

SLOVO, sv. 70 (2020), 77–91, Zagreb 2020.

Catherine Mary MACROBERT
University of Oxford
catherine.macrobert@lmh.ox.ac.uk

UDK 272-282.7:003.349.1
091(497.5)''14''
811.163.42'42

Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primljen: 26. travnja 2019.
Prihvaćen: 9. listopada 2019.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LITURGICAL PSALTER IN *MS CANON. LITURG. 172* (BODLEIAN LIBRARY, OXFORD)

This paper examines presentational and textual peculiarities of the liturgical psalter in the breviary contained in the Glagolitic *MS Canon. liturg. 172* in the Bodleian Library. It argues that they demonstrate a heavy reliance on memorization of text, seem to reflect distinctive liturgical practice, and imply that the manuscript was written for a specific user.

Key words: breviary, banalizations, canticles, office hymns, liturgical psalter, reminiscences

1. INTRODUCTION

The Glagolitic codex *MS Canon. Liturg. 172* in the Bodleian Library has attracted little scholarly attention, and that little has focussed mainly on the problem of its dating. The aim of this paper is to argue that the ostensibly defective character of its contents, which has made it seem a source of minor importance, in fact offers interesting clues to its intended and actual use.

1.1. Dating

The manuscript is supplied with a date at the end of the colophon on f. 409r: *Dovaršeny lito .č.t.i.*, i.e. in 1310. However, the reliability of this information is highly questionable. The date itself has been added in a different hand from that of the colophon or indeed from those found elsewhere in the manuscript, and it is written, apparently over black lettering, in a dull red ink which again is different from that used for rubrication (DU FEU 1971: plate). Tadin's attempt to vindicate a date early in the 14th century (TADIN 1953: 153–155)

was refuted by Hamm, who pointed out textual parallels with manuscripts of the 15th century (HAMM 1953: 118–119). More recent research has produced supplementary evidence in favour of a later dating (BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2006: 32; BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2009: 12; BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2010: 47–49), and this is further supported by the visual appearance of the manuscript: its ornamental initials have analogues from the early 15th century, e.g. at the beginning of the Pašmanski brevijar (ŠTEFANIĆ 1970: plate 27).

1.2. Contents and physical appearance

The manuscript belongs to a small number of liturgical compendia which combine breviary, missal and ritual: the codices *Paris slav. II* and *Kopitar 22* and the 1493 and 1561 printings by Baromić and Brozić (VAJS 1915: 571–574; VAJS 1910: xxxii–xxxvii, xciii–c; VAJS 1948: 39–43, 52–55). Although it has been rebound, and may have lost a folio or folios at the beginning, it is otherwise intact; its 411 folios have apparently not been trimmed, as prickmarks are still visible down some outer edges, and so its dimensions, 15×10.2 cm, are probably original. It is thus comparable in size to the items listed above: *Paris slav. II* measures 11×17 cm, *Kopitar 22* 18×12 cm, and the two printings are in 16^o format (VAJS 1948: 40, 42, 52; GRABAR 1984: 178). The inference that such books were intended for individual use by clerics who had occasion to move from place to place (GRABAR 1984: 159–160) is supported in the case of *MS 172* by the page layout and lettering: the columns of writing, which contain 28 lines, measure 8.5×2.5 cm, so each line of lettering is at most 3 mm high, i.e. too small for more than one person to read with ease.

Although the manuscript is of modest size, it surely required a significant outlay on the part of the person who commissioned it: the parchment is of good quality, fine, white and polished; the lettering is even and competent, and the frequent deployment of ligatures suggests an experienced scribe; the ornamental initials, executed in red and blue, are elaborate, varied and delicate; there are figural inserts on f. 1r and f. 381v, and polychrome decorations with some use of gold on f. 286v, f. 271v, f. 272r and 278r (TADIN 1953: 152).

Yet the evidence for actual use of the manuscript is ambiguous. On the one hand it has been read at least once: numerous annotations have been added throughout, sometimes over erasures, more often in the margins, in a different, slightly larger hand and rather paler brown ink. These are mostly minor corrections or insertions of missing text, though occasionally the annotator has added a comment, notably on f. 303v to S. John's refutation of the Ebionite heresy. On the other hand, while the parchment is slightly distorted around the outer upper corners, perhaps through damage by water, there is little sign

of the wear that comes from repeated reading; the discoloration on a few folios near the end is probably due to the use of inferior parchment at that point (*pace* TADIN 1953: 152).

A plausible factor in the neglect of this manuscript by potential users, as by modern scholars, is its tendency to compression: some texts appear in abbreviated form (BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2006: 30–31; BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2009: 10–11; BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2010: 47; BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ 2016: 421), and the psalter included in the breviary is so far from complete that its value in text-critical study has been characterized as negligible (VAJS 1916: ix) or at best limited for purposes of quantitative analysis (ŠIMIĆ 2000 : 118–120).¹ The presentational and textual peculiarities of the psalter in *MS 172* do, however, have implications for its intended use, and they will therefore be the focus of the following observations.

