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Abstract

Although the importance of music to the development of early medieval poetry has long been recognised, surviving musical notations have rarely been identified and only occasionally analysed. One reason for this neglect is the absence of a readily identifiable corpus of notated poetry. In the absence of a uniform body of material, attention is directed in this study towards one type of manuscript in which notated poetry was transmitted; that is, poetic collections. In total, six notated poetic collections written before the eleventh century are identified as primary material for research.

In selecting for investigation both a topic (early medieval verse and music) and a medium (poetic collections), a twofold enquiry is pursued. First, potential uses and users of the surviving notations are assessed. This entails a consideration of notation as, on the one hand, one among several activities involved in the collection and presentation of verse on the page, and, on the other, a witness to the later reception of poetic collections. The particular selections and presentations of text and notation in the individual collections are accordingly analysed as written representations of early medieval music and verse with their own rationale and audience. Through this assessment of the writing of individual manuscripts, a spectrum of uses for and users of the neumatic notations is proposed.

Second, surviving notations are analysed as representations of sounding structures. Although the information provided by the neumatic notation cannot be transcribed into a modern format, the information transmitted by the neumes is analysed in conjunction with the poetic texts. Two forms of analysis are undertaken: a comparison of surviving notations for textual concordances, and a comparison of notations for similar text structures. On the basis of these analyses, characteristic melodic behaviours are identified and new models for the interaction of music and poetry proposed. The notations and texts for these analyses are presented separately in a second volume, which contains reproductions, transcriptions and commentaries of the thirty-nine poems in the six poetic collections, as well as reproductions and transcriptions of notations for concordant texts transmitted outside these collections.
# Tables

1. Poetic collections with notation compiled before c. 1000
2. A summary of the contents and scribes of Pa lat. 8093
3. The original compilation behind Lei Voss. lat. F. 111 and Pa lat. 8093 (fols. 1r-38v)
4. The contents and main changes of hands in Ma 10029
5. Poetic structures in Be 455
6. The ordering of verse in Pa lat. 1154, fols. 98r-142v
7. Notated verse in Pa lat. 1154
8. The ordering of verse in Br 8860-8867
9. Marginal additions to Br 8860-8867
10. Notated textual concordances for ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections
11. Lines of notation added to *O stelliferi*
12. Neumatic patterns in Pa lat. 1154
13. Neumatic patterns in sapphics and iambic trimeters in Pa lat. 1154
14. Neumatic patterns in trochaic tetrameters in Pa lat. 1154
15. Neumatic patterns for remaining forms in Pa lat. 1154
16. Neumatic and poetic structures for notated strophic forms in ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections
17. Structural articulation indicated by notations added to stichic verse
Acknowledgments

The writing of this dissertation has only been possible due to the support received from numerous individuals and official bodies. A generous award of three years funding from The British Academy provided the financial means for undertaking full-time research. Further support to enable the completion of the project was enjoyed during the initial months of a Research Fellowship at Clare Hall; assistance in undertaking study abroad was earlier gratefully received from the trustees of the John Stewart of Rannoch Fund for Sacred Music (University of Cambridge).

It is a pleasure to record debts of gratitude incurred whilst working on this dissertation. In the course of research I have made calls on the time of staff at several libraries, including the Pendlebury and University Libraries in Cambridge, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, the Burgerbibliothek in Bern, the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples and the British Library in London. A particular vote of thanks is due to Andrew Bennett, Librarian of the Pendlebury Library (Faculty of Music, University of Cambridge), for dealing with numerous requests for microfilms. I am also indebted to Nicolas Bell who read the final draft of this dissertation and spared me the embarrassment of numerous errors. Any mistakes that remain are entirely my own.

The consideration afforded my work by experienced scholars has proved of immense benefit. The advice and encouragement offered by Rosamond McKitterick and John Caldwell during the initial stages of research served to shape much subsequent work. Further into the project, numerous corrections and suggestions were made by Andy Orchard and Wulf Arlt, both of whom kindly agreed to read drafts of the third part of this dissertation. During the later stages of writing David Ganz has generously offered advice and made numerous suggestions as to further reading: without his timely interventions several important areas would have been overlooked. Finally, the interest shown by Andreas Haug and Gunilla Björkvall throughout the course of research has been a source of inspiration; in particular, their
willingness to consider my work on several different occasions has enabled a development of ideas in unexpected directions.

My greatest debt however is to my supervisor, Susan Rankin. Her patience and support have underpinned all my explorations, and her commitment to the highest scholarly standards has acted as both an invaluable check on my wilder speculations and a model to emulate.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Analecta hymnica medii aevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEC</td>
<td>Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Corpus antiphonalium officii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td>Corpus christianorum. Series Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Codices Latini antiquiores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Corpus scriptorum Muzarabicorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Corpus troporum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMH</td>
<td>Early Music History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Musicological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFH</td>
<td>Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) I Aachen-Lambach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICUR</td>
<td>Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICL</td>
<td>Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>Mittelalterliche Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>Monumenta Germaniae historica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Auctores antiquissimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epp.</td>
<td>Epistolae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Poetae Latini medii aevi (Poetae Latini aevi Carolini)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue bénédictine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHT</td>
<td>Revue d'histoire des textes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full references are to be found in the Bibliography, pp. 225-41.
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Manuscript sigla

The construction of manuscript sigla follows principles used in the series CT. Libraries are referred to by abbreviation (listed here in bold); shelfmarks are given as listed below. Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale, 107 is thus referred to as Aut 107.

**Aut** AUTUN
- Bibliothèque Municipale
  107

**Ba** BAMBERG
- Staatsbibliothek
  lit. 10
  lit. 23
  HJ. IV. 20
  P. III. 20

**Bari** BARI
- San Nicola
  *s. n.* (Hymnal)

**Ben** BENEVENTO
- Archivio Capitolare
  V. 20
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- Deutsche Staatsbibliothek
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  theolog. lat. 2° 58
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>- Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pal. lat. 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>HEILIGENKREUZ</td>
<td>- Stiftsbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka</td>
<td>KARLSRUHE</td>
<td>- Landesbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. XCIii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. XCXCv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klo</td>
<td>KLOSTERNEUBURG</td>
<td>- Stiftsbibliothek 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>LAON</td>
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<td></td>
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  Bodley 38
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  286
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  133
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This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration. 

In the course of this dissertation the following names of neumes are used to refer to melodic gestures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melodic Gesture</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>punctum, tractulus, or virga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>pes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>clivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>torculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>porrectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>scandicus, salicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>climacus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>quilisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>oriscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>pressus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>virga strata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the description of musical forms, lower case letters are used to indicate half-line units (referred to as *membra*) and upper case letters are used to indicate single line units. In the description of verbal accentual structures primary accents are marked ', secondary accents are marked '.', unaccented syllables are marked ~, and word divisions are marked by a comma.
Examples and commentary upon individual notations are included in volume II, to which reference is made as follows: (II: 1) – volume II, notated verse no. 1; (II: i) – volume II, concordance no. i.
PART I

Early Medieval Music and Poetry
Early Medieval Music and Poetry

1 Introduction

The importance of music to the development of Latin poetry from late antiquity through to the eleventh century has long been recognised by philologists. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Wilhelm Meyer claimed that music was ‘bei den Anfängen aller Dichtungsformen nicht nur ein wichtiger, sondern der wichtigste Faktor’.¹ Some fifty years later Dag Norberg observed ‘La poésie rythmique était en général destinée à être chantée et non à être lue’.² Despite this assumption of an intimate connection between music and forms of poetry that flourished from c. 400-1000 AD, musical notations for poetry have rarely been subject to critical investigation. This has not been due to any lack of interest, but rather to difficulties in handling the surviving musical evidence. Two problems in particular have proved prohibitive: the late date of musical notations in relation to the poetry they are presumed to have influenced (musical notations survive from approximately the late ninth century onwards), and the impossibility of reconstructing the melodic content of these notations until an even later date (c. 1000 AD at the earliest).

