

Codex Angelicus 123 as a Liturgical Manuscript

Brian Møller Jensen

► **To cite this version:**

Brian Møller Jensen. Codex Angelicus 123 as a Liturgical Manuscript. *Classica et Mediaevalia. Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*, 2005, 56, pp.303-325. <hprints-00475198>

HAL Id: hprints-00475198

<https://hal-hprints.archives-ouvertes.fr/hprints-00475198>

Submitted on 21 Apr 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Codex Angelicus 123

as a liturgical manuscript.

- Brian M. Jensen

**Dept. of classical languages, Stockholm
& Fondazione di Piacenza e Vigevano**

”The medieval folio was not raw material for text editors and art historians working separately. It contained the work of different artists and artisans - poet, scribe, illuminator, rubricator, commentator - who projected collective social attitudes as well as interartistic rivalries onto the parchment. The manuscript folio contains different systems of representation: poetic or narrative text, the highly individual and distinctive scribal hand(s) that inscribed the text, illuminated images, coloured rubrications. Each system is a unit independent of the others and yet calls attention to them. Each tries to convey something about the other while to some extent substituting for it ... A miniature we admire as a work of art in its own right also represents a scene in the poetic narrative, now transposed from the verbal to the visual medium”.¹

Being a philologist studying liturgical texts in medieval manuscripts, I consider this statement by Stephen Nichols an appropriate point of departure for the following investigation of Roma, Bibl. Angelica c. 123 (= RoA 123). In order to do justice to my choice of title I want to make a few preliminary remarks on its last part, ”as a liturgical manuscript”, as well as present the usual codicological details such as the contents, measures, date and provenance of ”Codex Angelicus 123”, before I try to apply Nichols’ view in my presentation and investigation of specific folios, aspects and texts, which make it interesting to study ”Codex Angelicus 123 as a liturgical manuscript”.

¹ Stephen Nichols, ”Introduction, Philology in a Manuscript culture” *Speculum* 65 (1990) 1-10, 7.

As around 75 % of the preserved medieval manuscripts are commonly regarded as liturgical -- the percentage is the same when it comes to the number of medieval fragments used as covers or bindings for post-reformatory account books -- it might seem appropriate to start off with the question: Which codex is to be considered a liturgical manuscript? Apart from the obvious fact that this is a question of its contents, there appears to be at least two possible ways to define or describe this particular term. If we reach for the widest classification we may define it as a codex containing some kind of liturgical material -- a definition that would increase the percentage of liturgical manuscripts extensively and turn many miscellanies into being liturgical manuscripts -- or we may prefer to limit our definition to let it designate a codex containing texts and/or chants to be used in the liturgy of a specific cathedral, church, monastery or diocese at a specific time.

Recent codicological investigations made by e.g. Niels K. Rasmussen and Michel Huglo indicate that the origin of liturgical books appears to have been a separate book or booklet -- the so-called *libellus* tradition -- for each individual part of the liturgy, i.e. the rituals of the bishop were contained in the pontificale, one booklet contained the Psalter, another the evangeliarium with the gospel texts, a third the antiphonary with antiphons and responsories for the office, a fourth the gradual with the chants for the mass, a fifth the troper, a sixth the epistolary etc.² This system of *libelli* developed in various ways throughout the Middle Ages to match the basic and practical needs of a dynamic liturgy in evolution: that is, separate books were maintained for more specific liturgical actors and rituals such as the pontificale and the processionale, while larger books like the antiphonary, the gradual (with or without tropes and/or sequences) and the sacramentary combined the rearranged repertory of texts and chants for the office and for the mass.

² Niel K. Rasmussen *Les Pontificaux de Haut-Moyen-Age. Genèse du Livre Liturgique de l'Évêque* (I-III, uned. diss. Institut Catholique de Paris 1978). Texte mis au point par Marcel Haverals (Leuven 1998); Michel Huglo "Les Libelli de Tropes et les premiers Tropaires-Prosaires" *Pax et Sapientia. Studies in Text and Music of Liturgical Tropes and Sequences*, ed. by Ritva Jacobsson (Stockholm 1986) 13-22.