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE PSALTER

Another shared characteristic of the liturgical compendia is that they assist the recitation of the office hours through the week by inserting not only *invitatoria*, verses and antiphons, but also hymns and canticles at the appropriate points in the psalter (VAJS 1910: xxxiii–xxxiv; VAJS 1948: 42; GRABAR 1984: 172–173), rather than listing them separately, as in manuscripts which contain the breviary only (NAZOR 1977: 31; ŠIMIĆ 2014: 198–204). In *MS 172* this practice is carried to the point of disrupting the order of psalms in the psalter. So ps. 50 does not appear in sequence between pss. 50 and 52; instead its incipit is provided for Lauds, together with those of pss. 62 and 148 and of the psalm for the day. Pss. 117 and 118 appear after ps. 120, because Prime, Terce, Sext and None are located after Monday Vespers. Moreover, even where the psalms are listed in the usual order, their presentation is not uniform: they may be written out in full, or cited in alternating versicles, or indicated by incipit only. The effect of these presentational peculiarities can be seen in the listing below.²

2.1. Liturgical psalter in *MS 172* (omitting *invitatoria*, verses and antiphons)

f. 188v Sunday Matins: pss. 1–8 incipits; ps. 9 in full; ps. 10 incipit; pss. 11–13 in alternation; pss. 14–16 incipits; ps. 17 in full; pss. 18–20 incipits;

¹ I am grateful to Marinka Šimić for allowing me to consult her unpublished dissertation.

² I am much indebted to John Harper for advice on the structure of the liturgical psalter; any errors are of course my responsibility.

- f. 191r Sunday Prime: ps. 21 in full; pss. 22–25 incipits;
- f. 192r Monday Matins: *Snom' nasičeni (Somno refectis)* in full; pss. 26 incipit; pss. 27–30 in full; ps. 31 incipit; pss. 32–33 in alternation; pss. 34–36 in full; ps. 37 incipit;
- f. 196v Monday Lauds: pss. 50, 5, 62 incipits; *Ispv̄m se tb̄ē gī³* (Canticle I, Is. 12:1–6) in full; ps. 148 incipit; f. 197r *Svat̄nie sl̄vi oče (Splendor paternae gloriae)* in full;
- f. 197r Tuesday Matins: *Pričest̄nče otačaskie sl̄sti (Consors paterni luminis)* in full; ps. 38 in full; ps. 39–42 incipits; ps. 43 in full; pss. 44–45 incipits; ps. 46 in alternation; ps. 47 incipit; pss. 48–49, 51 in full;
- f. 200r Tuesday Lauds: pss. 50, 42, 62 incipits; *Az' r̄ex'v pr̄ēpl̄vleni d'ni* (Canticle II, Is. 38:10–20) incipit; ps. 148 incipit; *Petex' d'nev'ni v'zvstiīl̄b (Ales diei nuntius)* in full;
- f. 200v Wednesday Matins: *Tvari tv̄rče pr̄ēblgi (Rerum creator optime)* in full; ps. 52 in full; ps. 53 incipit; pss. 54–59 in full; ps. 60 initially in full, then in alternation; ps. 61 in full; ps. 62 incipit; ps. 63 in alternation; ps. 64 incipit; ps. 65 in full; ps. 66 incipit; ps. 67 in full;
- f. 205r Wednesday Lauds: pss. 50, 64, 62 incipits; *Vzradv̄a se s'rce moe o gē* (Canticle III, I Sam. 2:1–10) in full; f. 205v *Noč' obličnaē i tēmi (Nox et tenebrae et nubila)* in full;
- f. 206r Thursday Matins: *Noč' tam'nago dēēniē zatvaraūče (Nox atra rerum contegit)* in full; ps. 68 in full; ps. 69 incipit; pss. 70–73 in full; ps. 74 in alternation; pss. 75–79 in full;
- f. 213r Thursday Lauds: pss. 50, 89, 62 incipits; *Poem' gv̄e s'lvnē bo prosl̄vi se* (Canticle IV, Ex. 15:1–19) in full; f. 214r *Sīlost' v'staet' zl̄naē (Lux ecce surgit aurea)* in full;
- f. 214r Friday Matins: *Ti troice edin'stvo (Tu Trinitatis unitas)* in full; pss. 80–83 in full; ps. 84 incipit; ps. 85 in full; ps. 86 incipit; pss. 87–89 in full; ps. 90 incipit; ps. 91 in full; ps. 92 incipit; ps. 93 in full; pss. 94–96 incipits;
- f. 219v Friday Lauds: pss. 50, 142, 62 incipits; *Gī'uslišx̄b s'lux' t'voi* (Canticle V, Hab. 3:2–19) in full; ps. 148 incipit; f. 220r *Vēč'naē n̄ska sl̄va (Aeterna caeli gloria)* in full;
- f. 220v Saturday Matins: *Pr̄ēvelikago bē'dostoēniē (Summae Deus clementiae)* in full; ps. 97 incipit; ps. 98 in alternation; ps. 99 incipit; ps. 100 in full; ps. 101 incipit; pss. 102–108 in full;

³ Here and subsequently where the wording of the manuscript is reproduced, abbreviations are retained without expansion, but ligatures are resolved.