In this dissertation I hope to avoid many of the problems associated with a critical assessment of musical evidence by examining surviving musical notations in conjunction with the poetry to which they were added. In part, this dual focus on music and poetry is essential in so far as it enables the information provided by

neumes to be supplemented and compared with information drawn from poetry. In part, however, the dual focus is a matter of principle, for where music has been claimed as integral to poetic structure an examination of the relation between the two media promises insight into their modes of self-definition. It is this fluid relation between early medieval music and poetry that forms the basis for the following investigation and provides a starting point from which further divisions are to be explored; in particular, between metre and rhythm, imitation and innovation and, most importantly, between sounding structures and their written realisation.

The identification of notated manuscripts of early medieval verse is beset by difficulties. Several attempts have been made to compile lists and the variety of results that have been obtained may serve as an introduction to the problems that arise in pursuing research in this field.

The first substantial list of manuscript sources of notated early medieval poetry was published by Ludwig in 1924. Earlier historical accounts, such as that of Coussemaker in 1852, had highlighted individual sources without seeking to summarise documentary evidence in a comprehensive manner. Ludwig, in pursuing a more rigorous philological approach, compiled a list of notated manuscripts from the ninth to eleventh centuries that contained non-liturgical monophonic music. In so doing, Ludwig distinguished between different categories of notated verse, on the one hand separating notations of classical verse from notations of verses by contemporary poets, and on the other separating notations of lyrical from non-lyrical verse. In total, sixteen manuscripts transmitting ‘nichtliturgische, weltliche einstimmige Musik’ were identified.

---


4 E. de Coussemaker, Histoire de l’harmonie au moyen-âge, Paris, 1852, pp. 73-148 (II. ‘Musique rythmée et mesurée’). The following ninth- and tenth-century manuscripts are mentioned by Coussemaker (his own dates where specified are given in brackets): Va 150 (s. ix); Pa lat. 1154 (s. ix); Pa lat. 2832 (s. ix); Wo Aug. 56. 16/18 (s. x); Pa lat. 1118; Vi 116; MoH 425 (s. x); ‘Codex Frankenanus’ (s. x); the Moissac hymnal – Vat Rossi 205 (s. x); and Mo 6.

5 The following manuscripts were cited by Ludwig: Pa lat. 1154; Saumur, Abbey of St Florent (s.n.); Vat Rossi 205 (Moissac hymnal); StG 381; Mod I. 4; Ba P. III. 20; Pa lat. 11632; Wo Aug. 56. 16/18; Cdg Gg. V. 35; Vat lat. 3227; MoC 318; Be 36; Ma 10029; Vat Reg. lat. 586; FloC F. 3. 565; and Pa lat. 1118. See Ludwig, ‘Die weltliche und die mehrstimmige kirchliche Musik’, pp. 160-1.
The next attempt to compile a list of manuscripts transmitting early medieval notated verse was completed half a century later by Berendes. Berendes was concerned principally to identify sources for the liturgical \textit{versus} from the ninth through to the twelfth century, but in so doing distinguished a number of manuscripts that were ‘less liturgically ordered’ and appeared to resist classification into the categories of Gradual, Antiphoner and Troper. These manuscripts, which include both notated and unnotated sources, were termed ‘collections’, of which eleven were identified.

A different set of criteria was adopted by Jammers who, as an extension of his interest in the origins of neumatic script, sought to identify manuscript sources of monophonic non-liturgical music. In practice, this meant a collection of all notated texts considered to be ‘occasional poetry’ in manuscripts dating principally from the ninth to eleventh centuries (although also including German vernacular sources up to the thirteenth century). Jammers made no pretence at being comprehensive, regarding the examples he compiled as chiefly important for their witness to early notation. In total, some twenty-six manuscripts were identified by Jammers.

More recently an extensive study of the \textit{versus} of the ninth to eleventh centuries was undertaken by Sevestre, who drew up an extensive list of manuscripts containing verse, including both liturgical and non-liturgical material, notated and

---


7 The following ‘collections’ were identified by Berendes: Be 455; Br 8860-8867; Pa lat. 1154; Vi 1888; Vat Pal. lat. 489; StG 381; StG 382; Ver CIX (102); Vic 105 (111); Pa lat. 1139; and Pa lat. 9488. See Berendes, \textit{The Versus}, ch. 3 (‘Sources’).


9 Jammers, \textit{Aufzeichnungsweisen}, ‘Sie kann und will nicht vollständig sein; doch sind die wichtigsten Arten durch Beispiele vertreten’, p. 2.

10 The following notated sources were listed by Jammers: Be theol. lat. 2° 58; Hei Pal. lat. 52; Na IV. G. 68; Pa lat. 2832; Wo 56. 16/18; Vi 116; Cdg Gg. V. 35; Ma 10052; FloL Ashburnham 23; Mu clm 6260; StG 168; StG 174; StG 393; Mu clm 4660/4660a; Gra Il. 756; Stu H. B. I. Ascet. 95; Cl 1240 (189); Pa lat. 1154; MoH 425; Pa lat. 1118; Pa lat. 1139; Be 455; Be 36; Vat. Reg. lat. 1462; Vat lat. 3227; and Ma 10029. See Jammers, \textit{Aufzeichnungsweisen}, pp. 2-8.
unnotated manuscripts, and both antique and medieval poetry. The criteria according to which this list was compiled remained undefined and, as a consequence, the collection of sources acted as a sample selection rather than an attempt to encompass all known material within a certain category. Despite its weak theoretical basis, Sevestre’s list of twenty-four notated manuscripts from the ninth and tenth centuries remains a useful index.

Since Sevestre’s study, which was completed in 1989, only Gillingham has attempted to compile a list of notated early medieval verse. Gillingham’s avowed aim was to compile an anthology of medieval secular Latin song. In a manner similar to Sevestre, however, the terms of the anthology remained undefined and his list includes without comment a selection of both unnotated manuscripts and manuscripts transmitting classical verse. Moreover, Gillingham’s anthology is bedevilled by the approximate and often inaccurate dates that are ascribed to manuscripts. In total, fourteen manuscripts were assigned dates before the eleventh century.

This overview of previous studies reveals three different criteria by which sources have been identified. The first, adopted by Ludwig and Jammers, is the identification of an object defined by its properties: in this case, monophonic and non-liturgical. This approach resulted in an identification of examples of notated poetry

12 The following notated sources were identified by Sevestre: Pa lat. 8093; Na IV. G. 68; PaA 227; Ber Hamilton 542; Pa lat. 1154; Pa lat. 1240; Be 455; PaM 1707; Mu clm 3005; Lo Add. 19768; and Vi 1888. Unnotated sources included by Sevestre were: Lei Voss. lat. Q. 69; Cheltenham, Phillips Collection 18908; StG 2; Ver XC (85); Ver LXXXVIII (83); PaSG 111; Pa lat. 4883A; StG 679; StG 899; Br 8860-8867; Br 1511; Fulda (lost); and Ba lit. 10. See Sevestre, *Du versus au conduit* I, pp. 9-35.
14 The following notated manuscripts were assigned dates before the eleventh century by Gillingham: Be 36; Be 394; Be 455; Ox Bodley 38; MoH 425; MoC 318; Pa lat. 1118; Pa lat. 1154; Pa lat. 887; Vat lat. 3227; Vat lat. 586; Vat lat. 1462; Vi 116; Wo 3610. See B. Gillingham, *A Critical Study of Secular Medieval Latin Song* (Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen / Musicological Studies LX/2), Ottawa, 1995, pp. 27-48 (ch. 3 'The Major Sources').
whose contents pointed away from the liturgy. The second is that adopted by Berendes and Sevestre, who sought to identify an object defined by its use: for Berendes, the *versus* was a musico-poetic object distinguished by its association with the liturgy; for Sevestre, the *versus* was a musico-poetic object distinguished by a lack of precise function—an independent, new composition. This functional definition resulted in an inclusive approach to source compilation, conflating liturgical and non-liturgical material, notated and unnotated sources, and classical and contemporary verse. The third criterion, adopted by Gillingham and in other partial studies such as that of Coussemaker, was a broadly aesthetic one. The distinguishing feature of these approaches was an appeal to an undefined song-like character in either text or music.
3 Ninth- and Tenth-Century Sources

It is clear from the differing approaches and results of previous studies that extant notated poetry copied before c. 1000 does not form a unified corpus of material. The notated poems that have been identified in previous studies include Office hymns, processional hymns for the Mass, plautus or laments, moral-didactic songs, welcome odes, biblical narratives, encomia, penitential complaints and late antique lyrics. In addition to this variety in content, the records are themselves far from systematic. Verse texts survive mostly from the ninth century onwards and notation, whose earliest survivals in any form date from the early ninth century, was most often added at a later date. Where it occurs, this notation was added only sporadically and as a consequence a large percentage of the texts presumed to have been sung remain unnotated. Finally, the sources transmitting these notated verses include material drawn from different historical periods (classical, late antique, early medieval), composed according to different techniques (metrical and rhythmical verse) and belonging to different genres (such as hymns, pagan and Christian epics, laments, mnemonics, epistles).