In the XII century a new approach to the liturgical manuscript appears to have been conceived, since specific codices, often lavishly executed with large initials and miniatures, were planned as a matrix or ‘copia mastro’ for the various codices to be used in the liturgical practice. This new approach was applied in Piacenza after 1142 when a donation from the local cardinal Ribaldus enabled the cathedral chapter to make a new set of books for the revised liturgy of the *consuetudo secundum ecclesiam placentinam*. The most significant of this set of manuscripts is Liber Magistri, now in Piacenza, Biblioteca Capitolare c. 65 (= Pia 65), the matrix containing the notated chants for both the mass and the divine office as investigated and argued in my commentary to the facsimile edition of the codex in 1997³ and more detailed in my *Tropes and Sequences in the Liturgy of the Church in Piacenza in the twelfth Century. An Analysis and an Edition of the Texts*.⁴ Some 50-100 years later this model was further developed by the Cistercians and the Dominicans in their exemplar of their entire liturgy.⁵

Codex Angelicus 123.

Codex Angelicus 123 was not planned nor executed as a matrix; but like Pia 65 it has been published in a facsimile edition included in the Paléographie Musicale series in 1969 with an introduction by Jacques Frogner.⁶ Nearly a decade earlier it had been described in detail in a study by Luciano Gherardi, which book was reviewed by Frogner in *Études Gregoriennes* in 1968,⁷ and recently a group of Italian scholars published a number of (mainly musicological) investigations in a volume entitled *Codex Angelicus 123. Studi sul graduale-tropario bolognese del*

³ Brian M. Jensen, *Liber Magistri. Piacenza, Biblioteca Capitolare c. 65. Commentario esplicativo. Explanatory commentary* (Piacenza 1997) 73-75, 194-196.

⁴ Brian M. Jensen, *Tropes and Sequences in the Liturgy of the Church in Piacenza in the Twelfth Century. An analysis and an Edition of the Texts* (Lewiston–Queenston–Lampeter 2002) 47-54.

⁵ Cf. also David Hiley, *Western Plainchant. A Handbook* (Oxford 1993) 323.

⁶ Paléographie Musicale XVIII, *Le codex 123 de la Bibliothèque Angelica de Rome (Xie siècle). Graduel et tropaire de Bologne*, introduction par J. Frogner (Berne 1969).

⁷ Luciano Gherardi, *Il codice Angelica 123. Monumento della chiesa Bolognese nel sec. XI*, (Bologna 1959). Review by Jacques Frogner in *Études Gregoriennes* 9 (1968) 102-109.

secolo XI e sui manoscritti collegati.⁸ Moreover, studies on its particular aspects and texts have appeared in journals and Festschriften as e.g. Ritva Jacobsson's analysis of the unique introit tropes and my own investigation of the texts in the unique proper mass of Donatus of Arezzo.⁹

Summarizing the basic codicological facts from Gherardi's and Frogner's studies, RoA 123 is to be classified as a liturgico-musical parchment manuscript composed of 34 quires; in its present state, however, it contains only 265 folios, due to a number of lacunae.¹⁰ The measures are 266 x 174 mm, and the number of lines per folio differs in the various parts with 15 text lines and 15 lines for the music in the gradual as well as the troper-sequentiary. Considering contents the manuscript consists of three main sections: 1) extra-liturgical material including the calendar of the mobile feasts in fols. 1v-4 followed by the *Comptus domini Bede presbiteri* (fols. 5-12v) and the mnemotechnic verses *Anni domini notantur* traditionally attributed to Pacificus of Verona (fols. 12v-16v); 2) the main part is the gradual with the proper chants for the masses of the liturgical year (fols. 17-167), followed by a number of antiphons *in letania maiore*; and finally 3) the troper-sequentiary in fols. 184-265v.

The script is the typical Italian Carolingian of the XI century according to Frogner: "L'écriture est une minuscule caroline qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de décrire",¹¹ whilst the neums are written in an adiaستمatic, pre-guidonian notation (cf. Plates 2-8). Except for the first two quaternions including the extra-liturgical matters and written in its various hands, scholars seem to agree that the textual parts of the remaining manuscript are written by a single hand and likewise regarding the musical notation and the illustrations. As the main argument they

⁸ *Codex Angelicus 123. Studi sul graduale-tropario bolognese del secolo XI e sui manoscritti collegati*, a cura di M.T. Rosa-Barezzani & G. Ropa (Cremona 1996).

⁹ Ritva Jacobsson, "Création locale? Étude sur les tropes uniques dans le Graduel-Tropaire de Bologne, Biblioteca Angelica 123 (Roma)", *Studi in onore di Giulio Cattin*, a cura di Antonio Lovato (forthcoming) -- I want to thank Ritva Jacobsson for letting me read her study in manuscript -- and Brian M. Jensen, "*Magni presulis celebrans Donati diem sollemnem*. Bishop Donatus of Arezzo in Roma, Bibl. Angelica c. 123", *Rivista Internazionale di Musica Sacra* 22 (2000) 119-139.

¹⁰ Pal. Mus. XVIII, 22-25.