- f. 227r Saturday Lauds: pss. 50, 91, 62 incipits; *Vanmite n̄b̄sa ēže v'zgl̄u* (Canticle VI, Deut. 32:1–43) in full; ps. 148 incipit; f. 229r *Zora ūže rassēvaet̄b̄ (Aurora iam spargit)* in full;
- f. 229r Sunday Vespers: pss. 109–113 incipits; *S̄t̄a tv̄r̄če (Lucis creator)* incipit;
- f. 229r Monday Vespers: pss. 114–116, 119–120 incipits; *Neizm̄ēr'ni n̄b̄s̄b̄ saz'dat̄l̄ū (Immense caeli conditor)* in full;
- f. 229v [Prime]: ps. 117 in alternation, ps. 118 two incipits; Terce: *Nine nm̄[̄] s̄t̄i d̄s̄e (Nunc sancte nobis Spiritus)* incipit, ps. 118 three incipits; Sext: *Stroil̄l̄ū (Rector potens)* incipit; ps. 118 three incipits; None: *R̄ēči bē[̄] tv̄rdo ži (Rerum Deus tenax)* incipit, ps. 118 three incipits;
- f. 230r Tuesday Vespers: pss. 121–125 incipits; *Zeml'ni veliki sazdat̄l̄ū (Telluris ingens conditor)* in full;
- f. 230r Wednesday Vespers: pss. 126–130 incipits; *Nebs̄ki bē[̄] pr̄ēs̄t̄i (Caeli Deus sanctissime)* in full;
- f. 230v Thursday Vespers: pss. 131–133 incipits; pss. 134–136 in full; f. 231v *Veliki bē[̄] silni (Magnae Deus potentiae)* in full;
- f. 232r Friday Vespers: ps. 137 incipit; ps. 138 in alternation; pss. 139–141 in full; ps. 142 incipit; f. 233r *Sazdat̄l̄ū č̄s̄ki (Plasmator hominis)* in full;
- f. 233r Saturday Vespers: pss. 143–144 in full; ps. 145 incipit; ps. 146 in full; ps. 147 incipit; f. 234v *O s̄t̄e i b̄ž̄na troice (O lux beata Trinitas)* incipit;
- f. 234v Sunday [Lauds] ps. 148(–150), *B̄l̄te v'sa d̄l̄a gn̄ā (Canticle VII, Dan. 3:57–88), Te Deum, Magnificat, Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis* incipits; *Quicumque vult* in full.

This treatment of the psalter is clearly based on the assumption that the user would know the majority of the psalms by heart and would need only their incipits to identify which ones to recite. The question then arises why some psalms are excluded from this assumption.

2.2. Psalms in alternation

As indicated above, twelve psalms are presented in alternating versicles. In instances where each verse falls naturally into two halves, e.g. in pss. 32–33, an incipit, marked with a rubricated initial letter, is provided for the first half. Where the verse structure is more variable, however, the distribution of incipits does not always coincide with the usual starting-points of verses. The effect of this can be seen in the following examples, where the versicles which make up verses are indicated by superscript letters:

- ps. 12 1a. *Doklĕ gī zabvā*: 2a. *Doklĕ plĕzu sĕb v' d̄*: 3. *Doklĕ vznst se vrg'*: 4b. *Prostī oĉi moi eda koḡ*: 5b. *Stužauĉ mi vrzi moi*: 6b. *V'zraduet se srce moe*:
- ps. 63 2a. *Usl̄si gī gl̄sb moi*: 3a. *Pok'rii me ot san'ma*: 4a. *Iže izoštriše êk or̄*: 5. *Sbstrlati v' tainĕx'*: 6b. *Ut'vrđiše sbĕ s'lk̄*: 7a. *Is'pitaše bezknie*: 7c. *Pristpīt ĉk̄b v' sr*: 8b. *Strĕli mld̄nc̄b biš'*: 9b. *S'mĕš se v'si vđĕe*: 11a. *Vzvslit' se prvdn̄k̄b o ḡ*:
- ps. 74 2a. *Is'pvm̄ se tbĕ bĕ is'pvm̄ se tb.* 2b. *i przv̄m'*: 2c. *Povm̄' v'sa ĉđsa t'*: 4a. *Rastaĕ se z' i vsi*: 5a. *Rx' zkn̄noprĕstupnkomb̄*: 6a. *Ne v'znoste na visō*: 7a. *Ēk ni ot vstoka ni ot zp̄d*: 8b. *Sego s'mr̄aet̄b a sego v'z*: 9c. *I ukloni se ot sĕe v̄b onu*: 10a. *Az že v'zraduū se v'*: 11a. *I v'se roge gr̄šn̄x̄b sĹ*:
- ps. 98 1a. *Ḡb v'cri se da gnĕv*: 2a. *Ḡb v' sionĕ veli*: 3a. *Da is'pv̄det'se*: 4b. *Ti ugotova pravinū*: 5a. *V'znosite gā bā nš'*: 6a. *Moisĕi i ĕrun̄b v' erĕ*: 6c. *Prizivaxu gā i ta*: 7b. *Ēk xranaxu svĕd̄n*: 8a. *Gī bĕ ti poslušāše*: 9a. *Vznosite gā bā nš'*:

In ps. 60 the whole of the first verse and the beginning of the second are written out, followed by slightly haphazard alternating text thereafter. This inconsistency may be an indication that the scribe was copying selectively from an exemplar which contained the psalm in full, rather than relying on his knowledge or memory of its antiphonal recitation.

This alternating method of presentation could be taken for a more elaborate type of *aide mémoire* to help the reader through space-saving abbreviations of the psalms. However, such an explanation seems unlikely: the psalms in question range in length from 6 to 29 verses, but the majority are not longer than 11 verses, so they present no greater challenge to the memory than many of the psalms for which only initial incipits are provided. An alternative and more plausible interpretation is that the incipits to versicles were intended as prompts to guide the user through antiphonal recitation of pss. 11–13, 32–33, 46, 60, 63, 74, 98, 117 and 138, and that the missing versicles were to be supplied in response, whether by another individual or by a congregation.

2.3 Psalms, canticles and hymns in full

Length is however a possible factor in the selection of psalms written out in full. Of the 75 psalms, plus the 11 sections of ps. 118, for which only initial incipits are given, 33 have less than 10 verses, while only 10 have more than 16 verses and the longest have 29 verses (pss. 101, 148–150). By contrast,

out of 62 psalms which appear in full, only 6 have less than 10 verses, while 37 have more than 16 verses and the longest has 72 verses (ps. 77). Thus the majority of these psalms placed a burden on the memory which was obviated by writing the text out *in extenso*. The same consideration may have applied to some of the canticles, particularly the lengthy Cantic VI. The issue of memorization may also be relevant to the full citation of the Old Testament canticles for an additional reason: *MS 172* contains the more recent translation from Latin which appears in later breviaries such as the second breviary from Novi (NAZOR 1977: 318–320), rather than the traditional version based on Greek which was still to be found in breviaries of the 14th century (VAJS 1916: 192–204; ŠIMIĆ 2014: 198–203). A reader familiar with the older translation might have required the full text of the revised one. In this connexion it may be significant that most of the office hymns are likewise written out in full; only those most frequently used are indicated by incipit, while those for Sunday Matins and Lauds are omitted. It could be illuminating to know how long the version of the hymns in *MS 172* had been in use, and whether it belongs to the more innovative southern tradition (TANDARIĆ 1993: 32).

Yet ease of recall can hardly be the sole motivating factor in the choice between incipit or full text. On the one hand, some of the psalms which appear in full are relatively short and could surely be memorized without difficulty. On the other hand, only the incipit of Cantic II is supplied, although the revised version is undoubtedly intended here, as in the other canticles: it contains the phrase *v prēp̄vlēni d'ni*, rendering *in dimidio dierum*, in place of the older reading *v' visotē dni*, which follows the wording of the Septuagint (VAJS 1916: 192; ŠIMIĆ 2014: 198). So the variable presentation of the psalms, canticles and hymns in *MS 172* must have been motivated by additional considerations, whether relating to local practice or to the preference of the individual by whom or for whom the manuscript was written.

3. TEXTUAL PECULIARITIES OF THE PSALTER

Even in its incomplete state, the text of the psalms in *MS 172* offers sufficient evidence to support three significant conclusions. Firstly, although this is still in large part the version, translated from Greek and lightly edited on the basis of Latin, which is found in 14th-century breviaries, supplementary Latin influence can occasionally be detected:

f. 207r ps. 68:24 *i hrbt ih'vinu sag'ni se*, following *semper incurva* in place of the older wording *otnud^b slomi se* (VAJS 1916: 84; ŠIMIĆ 2014: 159);

f. 232v ps. 140:4 *i ne pričecu se*, perhaps prompted by Latin *communicabo* in this verse, where more conservative manuscripts have *sbčtu(i) se*, which goes back to Greek συνδυάσω (VAJS 1916: 181; ŠIMIĆ 2014: 194).