In view of this variety, I do not intend to propose yet another definition and to compile a further list of sources. Instead I shall take as a starting point contemporary categories as revealed in the compilation of sources. It is hoped by such an approach to avoid on the one hand anachronistic preconceptions, and on the other an uncritical conflation of objects that have little relation to each other.

One clear group that can be identified among surviving sources is manuscripts transmitting material destined for the liturgy. The notated verse in Graduals, Antiphoners, Processionals, Tropers and Sequentiaries stands apart in so far as it appears amid other sung items in codices whose content and order is clearly delineated. The schematic nature of the notation in such manuscripts is in direct contrast to the occasional nature of the notation in the remaining manuscripts. A recognition of this distinction in practice allows a central problem in previous studies to be addressed afresh; that is, the distinction between liturgical and non-liturgical song.

Although it has underpinned all previous musicological research in this area, the category of ‘liturgical song’ is difficult to maintain. The term ‘liturgical’ is open to a spectrum of meanings ranging from the contents of formal services held in a church through to any ritual associated with religious practice. The problem of definition is particularly acute when considering genres such as hymns since the same hymn could be used within the Office, in a devotional ritual, or for teaching purposes. By fixing attention on the sources, however, this problem is largely avoided in so far as there exists a clear distinction between notated verse in manuscripts transmitting material primarily intended for use in liturgical services, and notated verse in manuscripts whose material was not intended for such a use. A focus upon the circumstances of transmission thus allows the larger part of sung poetry within the liturgy to be separated out, while retaining those pieces that also occurred in other contexts.

The source material that is to be examined in this study may thus initially be defined as notated verse in ninth- and tenth-century non-liturgical manuscripts. Although such a definition is clear in terms of what it excludes, the sources it includes would appear to resist any systematic investigation. One immediate problem is the identification of relevant manuscripts. Although all manuscripts written in Latin before the ninth century are collected together and described in the series *CLA*, no
One clear group that can be identified among surviving sources is manuscripts transmitting material destined for the liturgy. The notated verse in Graduals, Antiphoners, Processionals, Tropers and Sequentiaries stands apart in so far as it appears amid other sung items in codices whose content and order is clearly delineated. The schematic nature of the notation in such manuscripts is in direct contrast to the occasional nature of the notation in the remaining manuscripts. A recognition of this distinction in practice allows a central problem in previous studies to be addressed afresh; that is, the distinction between liturgical and non-liturgical song.

Although it has underpinned all previous musicological research in this area, the category of 'liturgical song' is difficult to maintain. The term 'liturgical' is open to a spectrum of meanings ranging from the contents of formal services held in a church through to any ritual associated with religious practice. The problem of definition is particularly acute when considering genres such as hymns since the same hymn could be used within the Office, in a devotional ritual, or for teaching purposes. By fixing attention on the sources, however, this problem is largely avoided in so far as there exists a clear distinction between notated verse in manuscripts transmitting material primarily intended for use in liturgical services, and notated verse in manuscripts whose material was not intended for such a use. A focus upon the circumstances of transmission thus allows the larger part of sung poetry within the liturgy to be separated out, while retaining those pieces that also occurred in other contexts.

The source material that is to be examined in this study may thus initially be defined as notated verse in ninth- and tenth-century non-liturgical manuscripts. Although such a definition is clear in terms of what it excludes, the sources it includes would appear to resist any systematic investigation. One immediate problem is the identification of relevant manuscripts. Although all manuscripts written in Latin before the ninth century are collected together and described in the series CLA, no
comparable series exists for manuscripts dating from later centuries. Identification of verse manuscripts from the ninth century onwards is aided by the philological apparatus provided in several modern editions and in particular the monumental series *AH* and *MGH PAC*. Yet although the critical apparatus of such series are in many respects exhaustive, they are inconsistent in recording the presence of musical notation. The possibility that all relevant verse manuscripts might be cross-referenced with individual library catalogues is also frustrated by the inconsistency with which musical notation is signalled therein, especially where notation occurs as a later addition to a manuscript.

Such *lacunae* pose serious difficulties to research in so far as a rigorous identification of sources is ruled out. A second problem is that there is no pre-existing study of the transmission of early medieval verse upon the basis of which a representative or localised selection of sources might be drawn up. In seeking to avoid conflating unlike categories of sources in a manner similar to the conflation of unlike material in previous studies it is therefore necessary to undertake a paradigmatic study. The aim of this study will be to identify the types of sources in which such verse was transmitted and the conventions which governed their compilation.

As a focus for enquiry into the type of sources in which early medieval poetry was transmitted in the ninth and tenth century, manuscripts transmitting the poetry of a single author may be examined. Paulinus of Aquileia, as the first Carolingian poet to explore the artistic potential of rhythmical verse, is to be taken as the author most suited to the current investigation. In all, some twenty-one manuscripts from the

---

16 Bernard Bischoff was engaged in preparing a palaeographical survey of all ninth-century manuscripts before his death. At the time of writing, only one volume prepared by Bischoff has been published: *KFH*. To date, no comprehensive palaeographical study of manuscripts of the tenth century has been undertaken, although much can be recovered from H. Hoffmann, *Buchkunst und Königttum im ottonischen und frühsalischen Reich* (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae historica XXX), 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1986.

17 A survey of the manuscripts transmitting Carolingian poetry is also provided in E. Dümmler, ‘Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der lateinischen Dichtung aus der Zeit der Karolinger’, *NA IV* (1878), pp. 89-159, 239-322 and 511-82.
ninth and tenth centuries containing both rhythmical and metrical verse by Paulinus of Aquileia have survived. 18 None of these manuscripts consists solely, or even primarily, of the verse of Paulinus. In this respect Carolingian practice differed from antique and earlier Christian precedents, for whereas Claudianus, Sidonius Apollinaris, Avitus, Luxorius, Symphosius, Fortunatus, Eugenius of Toledo, Julian of Toledo, Aldhelm and Bede are all reported to have assembled collections of their own verse, there is no evidence to suggest that Carolingian poets did likewise. 19

The manuscripts in which the poetry of Paulinus is transmitted vary widely in composition. Few manuscripts transmit verse alone: in Be 394, a West Frankish collection of Prudentian carmina copied s. ix/x, a poem by Paulinus has been added to the flyleaf; 20 in Be 455 and Br 8860-8867 poems by Paulinus are copied amid predominantly strophic poetry by a number of different authors. 21 In the majority of manuscripts, prose works were copied alongside the poetry of Paulinus. In several manuscripts the poems of Paulinus were added to a work or works by a single author: for example, a single poem by Paulinus was added in the tenth century to Be 277, a manuscript of Ambrose’s De officiis ministrorum copied by several scribes at Fleury in the second third of the ninth century; 22 and several poems, including one by

---

18 For the attribution of poems to Paulinus and a list of surviving sources, see D. Norberg, L’oeuvre poétique de Paulin d’Aquilée, Stockholm, 1979, pp. 10-88.
19 For evidence relating to the composition of collections of their own poetry by early Christian authors, see G. Bernt, Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediavistik und Renaissance-Forschung II), Munich, 1968, pt II (‘Die Epigrammatik der Spätantike und des früheren Mittelalters bis zur Zeit der karolingischen Erneuerung’). The poetry of Alcuin and Theodulf was collected together into single manuscripts during the Carolingian era, but these were probably not authorial, and in both cases the manuscript disappeared after its use by a seventeenth-century editor: for details of these lost manuscripts, see MGH PAC I, pp. 164 and 442-3.
20 For full details of this collection, see H. Hagen, Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana), Bern, 1875, pp. 362-5. Date and provenance are after KFH, no. 590. For the notation of Mecum Timavi, see II: viii.
21 For the full contents of these collections, see Tables 13 and 15.
22 See Hagen, Catalogus, p. 304, and KFH, no. 567.
Paulinus, were added at a later stage to spaces left in a glossary of Ansileubus copied at Clermont Cathedral in the mid-tenth century.\textsuperscript{23}