¹¹ Pal. Mus. XVIII, 13

underline the high degree of homogeneity and coherence in the script, in the musical notation and in the richly decorated miniatures and initials.¹²

Based on the calendar listing the mobile feasts from 1039-1061, scholars have discussed the dating of the manuscript, ranging from a loose XI century dating via the first half and the second quarter of the XI century to ca. 1039 and/or 1039, which appears as the scholarly consensus today. Its provenance has been discussed with suggestions as the church San Lorenzo al Verano in Roma, the Umbrian diocese of Bevagna and the Benedictine monastery of Nonantola, until Gherardi attributed it to Bologna with references to the saints included in the sanctorale.¹³ A more specific provenance has been suggested by the art-historian Edward Garrison,¹⁴ who owing to the prominence of St. Stephen protomartyr and the Bolognese martyrs Vitalis and Agricola (Nov. 4) argues that the manuscript was written for the monastery of Santo Stefano in Bologna, and by Giampaolo Ropa and Giacomo Baroffio, who states its provenance as the cathedral of Bologna, dedicated to St. Peter.¹⁵

Codex Angelicus 123 as liturgical manuscript.

Let that be sufficient in regard to the codicological features of the codex, and let me in stead try to apply Stephen Nichols' above-mentioned statement on "Codex Angelicus 123 as a liturgical codex" by analyzing a few folios, some texts and significant aspects of this Italian manuscript.

Let's begin with the opening of the gradual, i.e. with fols. 17v-18 (Plate 1), although the gradual actually begins on fol. 17 with its full-size miniature of Maria visiting Elisabeth in the house of Zacharias, which illustrates the Advent of Christ. Besides the later additions above and below the original text, fol. 17v

¹² E.g. Gherardi 1959: 8, and Pal. Mus. XVIII, 13-14

¹³ Gherardi 1959: 29, in addition to his discussion of the other suggestions of provenance.

¹⁴ Edward Garrison, "A Gradual of S. Stefano, Bologna. Angelica 123" *Studies in the History of Medieval Italian Painting IV* (Rome 1960) 4, 93-110

¹⁵ Giampaolo Ropa, *Liturgia, cultura e tradizione in Padania nei secoli XI e XII. I manoscritti liturgico-musicali* (Bologna 1973), and Giacomo Baroffio, "I tropi nei codici italiani: orientamenti bibliografici ed inventario sommario delle fonti manoscritti", (forthcoming). I want to thank Baroffio for letting me see this inventory in manuscript.

presents 13 lines of information of various kind: the first six lines is a note defining the period in which the first Sunday in Advent (= Advent I) may occur, *Notum sit omnibus*;¹⁶ the next five lines present the text of *Gregorius presul* which praises Gregory the Great as the composer or rather the editor of the Roman gradual.¹⁷ This little text is generally regarded as the preface to the gradual, which Bruno Stäblein once argued: In some manuscripts the text is supplied with a musical notation leading into the introit antiphon for Advent I, *Ad te levavi*; sometimes it has a similar function in tropers and appears as introductory trope to *Ad te levavi* as e.g. in tropers from Novalesa, Monza and Mantova.¹⁸ Then the last two lines are the rubric supplying the information of the first feast of the liturgical year, i.e. *domenica prima de adventu domini*, as well as the Bolognese station church of the ceremony, i.e. *statio ad sanctum Andream apostolum post presepe*.

While fol. 17v appears simple and conventional, fol. 18 is offering an excellent opportunity to apply Stephen Nichols' view in full scale, especially the initial A: As to be expected the gradual opens with the notated introit to Advent I *Ad te levavi animam* in larger letters as in the introit to Christmas *Puer natus est nobis* in fol. 31 and the Epiphany introit *Ecce advenit dominator* in fol. 40 (Plate 2), while the rest of the text *meam deus meus in te confide* etc. is written in smaller letters in fol. 18v as is the case in the Christmas introit in fol. 31. The codex displays large initials for the major christological feasts but no one as large as the A in fol. 18, and compared to other manuscripts like e.g. the Piacentinian Liber Magistri, it seems normal to let larger letters indicate the beginning of the

¹⁶ Such notes are often included in graduals from this period and later, e.g. in Pia 65, fol. 268v.

¹⁷ "Gregorius presul pape meritis et nomine dignus unde genus ducit summum conscendit honore<m>, renovavit munimenta patrum priorum. Tunc composuit hunc libellum musice artis scale cantorum anni circulo".