Secondly, erratic copying, either by the scribe of *MS 172* or in the production of his exemplar, occasionally makes the text defective to the point of unintelligibility. The interventions of the annotator removed some defects, but left others uncorrected, and did not engage with the third textual peculiarity, the prevalence of non-standard readings – banalizations and reminiscences – which tend to occur when a scribe’s memory of a familiar text distracts his attention from the exemplar before his eyes (MACROBERT 2008). The evidence for inattentive copying and incomplete correction is reviewed in detail below.

3.1. Corrections

The marginal corrections made by the scribe and the annotator can readily be distinguished by differences in lettering and colour of ink. They are written to be clearly legible and are related to the text by the use of reference points. The appearance of careful checking is belied, however, by the sparse occurrence of corrections in this part of the manuscript: it is in fact little more than perfunctory.

3.1.1. *Corrections by the scribe*

The scribe’s marginal corrections are minimal: on f. 197v he added the incipit of ps. 40, on ff. 229v–233r verses of the *Magnificat* and the incipits of pss. 130 and 125; but he corrected only a couple of his numerous omissions, by adding f. 209r ps. 73:2 *isprva* and f. 214v ps. 80:6 *ne zna*.

3.1.2. *Corrections by the annotator*

The annotator took a rather more careful approach. In several places he wrote in the margin a verse or versicle which the scribe had omitted: f. 192r ps. 21:26b; f. 197v ps. 38:9; f. 209r ps. 73:11; f. 217r ps. 88:40; f. 221r ps. 102:20c; f. 223v ps. 104:35b; f. 233v ps. 144:2. He added an antiphon on f. 214r. He also used the margins occasionally to add words missing from the text: f. 207v ps. 70:17 *nauči me*, but without the relative pronoun *imže* which the text requires; f. 210r ps. 76:7 *nočiû*; f. 217v ps. 88:32 *ne sranetъ* and ps.

88:39 *o'rinu*; f. 233r–v ps. 143:1 [*oplčē*]nie, an incomplete correction. His notion of linguistic norm seems to have been slightly different from that of the scribe, because he added a superscript letter to the aorist form in f. 218r ps. 88:50 *kle^t'se*; but he left unaltered occasional minor variants, such as idiosyncratic changes in verbal prefixation (ŠIMIĆ 2000: 73–74).

In a small number of instances the annotator introduced corrections into the body of the text. Because these are written over erasures, it is not clear what errors they correct, but their effect is to restore the standard wording:

f. 217v ps. 88:32 *opr̄vdaniē moē os'kvrnetь. i zapov̄di moe*

f. 218v ps. 91:8 *proz̄bnutь*

f. 219r ps. 93:16 *na tvorečee bezakonie*; ps. 93:23 *imь ḡb po bezkoniemь ihь.*

3.2. Uncorrected errors

However, there is a considerable number of places where the annotator neglected to reinstate the standard text of the psalms. These fall into two more or less distinct categories: straightforward copying errors which simply reflect the scribe's visual reaction to his exemplar, and textual deviations which arise from the interference of habit and memory in the copying process. Errors of the first kind can probably be attributed to the scribe who wrote *MS 172*; the second type of mistake may either be his responsibility or be inherited from his exemplar.

3.2.1. Copying errors

Mechanical copying errors are not frequent in the psalter of *MS 172*, but they do occur. For instance there is a textbook example of *saut du même au même*:

f. 224v ps. 105:42–43 ... *smêriše se pod' r̄kmi ihь. m'nožiceū izb̄vi e. ti že prog'nēvaeš i s'vêtom' s'voimь. i s'mêriš̄ se pod' r̄kmi ihь. m'nožiceū iz'bv̄i e. ti že prog'nēvaeše i svêtom'svoimь. i s'mêriše se v' bzk̄ni s'voihь*

When the scribe reached the word *s'mêriš̄ se* in verse 43, he confused it with the same word in verse 42 and so copied out the preceding portion of text a second time before continuing to the end of verse 43. The same mechanism, though with the opposite result, was probably the cause of a lacuna in the Croatian Church Slavonic version of *Ales diei nuntius* on f. 200r: the translation of the six lines between the two instances of *sobrii* in the Latin hymn is

missing, presumably because the scribe's eye jumped from the first instance of *trézvê* in his exemplar to the second one.