Four manuscripts include the works of Paulinus amid material that is devotional or ritual in character; namely Pa lat. 1154, a manuscript that includes a penitential litany, prayers, and an extract from Isidore of Seville’s \textit{Synonyma};\textsuperscript{24} Ver XC (85), a homiliary with hymns and a martyrology;\textsuperscript{25} Ver LXXXVIII (83), a lectionary and antiphonary;\textsuperscript{26} and PaA 227, a pontifical from Poitiers.\textsuperscript{27} Of these four manuscripts, the first three include substantial collections of verse. A number of other manuscripts transmit poetry by Paulinus as isolated pieces in extensive collections: for example, Ka Aug. CXCV, a manuscript copied in Irish minuscule and half-uncial in a north-east Frankish centre c. 850, features verse by Paulinus in a collection of hymns copied after Augustine’s \textit{De quantitate animae}, Aurelian’s \textit{De prae sentia Dei} and a patristic \textit{florilegium} of ascetic excerpts;\textsuperscript{28} whilst in Pa lat. 242 a single verse by Paulinus is copied amid a veritable miscellany.\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} See G. de Poerck, ‘Le MS Clermont-Ferrand 240 (anc. 189), les “scriptoria” d’Auvergne et les origines spirituelles de la vie française de Saint Léger’, \textit{Scriptorium} XVIII (1964), pp. 11-33.
\item \textsuperscript{24} On the penitential features of this manuscript, see S. Barrett, ‘Music and Writing: On the Compilation of Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 1154’, \textit{EMH} XVI (1997), pp. 55-96.
\item \textsuperscript{25} For a description of this manuscript, see G. G. Meersseman, ‘Il codice XC della capitolare di Verona’, \textit{Archivio Veneto} CIV (1975), pp. 11-44. A more detailed palaeographical account of the manuscript has since been given in J. Borders, ‘The Cathedral of Verona as a Musical Center in the Middle Ages: its History, Manuscripts and Liturgical Practice’, Diss. Univ. of Chicago, 1983, pp. 467-84.
\item \textsuperscript{26} On this manuscript, see G. G. Meersseman, \textit{Les capitules du diurnal de Saint-Denis (Cod. Verona. cap. LXXXVIII, saec. IX)} (Spicilegium Friburgense XXX), Fribourg, 1986.
\item \textsuperscript{27} For the full contents of this manuscript, see H. Martin, \textit{Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal I}, Paris, 1885, pp. 118-21. On the appearance of a poem by Paulinus within this pontifical, see A. Wilmart, ‘L’hymne de Paulin sur Lazare dans un manuscrit d’Autun’, \textit{RB} XXXIV (1922), p. 28.
\item \textsuperscript{28} On this manuscript, see W. M. Lindsay, \textit{Early Irish Minuscule Script} (St Andrew’s University Publications VI), Oxford, 1910, pp. 57-60; B. Bischoff, ‘Irische Schreiber im Karolingerreich’, \textit{MAS} III, pp. 48-9 and \textit{KFH}, no. 1692.
\item \textsuperscript{29} For the full contents of this manuscript, see P. Lauer, \textit{Catalogue général des manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris I}, Paris, 1939, pp. 89-90.
\end{itemize}
In the absence of any authorised collection, the poetry of Paulinus was thus transmitted in a number of different types of source: verse collections and anthologies, authorial collections (consisting of the work or works of a single author), compilations of ritual material and varied compilations. This variety in material context highlights an underlying quality both of the poetry of Paulinus and much Carolingian poetic production; that is, a lack of any singular function or genre that leads to compilation alongside a range of other materials. A further significant feature of the manuscripts in which the poetry of Paulinus was transmitted is that none shares the same or even similar designs. The unique contents and organisation of these collections would appear to rule out any attempt to use the sources for categories upon which to base research into non-liturgical song. Nevertheless, it is apparent that notation was added almost exclusively to one type of collection: notation was added to all three verse collections or anthologies (Be 394, Be 455, Br 8860-8867) and to the verse collection included in one of the compilations of ritual material (Pa lat. 1154). Besides these verse collections, notation also appears in smaller collections of verse added to authorial collections; that is, Cl 240 and LoH 3091. This characteristic pattern in the addition of notation provides a material focus for investigation: notated verse in poetic collections.

Besides the methodological justification for basing research upon categories revealed in contemporary sources, an interest in notated verse within poetic collections serves as a pragmatic means of delimiting a field of research. There is at present no systematic means by which all surviving examples of notated verse may be identified and the number of sources involved in any enquiry that attempts to be comprehensive prohibits a close reading of all individual manuscripts. In considering poetic collections alone the number of manuscripts can be reduced to manageable proportions whilst the number of notated poetic pieces remains substantial. In taking these poetic collections as the focus for study, other examples of notated verse – such as those found as additions to authorial collections or as isolated examples within other forms of compilation – are not to be excluded from consideration since they promise invaluable information as to the status of the melodies notated in the collections. Other examples of notated verse are therefore to be considered in so far
In the absence of any authorised collection, the poetry of Paulinus was thus transmitted in a number of different types of source: verse collections and anthologies, authorial collections (consisting of the work or works of a single author), compilations of ritual material and varied compilations. This variety in material context highlights an underlying quality both of the poetry of Paulinus and much Carolingian poetic production; that is, a lack of any singular function or genre that leads to compilation alongside a range of other materials. A further significant feature of the manuscripts in which the poetry of Paulinus was transmitted is that none shares the same or even similar designs. The unique contents and organisation of these collections would appear to rule out any attempt to use the sources for categories upon which to base research into non-liturgical song. Nevertheless, it is apparent that notation was added almost exclusively to one type of collection: notation was added to all three verse collections or anthologies (Be 394, Be 455, Br 8860-8867) and to the verse collection included in one of the compilations of ritual material (Pa lat. 1154). Besides these verse collections, notation also appears in smaller collections of verse added to authorial collections; that is, Cl 240 and LoH 3091. This characteristic pattern in the addition of notation provides a material focus for investigation: notated verse in poetic collections.
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Besides the methodological justification for basing research upon categories revealed in contemporary sources, an interest in notated verse within poetic collections serves as a pragmatic means of delimiting a field of research. There is at present no systematic means by which all surviving examples of notated verse may be identified and the number of sources involved in any enquiry that attempts to be comprehensive prohibits a close reading of all individual manuscripts. In considering poetic collections alone the number of manuscripts can be reduced to manageable proportions whilst the number of notated poetic pieces remains substantial. In taking these poetic collections as the focus for study, other examples of notated verse – such as those found as additions to authorial collections or as isolated examples within other forms of compilation – are not to be excluded from consideration since they promise invaluable information as to the status of the melodies notated in the collections. Other examples of notated verse are therefore to be considered in so far
as they provide essential information relating to the nature of the information recorded in collections, but are not to be considered in detail in themselves.
4 Selected Sources

Having identified the types of manuscript to be studied, the precise limits of enquiry remain to be clarified. Again, the pattern of manuscript production may be taken as the best initial index to appropriate boundaries. After c. 900 the compilation of poetic collections declined as a more rigorous separation between poetry of different eras (classical and Christian), and different types (*versus*, sequences, hymns) was observed. With the exception of the ‘Cambridge Songs’ collection (CdG Gg. V. 35) no notated poetic collections have been identified from the later tenth and eleventh centuries.

Through consultation of the indices and apparatus provided in the philological, palaeographical and musicological studies identified above, six notated poetic collections copied between c. 800 and c. 925 are to be taken as sources for study:\textsuperscript{31}

**Table 1 Poetic collections with notation compiled before c. 1000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 8093</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{1/4}</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>Ile Barbe, Lyons (s. xvi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 2832</td>
<td>med.9\textsuperscript{2/4}</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>St Oyon (s. xi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br 8860-8867</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{c. %}</td>
<td>N. E. France, St Bertin?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{ex}</td>
<td>France, Paris?</td>
<td>Laon (s. x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>St Martial of Limoges (s. xii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 10029</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In drawing up this list of sources, two categories of collection have been excluded. First, partial collections have been excluded; that is, sources in which only a handful of verses have been collected together, usually as additions to a manuscript which was not originally compiled with these verses in mind. Examples of such notated partial


\textsuperscript{31} For the assignation of dates, origin and provenance, see Pt. II. For brief descriptions of these manuscripts, see the Appendix.
collections include Na IV. G. 68, a manuscript copied at St Gall in the late ninth century which transmits works by Boethius, Prudentius and Capella and to which was added in the early years of the tenth century some fourteen verses of which nine were notated, and Cl 240, a mid tenth-century manuscript copied probably at Clermont Cathedral which transmits the Liber glossarum and to which were added at a later date nine verses of which three were notated.