Considering the various aspects of the medieval Gregory the Great tradition, see the general survey in Hiley 1993: 503-513; regarding the *Gregorius presul* piece as an introduction to the gradual and as introit trope to Advent I see Bruno Stäblein, "Gregorius presul, der prolog zum Römischen antiphonale", *Musik und Verlag: Karl Vötterle zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Richard Baum & Wolfgang Rehm (Kassel - Basel 1968) 537-561; regarding *Gregorius presul* in Piacentinian sources see Jensen 1997: 165-166.

¹⁸ Ritva Jonsson et alii, *Corpus Troporum I. Tropes du proper de la messe I. Cycle de Noël* (Stockholm 1975) 102.

separate parts of the codex. But unfortunately the troper-sequentiary begins in the lacuna between fol. 183v and fol. 184, so we cannot know for certain if the scribe of RoA 123 followed the medieval convention.

With Nichols' words on the verbal and visual media in mind, we might admire the initial A as "a work of art in its right", as well as analyze and interpret it as "a scene in the poetic narrative transposed from the verbal to the visual medium". Besides being the first letter in the preposition *ad*, the size and form of the initial A has forced the notator to put the neum of the syllable on the consonant *d*. As illumination this initial presents two winged angels, holding a plate formed as an O, in which Christ is portrayed as pantocrator. He is equipped with his significant halo with the cross and portrayed as offering his benediction in the traditional manner with the two fingers of his right hand and holding his book in his left.

Furthermore, the colourful layers in the plate may signify his heavenly throne, and as such it becomes a pictorial representation of the message expressed in the introit antiphon *Ad te levavi animam meam*. The picture contains further christological connotations, as the letter A and the O form of this plate might be read both as an illustration of and reference to the three alpha-omega statements in the Book of Revelation,¹⁹ i.e. a reference to the book from which Christ will read the names of the dead and the living on Judgement Day according to the Credo, as well as to his words in the Gospel calling people to faith. Placed as the opening initial of the first introit of the liturgical year this A & O illumination collaborates with the text of the introit to represent the two spheres of Christian liturgy, the church in Heaven and the temporal church on earth. By adding such new dimensions to the text, the 'I' of which is the celebrating church, the initial A manifests the divine partner in the liturgy. Acting together the folio's combination of text, music and illumination indicates an exhortation to participate in the new liturgical year, since divine salvation is promised to be the congregation's merit

¹⁹ *Apoc.* 1:8 "Ego sum alpha et omega, principium et finis, dicit Dominus Deus, qui est et qui erat et qui venturus est, omnipotens"; 21:6 "Factum est: ego sum alpha et omega, initium et finis. Ego sitiienti dabo de fonte aquae vitae gratis" and 22:13: "Ego sum alpha et omega, primus et novissimus, principium et finis".

for this activity. This interpretation of the folio seems supported by the two non-liturgical hexametres above the plate and under the feet of the two angels:

Haec caeli deitas, haec est et summa potestas.
Suppetit angelicus sibimet per secula coetus.

The feast of St. Benedict.

The next case to apply Stephen Nichols' approach will be the feast of St. Benedict of Nursia on fols. 55v-57 (see Plates 3 & 4). Once again we notice how the illumination in the initial O of the introit *Os iusti meditabitur* expands the rubric *XII Kal aprilis natale sancti Benedicti abbatis* by portraying the saint as an abbot with halo.²⁰ But the initial is not the main feature of interest in these folios, which present other kinds of problems for the manuscript-reading liturgist,²¹ since we observe no less than five different introits to this feast, of which the first *Os iusti meditabitur* with the psalm-verse *Noli emulari* (*Ps* 36:30-31) is the traditional introit to be found in most graduals for the feast of St. Benedict on March 21.

Introit: Os iusti meditabitur (sapientiam,
et lingua eius loquetur iudicium; lex dei in corde eius).

As presented in fol. 55v the scribe has only written the incipit of *Os iusti meditabitur* followed by the psalm-verse *Noli emulari*, then the full text of the gradual responsory *Domine prevenisti* and its verse *Vitam peccati*, and finally the incipits of the tractus *Beatus vir qui timet*, the offertory *Veritas mea* and the communion *Beatus servus*. Writing only the incipit of the proper chants is the typical procedure in liturgical manuscripts when the entire chant has been entered earlier,

²⁰ Two other O initials portraying a saint appear in the sequences *Organicis canamus modulis* for pope Stephen on August 2 (fol. 242v) and *Omnes sancti seraphim* for All Saints' Feast on November 1 (fol. 254v).