Confusion may occur between letters of similar form in Glagolitic, as where the word *hlmêhь* is misread as *glumêhь*:

f. 212r ps. 77:58 *prog'nêvše i v' glumêhь s'voih'*

Text may be incorrectly divided:

f. 226r ps. 107:12 *ne li ti otrinoveni bše*

Here the expected reading, *o'rinuvь ni*, has been misinterpreted as a passive participial form, *ti* has been taken as a plural demonstrative governing it rather than as the 2nd person singular pronoun, and the corruption has been completed by turning *bē* from the vocative 'O God' into an abbreviation of the 3rd person plural auxiliary verb. This series of distortions arose from a reading of the text which made no reference to how it would sound in recitation.

3.2.2. *Substantive omissions*

Words and phrases may be omitted from the text for a variety of reasons, for instance because they are not essential to the sense (e.g. possessives) or because they are easily overlooked (e.g. the conjunction *i* and the homophonous accusative form of the 3rd person pronoun). When omission undermines meaning, the most likely cause is mechanical error on the part of a copyist who has failed to go back to the right place in the text, as in f. 197v ps. 38:7, where the verb *hoditь* has been left out of its clause. Explanation is more problematic where the text still makes sense, albeit a different sense, when a whole phrase or clause is left out, as in the following examples:⁴

f. 191r ps. 17:45 [*slgaše mi*]

f. 191v ps. 21:15 [*bis srce moe*]

f. 196v ps. 36:40 [*i izmetь e ot grêšnikь*]

f. 199r ps. 48:15 [*smrtь upasetь e*]

f. 224r ps. 105:39 [*i oskvrni se v dělêhь ihь*].

⁴ Here and in subsequent illustrations the expected readings are supplied in square brackets from the *Academy breviary* (ŠIMIĆ 2014).

These could again be straightforward copying errors where the scribe's eye skipped a line, but they could equally be due to lapses in memory by someone reproducing a text which he knew well but not perfectly.

3.2.3. *Banalizations*

A similar indeterminacy may apply to banal lexical substitutions. Where one word has been replaced by another of similar appearance which fits the context as well or better, it is impossible to determine whether the scribe has actually misread his exemplar or simply written what he expected to see, as in the following instances:⁵

- f. 189r ps. 9:23 *uvezaûť v' sêtêhь [svêtêhь] eže pomšlāûť*
- f. 193r ps. 29:13 *i ne umalû [umilû] se*
- f. 224r ps. 105:25 *i porptaše v' sšêhь [selêhь] s'voiňь.*

It is natural to expect people to get caught in nets rather than in counsels, to wish to avoid belittlement rather than compunction, to murmur in their words or discourse rather than in their settlements; the use of abbreviations merely increases the risk of reading what one expects rather than what is actually on the page.

Banalization, the tendency to substitute commonplace wording for less usual expressions, may also manifest itself through changes in grammatical form:

- f. 219r ps. 93:15 *i držet' [držeče] ũ v'si pravi s'rcemь*
- f. 193v ps. 30:23 *sego rdī usliši gī [usliša] glsь m̄vi moe*
- f. 194v ps. 34:11 *v'staše [vstaûče] n̄ me s'vd̄teli neprvd̄ni*
- f. 201v ps. 55:13 *obêti t'voe eže v'zdahь [vzdamь]*

The most striking instances of banalization result not from misplaced visual associations or careless reading but from familiarity with the themes, images and phraseology which are characteristic of the text:

- f. 206v ps. 68:6 *bē ti uv̄dē bzkn̄ie [bezumie] moe*
- f. 212r ps. 77:59 *s'liša b̄ i prog'nēva se [prêzrē]*
- f. 219r ps. 93:9 *i sazdav'i oko ne vd̄it [smotrit] li*
- f. 223r ps. 104:25 *v'znenavditi ego [lūdi ego]*
- f. 232v ps. 140:4 *ne ukloni us'ŕa moē [srca moego]*

⁵ Here and in subsequent illustrations the substitute expressions are indicated by underlining.

Each of these incorrect readings is plausible in context: the psalmist is typically preoccupied with his own lawlessness, with God's wrath and all-seeing presence, with the heathen's hatred of God, with keeping his lips as well as his heart from wrongful words.

Sometimes the likely model for a banalizing reading can be identified elsewhere in the text. So f. 201v ps. 55:14 *da ugoû préd gm̄b v' m̄sté [sv̄tē] živučīh̄b* may have been inspired by pss. 26:13 and 141:6 *na zemli živyh̄b* or by ps. 114:9 *v stranē živučīh̄b*, a phrase which is reproduced as direct reminiscence in ps. 55:14 of the Psalterium Sinaiticum (ŠIMÍČ 2000: 98–99). The addition of a temporal adverb in f. 202r ps. 56:4 *psla b̄b m̄l̄stb svoû i is'tinu svoû nočiû* may be an anticipation of *pos'pah's'mučn* in the next verse or an approximate reminiscence of ps. 16:3 *posētīl̄b esi nočiû*. The change of wording in f. 204r ps. 65:11 *požīl'esi s'krb̄b na s'rci [hrbtē] n̄sm̄b* may reflect an assumption that grief oppresses the heart rather than the back or be an echo of ps. 12:3 *dokolē položu [...] bolēzn̄b v sr̄ci moem̄b*.