A more difficult problem of definition is posed by the inclusion of metra of late antique authors such as Prudentius and Boethius in both Pa lat. 1154 and Be 455. Since these metra were typically transmitted in authorial compilations and as part of larger works (such as the Liber cathemerinon, the Peristefanon and the De consolatione philosophiae), they have in general been excluded from consideration. In Pa lat. 1154, however, three Boethian metra are included in the verse collection and thus share an equal status with the other notated verse: these metra have been included in this study. Where Boethian and Prudentian metra are not treated as independent works, but presented in the same order as in their original works and copied in a separate section of the collection (as in Be 455, fols. 25r-40v), they have not been included. In part, this exclusion is a matter of defining the limits of enquiry, for in so far as the metra are presented within a larger group they no longer form wholly independent pieces. In part, however, the exclusion is a pragmatic matter, for any attempt to identify and analyse the surviving notations for all these Boethian and Prudentian metra would require a separate study.


33 See de Poerck, ‘Le MS Clermont-Ferrand’, pp. 24-30.

34 Numerous notated passages in Carolingian manuscripts of the poetry of antique authors such as Horace, Lucan, Statius, Terence and Virgil have also been excluded owing to their inclusion within authorial compilations. For the relevant notated manuscripts, see Y.-F. Riou, ‘Chronologie et provenance des manuscrits classiques latins neumés’, in RHT XXI (1991), pp. 77-113.
Summary

The six notated poetic collections that form the material basis for this dissertation were neither compiled in one place nor, if one bears in mind both the later additions of text and music, within a narrowly circumscribed period of time. The justification for taking them as a coherent category for research resides not so much in any chronological or geographical consistency as in a unified phenomenon that they represent. It is the act of collecting together, presenting and editing music and poetry on the page that draws together these collections and represents a distinctively Carolingian activity the effects of which continued to be felt in later centuries.

By fixing attention on poetic collections, a category has been selected which cuts across conventional distinctions according to date, subject matter or function. Poetic collections nevertheless form a consistent material basis for research – a single lens through which to view strophic song from late antiquity through to the Carolingian renaissance. As a result of selecting both a topic (early medieval verse and music) and a specific medium (poetic collections), the focus of the following study is accordingly twofold. In the first part of this dissertation, manuscripts containing notated poetry are to be examined as products of their immediate cultural environment. In the second part, notated survivals are to be examined as witnesses to a wider tradition of musical and poetic practice.
PART II

Ninth- and Tenth-Century Poetic Collections
I

II

Ninth- and Tenth-Century
Poetic Collections

1 Precursors

Few direct precursors for ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections survive. Transmission of Latin poetry in codices copied before the Carolingian era occurred for the most part in authorial compilations; that is, in manuscripts transmitting one or more works by a single author. Codices typically contained either single extended works (such as Virgil’s Aeneid, Georgics or Eclogues, Lucan’s Pharsalia, Terence’s Andria, Aesop’s fabulae, Sedulius’ Carmen paschale or Iuvenecus’ Evangelium libri quattuor), or several works by the same author (such as a combination of Virgilian opera, or Prudentian carmina), or compilations of their own poetry by the authors themselves.¹ Less common were collections of a single type of verse – prominent examples from the centuries preceding the Carolingian era include the Epigrammata Bobiensia (an anonymous collection of poetry compiled c. 400 AD),² the Aenigmata

¹ There is to date no single study on the transmission of verse from late antiquity to the Carolingian era. The series CLA provides an account of extant sources from this era. Information relating to lost codices has been drawn from G. Bernt, Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter (Münchener Beiträge zur Medialistik und Renaissance-Forschung II), Munich, 1968 and L. Reynolds (ed.), Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics, Oxford, 1983.
hexasticha (a collection of riddles compiled c. 700 AD), 3 collections of syllogae, 4 and hymnals. 5

Collections of multiple genres of verse by a number of different authors, as represented by the six poetic collections to be considered here, can only exceptionally be identified before the ninth century. The most notable example is the so-called Anthologia Latina, 6 a collection of some 380 short Latin poems, as well as a few prose pieces, compiled in North Africa c. 530 AD and now most fully preserved in the Codex Salmasianus (Pa lat. 10318). 7 By the mid-ninth century significant portions of the Anthologia Latina were copied in the northern Frankish kingdoms. 8 These

3 For the Aenigmata hexasticha, see MGH PAC IV. 2, pp. 732-59. The manuscript in which the aenigmata are preserved is Be 611 (fols 42v-93v) (CLA VII, 604).
4 On the tradition of syllogae, see the survey and tables in A. Silvagni (ed.), ICUR n. s. I, Rome, 1922, pp. xvii-xxviii.
5 The only collections of hymns to have survived in pre-Carolingian manuscripts are the Bangor Antiphonary, Mi C. 5. Inf, and its related bifolia, Tur F. IV. 1. Fasc. 9 (see CLA III, 311 and IV, 454), and the Vespasian Psalter, Lo Cotton Vesp. A. I (CLA II, 193). For a further lost hymnal, see H. Gneuss, Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter, Tübingen, 1968, pp. 16-7.
6 The term Anthologia Latina is abbreviated from the title used by Burman in his edition of 1759-73: Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum sive Catalecta Poetarum Latinorum. The material included in the two-volume edition of Riese which goes under the title Anthologia Latina is a collection of hundreds of antique and medieval verses transmitted in manuscripts written before the twelfth century: see A. Riese (ed.), Carmina in codicibus scripta. Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina (Anthologia Latina pars prior), 2 vols., Leipzig, 1894 and 1906 (2nd ed.). The most recent edition by Shackleton-Bailey distinguishes between verse included in the main representative of the African collection (Pa lat. 10318), and verse transmitted in other manuscripts whose contents overlap with the Codex Salmasianus and thus may have formed part of the original collection: see D. Shackleton-Bailey, Anthologia Latina I Carmina in codicibus scripta, Stuttgart, 1983.
7 For a description of the manuscript, see CLA V, 593. For the revised date and origin, see B. Bischoff, ‘Manuscripts in the Age of Charlemagne’, in idem, Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne (ed. and trans. M. Gorman), Cambridge, 1994, p. 44.
8 Two extensive poetic anthologies from the mid-ninth century provide a substantial witness to the dissemination of the Anthologia Latina: Lei Voss. lat. Q. 86 (c. 850, central France) and Pa lat. 8071 (region of Paris). The latter is a copy of an early classical poetic anthology and contains, besides verses by Juvenal and Eugenius of Toledo, rarities such as Grattius’ Cynegeticon and the pseudo-Ovidian Halieuticon, as well as seventy-three poems from the Anthologia Latina, Catullus’ carmen 62 and selections from Seneca’s Troades, Medea and Oedipus. The former (fols. 91-116) contains thirty-nine
portions may have acted as models for Carolingian poetic collections in so far as they transmitted collections of relatively short poems loosely arranged according to theme and authorship. Nevertheless, it remains doubtful whether a direct line of influence can be traced from the Anthologia Latina to Carolingian poetic collections. First, Carolingian collections in which material from the Anthologia Latina was copied transmitted poetry that was almost exclusively antique; only one case of textual concordance between the two traditions can be traced.9 Second, the poetry of the Anthologia Latina may be considered verse of a single genre in so far as the short length of the individual poems (most are between two and twelve lines) indicates that the majority of the compositions remained within the tradition of the antique epigram.10

In the absence of any extant direct models for Carolingian poetic collections among manuscripts transmitting poetry, attention passes to other types of collection that may have acted as predecessors. Didactic compilations, or compilations intended to aid learning, were composed in some number between late antiquity and the Carolingian era.11 Although it found no imitators, Prosper of Aquitaine’s versified sententiae drawn from the works of Augustine were evidently used in school teaching from the sixth century through to the time of Notker Balbulus.12 In the sixth century, Eugippius also composed a collection of excerpts from St Augustine, although his poems of which only two are not found also in Pa lat. 8071. For a concise summary of the textual traditions that make up the Anthologia Latina, see Reynolds (ed.), Texts and Transmission, pp. 9-13. 9 The argumenta Vergiliana, which principally summarize the Aeneid and are attributed to Ovid, are copied in a collection that was originally bound with Pa lat. 8093; that is, Lei Voss. lat F. 111 – see below, pp. 30-2. These argumenta were earlier transmitted in the sixth-century Codex Romanus (Vat lat. 3867; CLA I, 19).