²¹ Cf. e.g. Knud Ottosen, "La problematique de l'édition des textes liturgiques" *Classica & Medievalia Francisco Blatt septuagenario dedicate*, ed. by O.S. Due, H. Friis Johansen and B. Dalsgaard Larsen (Copenhagen 1973) 541-556, and Gunilla Iversen, "Problems in the Editing of Tropes" *Text* 1 (1983) 95-132.

as is the case of *Os iusti meditabitur*, which is assigned as the introit to St. Felix in *Pincis* (January 14) in fol. 43.

Instead of entering the next feast, i.e. the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary on March 25, which follows in fol. 57v after the rubric in the last line of fol. 57, another introit to St. Benedict is introduced with the rubric *alia antiphona*. But although the introit *Gaudemus omnes in domino* appeared in full as the introit to the feast of St. Agatha on February 5 (fol. 52v), the entire chant is entered in fol. 56 as well, followed by the incipit of the psalm-verse *Ecce quam bonum*.

Introit: Gaudeamus omnes in domino diem festum celebrantes
 sub honore Benedicti abatis de cuius sollemnitate[m] gaudent.

The full entry is due to a necessary change of some words in the antiphon according to the categories of the two saints. Usually considered to be the original version composed by Gregory the Great in 592 for the re-dedication of the church of St. Agata dei Gothi,²² the *Gaudeamus omnes* introit to the feast of St. Agatha includes the formula *sub honore Agathe martyris de cuius passione*, which in this version has been changed to *sub honore Benedicti abatis de cuius sollemnitate[m]*, owing to his status as abbot and confessor. The fact that the other four proper chants of this mass are omitted after this introit indicates, according to conventional medieval references to liturgical practice, that the ones of the *Os iusti meditabitur* mass above are to be sung in this mass as well, if the officiating priest or bishop may choose to open the proper mass to Benedict with *Gaudeamus omnes* instead of the usual introit *Os iusti meditabitur*.

This holds true even for the third alternative introit of this feast, the unique *Vir dei mundum fugiens* and its verse *Relicta domus*, whilst the last two alternatives are complete masses with the likewise unique introits *Beatus Benedictus* with the verse *Relicta domo* and *Vir dei Benedictus* with the verse *Recessit igitur*. Whilst the biblical introit *Os iusti meditabitur* and the widespread *Gaudeamus omnes* are assigned to a number of saints in RoA 123, as it usually is in many other graduals,

²² Cf. G. Verbeke, "S. Gregoire e la messe de S. Agathe" *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 52 (1938) 68-76.

the last three introits are unique introit antiphons to St. Benedict. The primary source for these introits and verses are the oldest known St. Benedict vita included in the second book of Gregory the Great's *Dialogi*.²³ As the grammar of the texts of these introits seems to illustrate the then state of medieval Latin, I have, for the moment, made no attempts to emend or comment on the versions in RoA 123 except *domo* instead of *domus*:

Introit: Vir dei mundum fugiens, Romanus monachus obviavit ei,
quot cum desiderio cognovisset et secretum tenuit et adiutorium implevit.

Vs. Relicta domo rebusque patris soli deo placere
sancte conversationis (h)abitum quaesivit vir dei.

Introit: Beatus Benedictus per spiritum sanctum indagans
prenoscens que ventura sunt omnia.

Vs. Relicta domo (rebusque ...)

Introit: Vir dei Benedictus mundi gloriam despexit et reliquit,
quoniam dei spiritus erat in eo.

Vs. Recessit igitur scienter nescius et sapienter indoctus.

Applying Nichols' approach on RoA 123's presentation of the feast of St. Benedict, we may let it serve as an illustrating example of the two fundamental tensions in medieval liturgy, that between TRADITION and INNOVATION and that between the UNIVERSEL and the LOCAL church. One consequence of this particular fact is that almost every liturgical manuscript appears unique, since it presents the ritual *usus* or practice of a specific diocese, cathedral or monastery. We might illustrate this situation a little more in detail through the following features in RoA 123, which might be added to the above-mentioned issues:

²³ *Dialogi* II, Prologus: "Fuit vir vitae venerabilis, gratia Benedictus et nomine, ab ipso pueritiae suae tempore cor gerens senile. Aetatem quippe moribus transiens, nulli animum voluptati dedit, sed dum in hac terra adhuc esset, quo temporaliter libere uti potuisset, despexit iam quasi aridum mundum cum flore. Qui liberiori genere ex provincia Nursiae exortus, Romae liberalibus litterarum studiis traditus fuerat. Sed cum in eis multos ire per abrupta vitiorum cerneret, eum, quem quasi in ingressum mundi posuerat, retraxit pedem, ne si quid de scientia eius adtingeret, ipse quoque postmodum in inmane praecipitium totus iret. Despectis litterarum studiis, relictam domo rebusque patris, soli Deo placere desiderans, sanctae conversationis habitum quaesivit. Recessit igitur scienter nescius et sapienter indoctus".

