrvatski Državni Arhiv (beginning of the 18th century); 01-75-75 printed processional, Zagreb Biblioteka Bogoslovnog Fakulteta (1751), III.d.175 processional, Zagreb Arhiv Hrvatske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti
[2] Csomó, Orsolya, *A zágrábi székesegyház XVII-XVIII. századi processzionáléi* DLA dissertation, (Budapest: Liszt Ferenc Zeneművészeti Egyetem, 2001), 317-319.

disappeared between the medieval and the Post-Tridentine sources (e.g. the great Palm Sunday antiphons as *Collegerunt pontifices, Ante sex dies* etc.), some of them disappeared in the year of 1697-1698 (e.g. the beginning of the Purification-procession: *Postquam impleti sunt, Ave gratia plena, Adorna thalamum*), and some paraliturgical songs appeared in the latest sources (e.g. cantio *Chrsitus surrexit*, or the vernacular *Narodilszeie Kralje nebeszki*). However, the main liturgical shape has remained, there were a very few changes, according to the melodies: the not very exact copying and the wrong division of syllables was typical in the 16th-17th Century sources.

What was the situation in the case of the Pauline sources? The examination is very difficult as there is no remaining gradual (only fragments of some folios) or processional from the Middle-Ages. We can base on the Post-Tridentine sources, the early strigonian ones, and the early pauline missals.

The synode of Lepoglava in the year 1600 accepted the adaptation of the roman rite into the Pauline liturgy. However they followed a very special way: they adapted the roman rite as to the order and the selection of the chants, but they added their own music, sometimes in a very special way: they made new compositions to the newly prescribed texts with the early modus existed on the same liturgical place.[3]

---

[3] Szendrei, Janka ed. Graduale Romanum ad usum monasterii Paulinorum de Újhely, Musicalia Danubiana 24. (Budapest, 2010.), 14-18.

From the Post-Tridentine period two Pauline processionals remained. The earlier is from 1644, from the convent of Újhely, and the later is from 1753, from Lepoglava, Croatia. For the first sight the main difference between the zagrebian processionals and the pauline ones is that the paulines are rather cantuale, or a subjective collection of chants. The Újhely processional seems like a supplement to the Újhely gradual from 1623[4]. The gradual doesn't contain any processional movement, except the litany of the Easter vigil, it is the 20 years younger processional book where the important processional liturgies of the temporal took place. Apart from that, it contains a hymnary, a tonary, invitatories, passions etc. (See Table 1.)

As it can be seen from the contents, it is a miscellania, not a real processional.

The later processional is from Lepoglava. It is much more complete than that of Újhely, but still less consequent than the Zagrebian ones. As to the order of the chants it strictly follows the liturgical year from the beginning to the end of that. But, as to the genre of the chants it is also like a miscellania. It contains the whole completorium of Christmas e.g., or the 4th, 8th, 11th tracts for Easter vigil. The concrete processional part begins again with Purification, but its content is complete till Corpus Christi. As an addition the feast of St Lawrence got some processions, and at the end of the manuscript – similarly to the Újhely one – *ritus sepeliendi mortuorum* got its place. (See Table 2.)

---

[4] Edited by Janka Szendrei: see. footnote nr. 3.

To point out some intetersting facts the Good Friday processions are examined.

In the case of *Popule meus* and *Ecce lignum* the order of these chants is very significant according to the age of the sources where they appear: before the Tridentine uniformization, in the liturgical tradition of the Hungarian dioceses it was used in the mentioned order, but the Tridentine liturgy – based upon a Roman liturgy – prescibed the opposite (*Ecce lignum*, and then *Popule meus*).

The Paulines insisted on the roman order of the chants, but differently in the two sources: in the Újhely processional the sequence of the notated chants remained medieval, however in the rubrics (probably later corrected), the other way is explained.

In the later, Lepoglava processional, it is already completely corrected according to the roman/Tridentine rite.

One of the most important questions is the melodies. What was the aim and what was the result in the different ways of melody using? This examination didn't cover the whole repertory concerning the melodies, but examining some of them pointed out some interesting thing. For example, though the *Verbum caro* responsory has only its main part in Lepoglava processional, it has many diatonic patterns.

To demonstrate that complex question, one single processional chant is selected, the *Popule meus* improperies. One can say that it is a very common chant without any variant in all over Europe, but the examples show the opposite. I used 5 representative sources:

MisNot:	**Missale Notatum Strigoniense** ante 1341 (Bratislava, Arhiv Mesta EC Lad.3.)[5]
GrBa:	**Graduale Strigoniense** (beginning of the 16th Century) (Esztergom, Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár Mss.I.1. and 3b.)[6]
Újhely:	**Processionale** Conventus Ujheliensis Ordinis Sancti Pauli Primi Eremitis (1644) Budapest, Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár, Oct. Lat. 794
Lepogl.	**Processionale**, Zagreb, Nacionalna i Sveučilisna Biblioteka, R 3612 (1753)
Zag 107	**Processionale**, Zagreb, Arhiv Hrvatske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti, VII-104 (1697)
Mis234	**Missale,** Österreichishcer Nationalbibliothek Wien, Cod. 234. St. Göttweig
–	**Missale** fratrum Eremitarum ordinis divini Pauli primi Eremitae, Budapest, Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár, Venezia 1514 (printed)

(The medieval Pauline Missals also contain this melody, but it is identical to the Missale Notatum Strigoniense except 2 small notes. See Table 3.)