3.2.4. *Reminiscences*

Direct, verbatim reminiscences can also be seen as a type of banalization, but they depend on close familiarity with the words of the text, not just with its subject matter and style, and therefore provide evidence of internal dictation on the basis of memory. At one point in the liturgical psalter of *MS 172* the interaction between this process and that of copying from an exemplar is clearly visible, when because of a similarity in wording at the start of Is. 12:2 and Ex. 15:2 a clause from Canticle IV was interpolated into Canticle I. If this was done by the scribe of *MS 172*, he realised his mistake immediately, because the reminiscence is crossed out in the red ink used for rubrication and the text reverts to Canticle I:

f. 196v Is. 12:2 se *b̄b moi proslv̄lū i i b̄b oca moego v'znesu i sp̄sīl̄b moi i upv̄nē s' tvorū*

< Ex. 15:2 se *b̄b moi proslv̄lū i i b̄b oca moego i v'z'nesu i*

Alternatively the error may already have been present in the scribe's exemplar, in which case he detected it after he had copied it.

Elsewhere, however, reminiscences went undetected. Some are the result of proximate influence from an earlier verse in the same psalm, and so could be regarded as a kind of copying error where the scribe reverts to a phrase written shortly before:

f. 195r ps. 35:5 *bezkn̄ie i lasti pomisli* < ps. 35:4 *gl̄i ust̄b ego bzkn̄ie i l̄st̄b*

f. 197v ps. 38:8 *upostasъ moê ničože ě prĕd tĕou* [u tebe estъ] < ps. 38:6 *i upostasъ moê ničože ě prĕd tĕou*

f. 207r ps. 70:5 *ěk ti esi pribĕžiĕ [trpĕnie] moe* < ps. 70:3 *ěk utvrĕdenie moe i pribiĕiĕ moe esi ti*

This mechanism cannot however account for anticipation of a phrase which occurs later in the given psalm, nor for the transference of phrases from psalms which are widely separated from each other within the psalter:

f. 201v ps. 55:5 *o bzĕ pohvlĕ glĕ o gĕ pohvlĕ ssa moê* < ps. 55:11 *o bozĕ pohvlĕ glĕ o gĕ pohvlĕ ssa*

f. 192r ps. 21:32 *v'zvetet' nbsa prvĕdu ego* < ps. 49:6 *v'zvetet' nbsa prvĕdu ego*

f. 198v ps. 43:25 *lĕe tvoe otvrĕaeši ot mnĕ* < ps. 87:15 *otvrĕaeši lice tvoe ot mnĕ*

f. 207v ps. 70:15 *usta moê v'zvĕstetъ hvĕ [pravdu] tvoŭ* < ps. 50:17 *usta moê v'zvĕstetъ hvalu tvoŭ*

f. 217v ps. 88:47 *raz'garaet se ěk ogan'r'vnie t'voe [gnĕvъ]* < ps. 78:5 *razgaraet se ěk ognъ r'vnie t'voe*

f. 218v ps. 91:6 *ěk v'zvlĕi se do nbsъ mlstъ t'voĕ [dĕla tvoĕ]* < ps. 56:11 *ěk v'zvlĕi se do nbsъ mlstъ t'voĕ*

f. 223r ps. 104:22 *da nauĕitъ snĭ [knezi] ego ěk smĕ sbĕ* < ps. 89:16 *nastavi snĭ ih*

f. 225r ps. 106:11 *i svĕtъ niĕago [višnago] razdraĕiše* < ps. 13:6 *svĕtъ nĕago pos'rmste*

f. 227r ps. 108:30 *posrdĕ crkve [mnogъ] v'shvlĕ i* < ps. 21:23 *posrdĕ crkve v'spou te*

These are unequivocal reminiscences, the work of a scribe who relied at least in part on his memory of the psalms, not just on reproduction of a written text. Since there are some indications, discussed above in sections 2.2. and 3.2.1., that the scribe who wrote *MS 172* copied from a fuller version of the psalter and was guided more by eye than by aural memory, it is possible that they were already present in his exemplar.