10 See Bernt, Das lateinische Epigramm, pp. 112-5.
11 On the use of florilegia for didactic purposes in antiquity, see H.-I. Marrou, Histoire de l’éducation dans l’antiquité, Paris, 1948, pp. 225-6 and 521 (n. 4). Rare instances of antique florilegia whose contents may be reconstructed include a collection of the sententiae of Publius Syrus for school use and a collection of speeches and letters excerpted from the Bella and Historiae of Sallust: see Reynolds, Texts and Transmission, pp. 327-9 and 343.
12 For full details, see Bernt, Das lateinische Epigramm, pp. 86-7.
anthology was in prose form.\textsuperscript{13} In his \textit{Institutiones divinarum et humanarum lectionum} (c. 550) Cassiodorus mentioned that he compiled books of the \textit{introductores} and \textit{expositores} to scripture into one volume.\textsuperscript{14} Turning to Insular compilations, Bede records that he composed patristic \textit{florilegia} for use in teaching the monks at Jarrow,\textsuperscript{15} whilst from Ireland the eighth-century grammatical compilation \textit{Donatus Ortigraphus} survives in various redactions.\textsuperscript{16}

Besides didactic collections, there was a strong tradition of collection in the field of canon law before the ninth century. Numerous collections of conciliar and papal decrees were composed and disseminated from c. 700 onwards; in particular the \textit{Collectio Dionysiana} and its derivatives circulated widely in the late seventh and early eighth centuries.\textsuperscript{17} A separate tradition consisted of compilations of ascetic

\textsuperscript{13} Vat. lat. 3375 (CLA I, 16). A mid-eighth century copy of Eugippius' collection was made in Tours – Pa n. a. lat. 1575 (CLA V, 682).

\textsuperscript{14} Cassiodorus, \textit{Institutiones divinarum et saecularum litterarum} I, ch. x (De modis intelligentiae): Primum est post huius operis instituta ut ad introductores Scripturae divinae, quos postea repperimus, solicta mente redeamus, id est Ticonium Donatistam, sanctum Augustinum "de Doctrina Christiana", Adrianum, Eucherium et Junilium; quos sedula curiositate collegi, ut quibus erat similis intentio, in uno corpore adunati codices clauderentur; qui modos elocutionum explanationis qui modos elocutionum explanationis causa formantes per exemplorum diversas similitudines intelligi faciunt, quae prius clausa manserunt, R. A. B. Mynors (ed.), \textit{Cassiodori senatoris Institutiones}, Oxford, 1937, p. 34. 'The first thing for us to do after having been instructed by the present manual is to return solicitously to the writers of introductory works on the Sacred Scripture, writers whose works we have eventually discovered: that is, Ticonius the Donatist, St Augustine "On Christian Learning", Adrian, Eucherius, and Junilius; I have collected their works with sedulous care in order that codices with the same purpose may be held united in a single collection; by their various explanations and examples these men make known matters which were previously unknown', L. W. Jones (trans.), \textit{An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings}, New York, 1946, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{15} See A. Wilmart, 'La collection de Bède le Vénérable sur l’Apôtre', \textit{RB} XXVIII (1926), pp. 16-52. On patristic \textit{florilegia} in general, see J. de Ghellinck, 'Diffusion, utilisation et transmission des écrits patristiques', \textit{Gregorianum} XIV (1933), pp. 356-400.


\textsuperscript{17} A brief summary of the dissemination of collections of canon law from c. 700-900 is provided in R. E. Reynolds, 'The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700-900', in \textit{The New Cambridge Medieval History} II c. 700-900 (ed. R. McKitterick), Cambridge, 1995, pp. 613-7.
canons for purposes of private penance, the so-called *libri paenitentiales*, which flourished in Ireland from the sixth century onwards before subsequent dissemination on the continent.\(^\text{18}\) Ascetic *florilegia*, consisting of extracts arranged according to common themes drawn from a number of different authors, were compiled in some number from the seventh century onwards, including such works as Isidore of Seville’s *Sententiae*, Aldhelm’s prose version of the *De laudibus virginitatis*, the *Admonitio*, and towards the end of the century Defensor of Ligugé’s *Liber scintillarum*.\(^\text{19}\)

Once more, the extent to which any of these moralistic or didactic collections provided direct models for Carolingian poetic collections is to be doubted, since, unlike most of the compilations mentioned above, poetic collections did not consist of extracts arranged into chapters. Nevertheless, the principle of selecting from existing materials to form compilations directed towards immediate and pragmatic ends was one that extended from late antiquity into the Carolingian era and into poetic collections in particular. Rather than a continuous material tradition, it is this principle of selection according to immediate use which provides the background to poetic collections to be considered here. Pragmatic selection is manifest in other Carolingian poetic collections of multiple authorship and genre such as the collections of ‘school authors’ (Virgil, Iuvenecus, Sedulius, Avienus and the *Disticha Catonis*) that were evidently intended for teaching purposes.\(^\text{20}\) A further example of pragmatic selection is to be found in Carolingian poetic *florilegia*, collections of single lines.

\(^{18}\) Texts and translations of the Irish penitentials are provided in L. Bieler (ed., with an appendix by D. A. Binchy), *The Irish Penitentials (Scriptores Latini Hiberniae V)*, Dublin, 1963. For the manuscript dissemination, see idem, *The Irish Penitentials*, pp. 12-27.


drawn from both pagan and Christian authors which were compiled not for purposes of metrical teaching, but to clarify accentuation in difficult cases.  

The formation of poetic collections in the Carolingian era may thus be seen as part of a wider phenomenon of compilation that was practiced with some regularity from late antiquity onwards. Compilation proved particularly suited to the task of cultural re-alignment faced during this period, for on the one hand it allowed a placing of oneself within a tradition as represented by selected auctoritates, and on the other it enabled a re-working of that tradition while making it both accessible and relevant to contemporary concerns. This twofold dimension of compilation has recently been brought to attention in consideration of Carolingian compilations: florilegia compiled by authors such as Alcuin and Florus of Lyons have been seen to be motivated by contemporary theological debates; the extent to which specula served as political manifestos in addition to their personalized presentation of established moral teaching has been indicated; and a judicious editing and arrangement of material in order to isolate moral teaching from pagan ideology has been observed in compilations such as those of Heiric of Auxerre and Hadoard of Corbie.  

---


24 Hadoard took pains both to suppress proper names and historical allusions and to christianize extracts by, among other means, replacing Dei with Deus: see B. Munk-Olsen, ‘Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle’, RHT IX (1979), p. 53 (n. 1). For the Collectanea of Heiric see R. Quadri (ed.), I collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre (Spicilegium Friburgense XI), Freiburg, 1966. On the Collectaneum of Hadoard, which contains extracts from the De Trinitate of Augustine alongside extensive quotations from Cicero, as well as Sallust, Macrobius, Servius,
Compilation placed existing texts in new environments and in the process created new modes of reading, writing and transmission. It is precisely these textual environments that form the focus for the following investigation, for, in so far as the meaning of individual poems was dependent upon the context within which they were interpreted, the textual environments of the manuscripts provide a primary source of information relating to the contemporary evaluation of poetry and, where notated, music. In seeking to explore these textual environments, the following chapter is divided into two parts: in the first part, I shall analyse individual poetic collections; in the second part, I shall identify common conventions of compilation and use.