The Pauline sources have different structure according to the Hagios-Sanctus part: they alternate the greek and latin text by each Hagios-Sanctus, but for the easier comparison, I used them on the way similar to the secular sources. (In Zagreb VII-104, at „*Quid ultra debui*" the key-placing is uncorrect, but it is also revised for the better comparison.)

Through this research, the first question was, whether the pauline tradition differs in some ways in its different sources, and, these differences are caused by the diocese they belong to.

---

[5] Edition: Szendrei Janka–Richard Ribarič, Missale Notatum Strigoniense ante 1341 in Posonio, Musicalia Danubiana 1. (Budapest: MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, 1982)
[6] Edition: Szendrei Janka, *Graduale Strigoniense s. XV/XVI*. Musicalia Danubiana 12*; (Budapest: MTA Zenetudományi Intézet, 1993.)

There are some points where the differences are remarkable.

The division of the syllables are sometimes different:

or, page 3, line 2, „*de terra*", and then „*parasti*", where all the three existing pauline sources are different.

However, in other cases, the differences touches the notes as well.

The main question was, wether the Lepoglava Pauline source uses a proper way, or it is similar to some of the cited sources. There are cases, where the two Pauline source goes together: In the case of Agios Athanatos they are similar, and different from all the others.

The same phenomenon is in the latin version of that part. The „*immortalis*" instead of „*Athanatos*" gives also different solutions: the pauline sources adjust a pes, and the others adjust the word: „et".

There are places, where the Újhely processional differs from all the others: „*per desertum*" and „*parasti crucem*".

It is the Lepoglava source which follows for the most cases its personal way: the division of syllables are sometimes strange, (probably due to the late origin of the manuscript), but it is quite consequently differs from the other pauline source as well:

On the second line, somehow it follows the principle of the Újhely processional of dividing syllables into two groups, instead of dividing one long neume, and one pitch, but, it uses different grouping than the Újhely processional.

On page 6. there are many small movements, where its composition differs from the others. On these solutions sometimes inhabilities can be seen, e.g. „*meam speciosissimam*": the division of syllables is unskillful: the emphatic syllables don't fit very well to the notes.

It is the Lepoglava source which makes the only text difference: instead of *in terram satis optimam - in terram satis bonam* (page 5), which fits to the Tridentine version of the text.

Looking through the melodies, it is obvious, that the secular sources are much closer to each other and also the pauline ones refer to each other.

There is only one place, (with two difirent texts in two different verses) where the pauline sources are different, and the Lepoglava refers to the zagrebian and Strigonian sources. However, the Lepoglava source follows its own way of composing the melody.

Summary

If the post-medieval processional practice of certain communities is taken into examination, it is difficult to got into a relevant result. In the middle ages there were no processional books in Hungary, processional chants were written in the graduals, missals, and sometimes in breviaries. The aim of conservation of something from the medieval practice gave birth to the processional books. According to the sources, Zagreb cathedral owned 9 different processionals, (among them one printed!), and these had strictly processional contents for 90%. On the opposite, there remained only two Pauline sources from two different convents, and these books are rather cantuals, a collection of different genre of chants for different liturgical occasions, mainly according to the requeries of certain soloists of the convent.

However, the Lepoglava source – instead of its late datation – has a dual feature. On the one hand as to the content, it's much more redundent and much more conservative than the Újhely one, on the other hand as to the music and texts, it is much more destroyed and much more fits to the Tridnetine versions. It could be the Zagreb influence, that its content is much richer, than its hundred years older relatives, there are traces of the typical deliberate Pauline-type compositions but the destruction of the melodies represents the common influence of the 18th century.

Table 1. The content of the Újhely Processional

1-32v   Hynmarium

32v   *Te Deum*

37r   *Regina caeli* - with tropes

37v   *Salve Regina* - without tropes

38v   *Gaude Dei genitrix* - with tropes

39r   Modus intonandi psalmos et Magnificat

44r   Aliud tonorum compendium

51r   Office-antiphons, hymns

53v-   Processional (Purification, Palm Sunday, Resurrection,

77v   Rogation, St. Marc, Corpus Christi)

78r   Ritus sepeliendi morutorum

82r   Invitatories

86r   *Vidi aquam, Asperges*

87v   Some additons to the rogations

89v   Readings of the Lamentation for all the 3 days

105r   Good Friday

111r   Mattheus passion

136v   John passion

Table 2. The content of the Lepoglava Processional

1r   *Veni Sancte Spiritus, Asperges, Vidi aquam*

3r   Completorium and Matins of Christmas (complete liturgies,