1) When compared to functional graduals like the Piacentinian Liber Magistri, which includes no alternative introits or tropes and sequences, RoA 123 appears more to be the work of a compiler with e.g. its five introits to Benedict, its two alternative introits with tropes and three sequences to the Invention of the Holy Cross in fols. 223-225v, and two alternative introits with alternative tropes to Martin of Tour in fol. 256.

2) A combination of an identical complex of introit trope and introit antiphon may be assigned to different feasts, as e.g. the trope set *Divini fuerat quoniam* and the introit *Statuit ei dominus* is assigned both to 'Confessores' in fol. 205v and to Martin of Tour in fol. 256.

3) Different introit tropes were supplied to the same introit as e.g. the tropes to *Vultum tuum* assigned to *In natale virginum* (fol. 209v) and to the Assumption feast (fol. 247v), the two tropes to the apostle introit *Mihi autem* in fols. 253v and 258v, and the three trope sets to *Gaudeamus omnes* to Natale Mariae (fol. 248), to All Saints' Feast (fol. 254) and to Senesius & Theopontius (a later addition in fol. 265), which means that the *Gaudeamus omnes* introit is assigned to at least five feasts in this manuscript.

4) Considering the sequences, various texts were put to the same melody as e.g. the so-called *Mater* melody used for the Christmas sequence *Christi hodierna pangimini* (fol. 201) and Notker Balbulus' *Congaudent angelorum chori* to the Assumption (fol. 248v), the melody *Romana* used in four sequences, i.e. the two Easter texts *Clara gaudia festa paschalia* (fol. 218v) and *Dic nobis quibus in terris* (fol. 216) and the saints' texts, *Iohannes Iesu Christo* for John the Apostle (fol. 199v) and *Laurenti martyr David magni* for Lawrence (fol. 245), as well as the *Occidentana* melody used for both *Rex omnipotens* (fol. 227v) and *Sancti spiritus adsit nobis gratia* (fol. 232) to underline the relation between Ascension and Pentecost.

5) Unique sequences were composed not only to the local saints of the region like Donatus of Arezzo (*Laudes deo digna concinat*, fol. 243) and the two Bolognese Vitalis & Agricola (*Martyrum nobis festum*, fol. 255v) but also to universally celebrated saints; in the present case to e.g. Lawrence (*Almi martyris*

rogitemus, fol. 245v), Paul (*Celebretur ad laudem*, fol. 241), John the Baptist (*Nativitatis colamus debito*, fol. 237v) and George (see below); in fact nine of the 59 sequences in RoA 123 are known only from this manuscript according to Lance Brunner's most useful "Catalogo delle sequenze in manoscritti di origine italiana anteriori al 1200".²⁴

6) Its number of non-biblical introits seems to reflect a specific Italian practice of composing new introits, sometimes with coherent introit tropes as texts were excerpted from hagiographical vitae, legends and sermons and transformed to proper chants and tropes. In addition to the above-mentioned unique introits to St. Benedict, of which *Vir dei benedictus* is supplied with tropes in codices from Modena, Mantova and Benevento, we might mention the introit *Beatus Martinus* for Martin with tropes in our codex and in troped graduals from Monte Cassino and Benevento, the introit *Domine Iesu Christe* for Donatus of Arezzo, if it hadn't been for the lacuna between fol. 128v and fol. 129 as indicated in my analysis of the texts in the mass for Donatus,²⁵ and finally *O beatissimi viri* to the local saints Vitalis & Agricola with tropes only in RoA 123.²⁶

The feast of St. George.

The third and last issue to be investigated in my application of Nichols' view on RoA 123 is the unique trope and sequence to the feast of St. George in fols. 221v-222v (Plates 5-6). Since I am presenting a literary interpretation of the sequence in another study,²⁷ I want in this paper only to comment on two of the

²⁴ *Rivista Italiana di Musicologia* XX (1985) 191-276.

²⁵ Jensen 2000:122-126.

²⁶ Other examples are *Ecce sacerdos magnus confessor Zeno* for Zenon of Verona in the Pistoian troped gradual Pistoia, Bibl. Cap. c. 121, *Surge accipe spiritum sanctum* for Appollinaris in a miscellaneous source from Fonte Avellana (Bibl. Apost. Vaticana, lat. 3797), and the later introits *Cum mortuus esset Alexius* for Alexius and *Beatus Nazarius ibat gaudens cum Celso* for the Milanese martyrs Nazarius & Celsus in a Piacentinian gradual from 1351 (Pienza, Bibl. Cap. c. 55).