2 Individual Collections

An attempt to examine poetic collections not only brings a new set of questions to bear upon early medieval poetry, but also provides a new angle from which to approach the notation that appears in these manuscripts. The main editions of early medieval poetry, with their roots in nineteenth-century scholarship, concentrated on establishing ‘best’ texts, ascribing authorship and tracing chronologies of composition. In presenting texts according to the same criteria, the poetry has been represented in forms that it never assumed in contemporary manuscripts. As the poetry appears in ninth- and tenth-century collections, the texts often vary in content from source to source, they are routinely misattributed or lack indications of authorship, and almost always are copied alongside verse of differing dates of composition or non-poetic material. The poems are also frequently ordered into schemes of local significance, and most often laid out in ways which reflect a specific understanding of the material – a presentation that includes the disposition of the verse across the page, punctuation and the addition of musical notation.

By focusing on the material context for ninth- and tenth-century verse, it is hoped in this section to move away from questions of authorship and style towards an appreciation of the uses and users of verse. This approach entails a series of questions concerning the contents of such collections, their compilers and readers, and their circumstances of production and reception. Notation is included in such an enquiry as one among several elements involved in the presentation and elaboration of verse in a written context. The questions addressed to notation will thus be similar to those

25 In the series MGH PAC poetry is arranged according to projected chronologies and authorship, and the latinity of the sources is routinely altered. Strecker’s volume of Merovingian and Carolingian rhythmical poetry in part follows the order found in certain sources, but not only is the material selected from these sources partial, but the principles for the identification of ‘rhythmical poetry’ are not articulated: for Strecker’s own account of the organisation employed in his edition, see MGH PAC IV. 2, p. 454. In the series AH, selection is made in part on the basis of manuscripts used, in part on the basis of authorship and in part on the basis of genre (hymn, sequence, rhymed Office etc.): arrangement of material is thus dependent upon the criteria adopted for individual volumes. The latinity of the sources is again often altered; the syllable count of rhythmical verses in particular is often regularised.
addressed to texts; that is, enquiry into the choice of texts notated, the extent of notation added, the possible uses and users of such notation, and the relation of notation to other textual additions. Where musical notation assumes particular importance is in the witness it provides to later reception, for while the anthologies to be considered here were composed before c. 925, most notation was added to sources after that date.

Each of the six notated poetic collections will now be examined in turn. The scribes, contents and order of the texts will be considered first, followed by notation and other later additions. The order in which the anthologies are discussed is dependent not upon any systematic principle, but upon similarities in content.

i Pa lat. 8093

d (a) Texts

Pa lat. 8093 is a composite manuscript that consists almost entirely of poetic material. The contents and main text scribes are shown in Table 2.26

---

26 All ninth-century dates in Table 2 are reproduced from Bischoff’s notes on ninth-century manuscripts, held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.
Table 2  A summary of the contents and scribes of Pa lat. 8093

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Summary of Content</th>
<th>Scribes and Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1-32v   | *Carmen paschale* – Sedulius  
*Carmen de septem diebus* – Dracontius  
Spanish *syllogae epigraphicae*  
carmina – Eugenius of Toledo  
Disticha Catonis  
carmen – Fortunatus  
Spanish *syllogae* and Eugenius carmina  
Dracontius carmen in the recension of Eugenius  
carmina – Martin of Duma, Damasus and Bassus | A, 9\(^{1/4}\) |
| 33-36v  | carmina – Theodulf of Orleans  
*Judicii signum*  
carmen – Julianus to Bishop Modoin  
*Versus in bibliotheca* – Isidore of Seville | B, 9\(^{1/4}\) |
| 37-38v  | *Vita Vergilii* – Foca  
carmen (frag.) – Paulinus of Nola  
carmen – Agrestius | A, 9\(^{1/4}\) |
| 39-47v  | *Versus in psalmorum*  
Fragment of the passion of St Aigulf | C, 9\(^{m-2/4}\) |
| 48\(^{v}\) |  
Fragment of the passion of St Aigulf | D, 10/11 |
| 52-59v  | *Fabulae* – Avienus  
Anon. fragment on grammar | F, 10 |
| 60-68\(^{v}\) | *Virgil opera supposita*  
Anon. fragment on grammar | G, 9\(^{7/4}\) |
| 69-83\(^{v}\) |  
Fragment of bk 12 of the Aeneid  
varia carmina | H, 9\(^{7-m/4}\) |
| 84-94\(^{v}\) | *Disticha Catonis*  
Anon. fragment on grammar | I, 9\(^{1/4}\) |
| 94-95\(^{v}\) | varia carmina  
Anon. fragment on grammar | F, 10 |
| 96-148\(^{v}\) | *carmen de pulsibus et urinis* with commentary – Aegidius | J, 13 |

As can be seen from this table, Pa lat. 8093 is a veritable miscellany. The material it contains was copied at various places and, with the exception of the final section, over
the course of two centuries. The date at which the material was collected into a single volume is difficult to identify: the current binding dates from the early nineteenth century and it is most likely that the various sections were compiled by the binder. The first section of the manuscript (fol. 1-38), however, can be shown to have formed a unity at the time of copying and is to be examined here.

The opening thirty-eight folios of Pa lat. 8093 were copied by two or three Spanish emigrants in Lyon during the first quarter of the ninth century. The visigothic minuscule used by these emigrants is not uniform: the hand of scribe B is unsteady, especially in the execution of ligatures, ‘e’ and ‘r’ forms, and letters are generously spaced. The folios copied by scribe B are also unruled, accentuating the uneven disposition of the script in comparison to scribe A. The possibility that the folios copied by scribe B did not originally form an interpolation within the two groups copied by scribe A is confirmed by gathering signatures. The opening thirty-two folios contain the signatures QII-QIV, and on fol. 38v is found the signature QIX.

27 The early ninth-century visigothic minuscule of the opening thirty-eight folios, for example, is followed by a gathering of mid ninth-century perfected caroline minuscule from Corbie. On the Corbie origin of fols. 39r-47v, see D. Ganz, Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance, Sigmaringen, 1990, pp. 64 and 148.

Tafel has shown that the missing five quaternios can now be found in Lei Voss. lat. F. 111.\textsuperscript{29} This Leiden manuscript, copied by a scribe writing in the same style as scribe A in Pa lat. 8093, consists mainly of the collected poetry of Ausonius, complemented by a couple of letters by Paulinus and a selection of late antique poetry.\textsuperscript{30} This manuscript not only provides a glimpse of an earlier compilation, but clarifies the relation of scribe A to scribe B. The shaky forms of scribe B are found in the Leiden manuscript in a marginal note on fol. 11r;\textsuperscript{31} scribe B was thus a reader of the original compilation of A. It follows that fols. 33r-36v most likely postdated the sections copied by A, and it may be conjectured that they were added to A’s compilation by scribe B himself. A further indication of the early history of this opening section of Pa lat. 8093 is provided by the presence of the script of Florus of Lyons (d. 859 or 860) in the lower margin of fol. 33r.\textsuperscript{32} Two verses were added by Florus to the section copied by scribe B.

The full contents of the earlier compilation copied by scribe A are shown in Table 3:


\textsuperscript{30} For a full description of Lei Voss. lat. F. 111, see K. de Meyier, Codices Vossiani Latini I Codices in folio, Leiden, 1993, pp. 235-40.

\textsuperscript{31} See Tafel, ‘Die vordere’, p. 632. For a facsimile of fol. 11r, see the insert preceding MGH AA V Pars posterior.

