The Repertory of *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* Tropes in the Bohemian Tradition

This study continues the detailed discussion of the development of the chant tradition in Bohemian lands from the first volume of this edition and the description of the chief sources of tropes to the mass ordinary chants begun in the second volume. This introduction serves primarily as a general summary of the repertory of *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* tropes edited in this and the previous volumes. Thus it complements the introduction to the second volume of this edition, which was devoted to Bohemian tropes to the *Kyrie eleison* and *Gloria in excelsis Deo*.[1] This introduction should by no means replace an exhaustive study of medieval Bohemian tropes to the *Sanctus* and the *Agnus Dei*. It is rather a summary of basic facts about this rich and stylistically diverse repertory; observations on individual chants are also included in commentaries in the text editions.

I. Statistics and basic characteristics of the repertory

Fifty tropes to the *Sanctus* and nineteen tropes to the *Agnus Dei*, representing the chant tradition in Bohemian lands from the 12th to the beginning of the 16th centuries, were included in the *Repertorium troporum medii aevi*. However, these plain numbers need to be revised. The function of some tropes oscillates in Bohemian manuscripts, meaning that the same chant appears as a trope to the *Sanctus* in some manuscripts, in others as a trope to the *Agnus Dei*. Such 'liturgical migrations' generally involve chants originating from outside Bohemia. A number of tropes were used in Bohemia in a different liturgical function than in surrounding regions; therefore, in this edition, they appear as part of another repertory group that in which they appeared in *Analecta hymnica medii aevi* or *Corpus troporum*. Commentaries in the text edition include a reference to relevant details; further explanation of this phenomenon is provided in this introduction below.

Similarly to tropes to the Mass Proper and to the *Kyrie eleison* and the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, three distinctive repertory groups, that only partly overlap, can be defined in the Bohemian tradition.[2] The repertory of *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* tropes in St Vitus's Cathedral, documented foremost in the so-called St Vitus Troper from the end of the 12th century and in the Ordinarium from the collection of the archbishop Arnošt of Pardubice from 1360s, is, even more distinctly than other repertory groups, saturated with chants from the older French tradition and is marked by a high number of uniquely documented chants.[3] Throughout the late Middle Ages, and even after the renewal of liturgical performance in the second half of the 15th century, the repertory remained extremely faithful to the shape defined during the liturgical "reform" in the second half of the 14th century: this can be deduced, at least, from sparsely preserved notated manuscripts, represented by the so-called Marian Gradual PrM XII A 1.

The Diocesan tradition, on the contrary, concurs to a large extent with the practice documented in the adjacent South-German region, and, from the beginning (e. g. from the 14th century, in which the first important preserved collections originate) shows all the signs of a creative approach: some chants were newly elaborated here, either in their text or music, and the first of the many additions to the *Sanctus* trope repertory originate in this milieu. At the same time, the end of the 14th century saw a distinct decline in interest in *Agnus Dei* tropes and their gradual migration to *Sanctus* tropes.

This process was completed in the tradition of Bohemian (Latin) Utraquists in the late 15th/early 16th century, which developed individually, as did the repertory of the Mass Proper tropes and tropes to the *Kyrie* and *Gloria in excelsis Deo*. The Utraquists' repertory that was reduced to tropes to the *Sanctus* only, is built on chants transmitted in the Prague Diocese that were continually supplemented by new chants.

---

[1] See RTB II, pp. 67–73.

[2] See RTB I, pp. 18–21 and RTB II, pp. 10–31.

[3] See RTB II, Tab. 2, p. 78.