4. CONCLUSIONS

What then is the value of the liturgical psalter in *MS 172* to the modern investigator? To the textual scholar it must be a source of disappointment and frustration, even if it contains instructive examples of how corruption may arise and be tolerated in a well known text. To anyone interested in the production and use of liturgical books, however, it offers some illuminating insights. It is not, of course, unusual that fine parchment, penmanship and

ornamentation should go hand in hand with imperfect copying. What is more remarkable is that such expense and pains should be devoted to the production of a manuscript which was only likely to be used by one person. The presentation of the psalter in *MS 172* presupposes a user who was confident that he knew more than half of the psalms by heart and that brief prompts, rather than full text, were adequate to his needs. If he wrote the manuscript himself, he relied either on a faulty exemplar or on his own memory even for the psalms which he reproduced in full; if he commissioned the book and corrected it on receipt, he knew the psalms rather better than the scribe did, but by no means perfectly. He had sufficient means to afford a book for his sole use; he was perhaps old enough to need full copies of recently revised canticles; advancing years and failing eyesight may explain why in the event he made little use of a manuscript which is almost miniature in scale. Thereafter the elliptical treatment of key texts would have limited its usefulness to prospective readers who were not as well versed in the psalms as its first owner. Comprehensive textual investigation could yet cast fuller light on the dating, provenance, local liturgical practice and intended use of this enigmatic manuscript.

LITERATURE

- BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, V. 2006. *Knjige o Makabejcima* u hrvatskoglagoljskoj književnosti: *Prva Knjiga o Makabejcima* u hrvatskoglagoljskim brevijarima. *Slovo* 54–55: 5–126.
- BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, V. 2009. *Knjige o Makabejcima* u hrvatskoglagoljskoj književnosti: *Druga Knjiga o Makabejcima* u hrvatskoglagoljskim brevijarima. *Slovo* 59: 1–75.
- BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, V. 2010. Hrvatskoglagoljska *Muka svetoga Andrije apostola*. *Slovo* 60: 41–71.
- BADURINA STIPČEVIĆ, V. 2016. Hrvatskoglagoljska *Pasija svete Lucije*. *Ricerche slavistiche* 14 (60): 417–438.
- DU FEU, V. M. 1971. The Glagolitic MSS in the Bodley Library. *Slovo* 21: 301–303 and plate.
- GRABAR, B. 1984. Tiskani glagoljski Baromićev brevijar. *Slovo* 34: 159–180.
- HAMM, J. 1953. Review of TADIN 1953. *Slovo* 3: 118–19.
- MACROBERT, C. M. 2008. On the role of memory and oral tradition in the early transmission of the Church Slavonic psalter text. A. Miltenova; E. Tomova; R. Stankova (ed.). *Xristijanska agiologija i narodni vjarvanija*. *Sbornik v čest na st. n. s. Elena Koceva*. Sofia: Iztok-zapad, 340–55.
- NAZOR, A. 1977. *II. Novljanski brevijar: hrvatskoglagoljski rukopis iz 1495*. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut.

- ŠIMIĆ, M. 2000. *Leksik hrvatskoglagoljskoga psaltira*. Doctoral dissertation, Zagreb.
- ŠIMIĆ, M. 2014. *Akademijin Brevijar HAZU III c 12*. Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut.
- ŠTEFANIĆ, V. 1970. *Glagoljski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije*. II. dio. Zagreb: JAZU.
- TADIN, M. 1953. Glagolitic manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. *Oxford Slavonic Papers IV*: 151–158 and plates.
- TANDARIĆ, J. L. 1993. *Hrvatskoglagoljska liturgijska književnost*. Zagreb: Kršćanska Sadašnjost – Provincijalat franjevacica trećoredaca.
- VAJS, J. 1910. *Nejstarši Breviář hrvatsko-hlaholský*. Prague: Náklad Král. České Společnosti Naúk.
- VAJS, J. 1915. Hlaholské kodexy v Bodlejaně v Oxfordě. *Časopis katolického duchovenstva LVI (81)*: 560–574.
- VAJS, J. 1916. *Psalterium palaeoslovenicum croatico-glagoliticum*. Krk – Prague: Academia palaeoslovenica Veglensis.
- VAJS, J. 1948. *Najstariji hrvatskoglagoljski misal. Djela Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti 38*. Zagreb: JAZU.

Sažetak

Catherine Mary MACROBERT

ZAPAŽANJA O LITURGIJSKOM PSALTIRU U *MS CANON. LITURG. 172* (BODLEYANSKA KNJIŽNICA, OXFORD)

U tekstu su analizirane strukturne i tekstološke posebnosti psaltira u brevijarskom dijelu glagoljskog rukopisa Canon. liturg. 172 koji se čuva u Bodleyevoj biblioteci. Na osnovi tih posebnosti iznose se dokazi o učestalom korištenju psaltira prilikom učenja teksta napamet i osobnoj liturgijskoj praksi te se ukazuje na mogućnost da je rukopis bio namijenjen specifičnom korisniku.

Ključne riječi: brevijari, pojednostavljena, kantici, himni, psaltir

Catherine Mary MacRobert
University of Oxford
Oxford (United Kingdom)
catherine.macrobot@lmh.ox.ac.uk