²⁷ As a sequel to this paper I intend to make a new edition of the sequence based on a liturgical and literary analysis of the text in a study entitled, "*Hodie in sancti Georgii passione* or *Diem sanctum Georgii passione*. Analysis and edition of a medieval sequence to St. George", which is going to be published in my forthcoming selection of studies on liturgical texts in medieval Italian manuscripts (The Edwin Mellen Press 2006).

philological aspects facing the manuscript-reading liturgist, who intends to act as editor of liturgical chants.

With one of the manuscript's frequent bird illustrations forming the initial G, the trope set *Gaudeamus omnes in domino diem festum beati Georgii martyris* is added to the biblical introit *Protexisti me deus*, which has been assigned to both St. George on April 23 (fol 119) and to St. Vitalis on April 25 (only incipit in fol 120v). Opening with an evident allusion to the above-mentioned introit to St. Agatha (and St. Benedict) this three-element trope set consists of an introductory element leading into the first part of the introit and two intercalated elements to the second half of the introit and its usual psalm-verse *Exaudi deus orationem*. Since the notorious story of St. George fighting the dragon became known in Western Europe only after the First Crusade (1096-1100),²⁸ i.e. more than 60 years after the making of RoA 123, the contents of the trope is conventional in its description of the fight between the evildoers, *invidiosi maligni*, and God's martyr George, who speaks the biblical words of the introit.

Gaudeamus omnes in domino
diem festum Georgii martyris,
qui pro Christi nomine reliquit seculum;
secutus est dominum et dixit:
PROTEXISTI ME DEUS
(A CONVENTU MALIGNANTIUM, ALLELUIA)
Invidiosi et maligni
lapidibus obpresserunt eum,
et beatus Georgius laudaverat deum,
A MULTITUDINE (OPERANTIUM INIQUITATEM).
Quem gaudent angeli et archangeli
et conlaudant in caelis filium Dei, alleluia alleluia.
(Ps) EXAUDI DEUS ORATIONEM CUM DEPRECOR
(A TIMORE INIMICI ERIPE ANIMAM MEAM).²⁹

²⁸ Cf. the recent studies of William H.C. Frend, "Fragments of a version of the *Acta S. Gregorii* from Q' asr Ibrim" *Jahrbuch für antike und Christentum* 23 (1989) 89-104, and "The Saga of St. George" *Martyrs and Martyrologies. Papers read at the 1992 summer meeting and the 1993 winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. by Diana Wood, Oxford (1993) 47-56, as well as Brian M. Jensen, "Perché è rosso il cavallo di Sant'Antinino", *Bollettino Storico Piacentino* 94 (1999) 23-34.

²⁹ Following the conventions of the *Corpus Troporum* editions of introit tropes, I print the trope in ordinary types and the introit in capital letters.

The transmitted text presents a syntactical incongruity in *beatus Georgius laudaverunt deum*, i.e. the singular *Georgius* as subject to the plural form *laudaverunt*, and consequently I have emended the form into *laudaverat*. Instead of just changing the plural of the perfect tense to the 3rd ps. sing. *laudavit*, I have with due respect to the musical notation chosen the pluperfect because this form keeps the correct number of syllables to the four neumes, whereas the perfect form leaves us with only three syllables plus an extra neume. As editor of liturgical chants you always have to consider and respect the musical notation before you attempt any emendation of the text and vice versa. Furthermore, the context seems to favour the pluperfect form to supply or explain the reason for the evildoers throwing stones at the saint.

A similar problem faces us in couplet 6b of the sequence *Hodie in sancti Georgii passione*, but not quite as easy to solve. The apparent grammatical incongruity appears in the manuscript's *pro nostris facinoris*; the obvious emendation to make would have been the correct ablative form *pro nostris facinoribus* just as the editor Clemens Blume once did in *Analecta Hymnica* vol. 37,³⁰ but the melody does not seem to permit this solution: The poet or the scribe might have regarded the neuter plural form *facinora* as a feminine singular, which shift of gender is a very noticeable feature in medieval latin, continuing a trend of the late antique latin.³¹ Subsequently, *facinoris* is considered the correct plural ablative form, in which case we might accept RoA 123's reading; in other case we could perhaps emend to e.g. the synonymous noun *peccatis* instead of using the five syllable emendation *facinoribus* in AH.

1a	<H>odie in sancti Georgii passione Christi laudes canamus omnes	1b	Cum chorisque angelorum laetantes simulque et sanctorum gaudentes.
2a	“Veni puer dilectissimus meus!” - cum coronam ascendit in gloria.	2b	Vocavitque nomen eius et dicens: “Georgius, ego sum deus tuus”.
3a	Tunc respiciens in caelum	3b	Obsecrantem et deprecantem

³⁰ *Analecta Hymnica* 37. *Sequentiae ineditae*, hrsg. von Clemens Blume (Leipzig 1901, reprint 1961) 175-176.

³¹ Cf. L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London 1954) 159-160.

	beatum Georgium		in evum dominum:
4a	“Quod dedisti fidutiam servis tuis, magne,	4b	Quod memor es, sum mandatorum tuorum, domine,
5a	Ut eripias me de dolore, quo circumdant me, et sicut in gloria fulgentem;	5b	Furor illorum valde malorum venenum serpentium et insurgent ex malignantibus”.
6a	Et visus est ei dominus in custodia nocte confortans eum: Ne timeas omne[s] genus tormentorum”.	6b	Omnes nos populi te deprecamur, sancte, ut intercedere pro nostris facinoris ad eum dignemini.
7a	Qui tuam memoriam solemnitatem celebrant	7b	Mereamur tecum habere consortium paradisi gaudia,
		8	Qui cum patre regnat in aeterna saecula. Amen. ³²

Among the textual and editorial problems in this unique composition, I only want to mention the one regarding its very opening word, which seems to have puzzled scholars for more than a century for no obvious reason: In U. Chevalier’s *Repertorium Hymnologicum*,³³ in Frogner’s ”Table alphabetique des piéces de chant” in the facsimile edition in 1968 and in Brunner’s above-mentioned catalogue the sequence is listed as *O die in sancti Georgii passione*, while Dieter Schaller and Ewald Könsgen in their inventory from 1977, *Initia carminum latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum*,³⁴ followed Blume’s edition in AH by listing it as *Diem sanctum Georgii passione* -- Blume does not mention the opening *O* in his critical apparatus, and printing *diem* he disregarded the three neumes on *die in*.

Considering not only the most unusual syntax of the interjection *O* combined with an ablative but also the large amount of introit tropes and sequences, that begin with *Hodie* as an indication of the ritual *hic et nunc* of the feast to be cele-

³² In this version of the text I have emended the text in RoA 123 in a few places: 1b: chorusque AH, chorusque ms; 3b: obsecrantem scripsi, obsecrantes ms; evum AH eum ms; 5a quo AH, que ms; 5b insurgent ex malignantibus scripsi insurgents malignantibus ms.

³³ Ulysse Chevalier, *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, I-VI (Louvain 1892-1919) no. 36.714

³⁴ Dieter Schaller & Ewald Könsgen, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum. Bibliographisches Repertorium für die lateinische dichtung der Antike und des früheren Mittelalters* (Göttingen 1977) no. 171

brated,³⁵ it seems more than obvious that even this sequence begins with *Hodie*. This simple solution not only presents a smoother syntax in the first couplet but also a text more in accordance with traditional liturgical formulas than the above-mentioned attempts to emend and to read this in other places tricky and complicated text.

Without pretending that these are the only interesting folios and unsolved problems in RoA 123, these few examples have hopefully indicated some of the many aspects facing a liturgist reading medieval manuscripts as well as a philologist editing liturgical texts. Applying Stephen Nichols' approach on future projects awaiting investigation and analysis regarding this manuscript would be of interest in various fields such as an analysis of RoA 123's trope- and sequence repertory in its liturgical context and theological significance -- a study similar to my above-mentioned thesis on the tropes and sequences in *Liber Magistri* -- or a thorough investigation and analysis of the non-biblical introits in Italian graduals with this codex as point of departure. An interdisciplinary approach is indeed to be applied when studying "Codex Angelicus 123 as a liturgical manuscript".³⁶

³⁵ Among the *Hodie*-pieces included in RoA 123 could be mentioned the introit tropes *Hodie spiritus sanctus* for Pentecost (fol. 230v) and *Hodie exultent iusti* for John the Baptist (fol. 234v) as well as the two sequences *Hodie sanctissima virgo* for Assumption (fol. 247) and *Hodierna sacrator venerandus* for Martin of Tour (fol. 257).

³⁶ An earlier version of this investigation was presented at the conference "Manuscript Books in the Early Middle Ages" in Villa Barberini, Piazza San Pietro in Rome, June, 2004. Being most grateful for the comments from the participating colleagues, I want to thank Michael Gorman for inviting me to present my paper at the conference.