\textsuperscript{32} Attention was drawn to this specimen of the handwriting of Florus in Charlier, ‘Une oeuvre inconnue’, p. 94 (n. 31). The attribution is repeated in Bischoff’s notes held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript /Folios</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Pa lat. 8093) 1\textsuperscript{-}15\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Carmen paschale</em> – Sedulius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Carmen de septem diebus</em> – Dracontius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15\textsuperscript{r}-16\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>Spanish <em>syllogae epigraphicae</em> (ICUR II. 1, pp. 293-5, nos 1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16\textsuperscript{r}-20\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Eugenius of Toledo (<em>MGH AA</em> XIV, nos. 1-4, 6-7, 9-14, 5, 16, 18-19, 28, 36-39, 42, 70, 97-100, 96, 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20\textsuperscript{r}-23\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>Disticha Catonis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Aspera condicio et sors</em> – Fortunatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Sume miser</em> – Pseudo-Isidore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24\textsuperscript{r}-v</td>
<td>Spanish <em>syllogae</em> (ICUR II. 1, pp. 295-6, nos. 9-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24\textsuperscript{v}</td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Eugenius of Toledo (<em>MGH AA</em> XIV, nos. 80-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25\textsuperscript{r}-32\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>Dracontius <em>De laudibus Dei</em> in the recension of Eugenius of Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Primus in orbe dies</em> – Eugenius of Toledo, summary of Dracontius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{r}-v</td>
<td><em>Post evangelicum, Non hic auratis, Pannonis genitus</em> – Martin of Duma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{v}</td>
<td><em>iam dudum Saulus</em> – Damasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{v}</td>
<td><em>Hic posuit cineres</em> – Bassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{v}</td>
<td><em>Aspicite venientes</em> – Anon. epitaph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lei Voss. lat. F 111) 1\textsuperscript{r}-33\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td>Ausonius – <em>Praefationes, Epheremis, eclogae, precationes, Parentalia, Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium, epitaphia, eclogae, Domestica, Ordo urbiun nobilium, Technopaegnion, Ludus septem Sapientum, De xii caesaribus, De fastis, Gripphus and epistulae</em> (see Prete (ed.), pp. xvi-xix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33\textsuperscript{r}-v</td>
<td><em>epistulae ad Ausonium</em> – Paulinus of Nola (<em>CSEL</em> 30 nos. 11 and 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35bis\textsuperscript{v}</td>
<td><em>oration</em> – Paulinus of Nola (<em>CSEL</em> 30 no. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35bis\textsuperscript{r}-36\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>epigrammata</em> – Ausonius (see Prete, pp. xix-xx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36\textsuperscript{r}-v</td>
<td><em>epistulae ad Gestidium et Nicetam</em> – Paulinus of Nola (<em>CSEL</em> nos. 1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Heu misera in nimios</em> – Sulpicius Lupercus Serbatus Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Quid faciant leges</em> – Petronius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td><em>Omnia quae</em> – Claudianus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This collection of material, unlike the miscellaneous content of the rest of the manuscript, shows evidence of careful design. Prete has noted that the arrangement of the works of Ausonius in the Leiden manuscript follows a broadly ‘logical’ order based on associations of content.33 After opening with the Praefationes, the Ephemeris describe daily occupations and are followed by selected eclogues dealing with the structure of weeks and months. There follows a group of commemorative works (Parentalia, Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium, and epitaphia that celebrate heroes of the Trojan war), before two series guided by a single outlook: the remaining eclogae are Pythagorean reflections on morality and measurement, whereas the Domestica (De herediolo, Versus paschales, Oratio consulis Ausonii versibus rhopalicis and Epicidion in patrem) are verse related to personal arrangements.34 The final section consists of verse on unrelated topics: verse in praise of major cities (Ordo urbis nobilium), verse constructed around monosyllables (Technopaegnion), on seven Greek sages (Ludus septem Sapientum), on the twelve Caesars (De xii caesaribus), on consuls (De fastis) and on the number three (Griphus).

Associations of content can also be discerned in the remainder of the collection. Paulinus of Nola’s epistulae in response to Ausonius are naturally placed between the epistulae and epigrammata of Ausonius. The oratio included here is also

34 The Domestica grouping was proposed by Peiper: see R. Peiper (ed.), Ausonius, Leipzig, 1866, p. xv.
of immediate relevance since it echoes Ausonius’s own prayer in the *Ephemeris*.\(^{35}\) After the first set of Ausonian *epigrammata* was then copied Paulinus’ *epistulae* to Gestidius, which contains a rhetorical defence of Paulinus’ poverty. Following the second set of Ausonian *epigrammata* are works by the antique poets Sulpicius Lupercus Serbastus Iunior, Petronius (d. 65 AD) and Claudian (late fourth century AD) of which the final poem by Claudianus is a close imitation of the preceding Petronius poem.\(^{36}\) The final group of material (fols. 38v-40v) is clearly directed towards an understanding of Virgil and is completed by Foca’s *Vita Vergili*, which begins the ninth gathering now in Pa lat. 8093.

A loose association of individual pieces can also be traced in Pa lat. 8093. The collected verse of Eugenius includes only verse on moral and religious subjects; almost all the Eugenian proverbs and verse on nature have been excluded.\(^{37}\) Whether this omission reflects deliberate selection by the compiler or merely the availability of material cannot be discerned on the basis of internal evidence alone. There is nevertheless circumstantial evidence for deliberate selection in so far as much of the other verse in these initial gatherings is similarly moral-didactic in tone: Sedulius’ *Carmen paschale*, epigraphs on exemplary figures, the *Disticha Catonis*, and Eugenius’ recension of Dracontius’ account of Genesis.

Turning to small-scale ordering, the Eugenian verse in Pa lat. 8093 is clearly divided into two sections. The first consists of verse on the broad theme of repentance, which is itself broken into several smaller groups: nos. 1-4, 6 and 7 are strongly moralistic in outlook; nos. 9-12 are inscriptions from basilicas on the topic of saints; nos 13-14 and 5 are prayers for forgiveness; and nos. 16-19 and 28 are concerned with death – first Eugenius’ own epitaph calling the reader to remember his

---

\(^{35}\) Line 7 of Paulinus’ *oratio* is taken almost *verbatim* from line 65 of Ausonius’ prayer: the former reads *nulla sit ac bene posse ad sit tranquilla potestas*; the latter reads *nulla sit et bene posse ad sit tranquilla potestas*: see G. de Hartel (ed.), *Sancti Ponti Meropii Paulini Nolani opera* (CSEL 30), Vienna, 1894, pp. 3 and 6.

\(^{36}\) For this sequence of poems, see A. Riese (ed.), *Anthologia Latina* II, pp. 116-20 (nos. 648-52).

\(^{37}\) *Dura quae gignit*, the only Eugenian verse included here that is specifically on the topic of nature, was added to fol. 24v by a different, although contemporary, hand.
own life, then two prayers for Eugenius’ death and an epitaph for Nicholas Evantius (Bishop of Toledo in 586).

The second section of Eugenian verse is concerned with broader social topics and is more rhetorical both in complexity and address. Two groups are visible within the second section: nos. 36-9 and 42 elaborate single topics (the joys of Christ as opposed to the devil, the seven days of creation, the ten plagues of Egypt, the invention of letters and living species); nos. 70, 97-100 are all epistolary in form. The final two poems, nos. 96 and 78, on the times of the year and a prayer before sleep, appear unrelated in topic to either of the sections outlined.

The remaining verse in Pa lat. 8093 displays not an association of individual pieces, but a common theme. The manuscript opens with the biblical material of Sedulius’ Carmen paschale and Dracontius’ Carmen de septem diebus. This is followed by eight epigraphs of which six relate to eminent Spanish figures from the sixth to eighth centuries, whilst two (nos. 5 and 6) are taken from Jerome’s letter to Eustochium and relate to the austere St Paula (d. 405). The moral-didactic theme is continued after the Eugenian verse in the shape of the moral maxims of the Disticha Catonis. The tone of these maxims is continued by the following five Eugenius verses, which are also proverbial distichs. Either side of these verses are further exempla: Fortunatus’ long hexameter poem to King Chilperic (561-84) outlining essentials of the Christian faith, the Pseudo-Isidore confession, and four further epigraphs. There follows Eugenius’ recension of Dracontius’ first book on Genesis from De laudibus Dei, a lengthy didactic poem in which the author attempts to justify the ways of God to man. The seven verses which close the first part of Pa lat. 8093 are once more epigraphs: three, of which the last is an epitaph, from the monastery of St Martin of Duma (near Braga), one confession in praise of St Paul (Damasus), and three further epitaphs.

On comparing the content of these Leiden quaternios to those of the Paris manuscript it would appear that differences are more marked than continuities. Broadly speaking, the Paris gatherings transmit poetry by Christian authors, whereas the Leiden gatherings transmit poetry by pagan authors. There are, however, two
significant exceptions to this pattern: the Disticha Catonis in Pa lat. 8093 and the selected works of Paulinus of Nola in Lei Voss. lat. F. 111. It might also be said that the Paris gatherings contain moral-didactic material, whereas the Leiden gatherings contain material concerned with worldly affairs. Yet such a distinction is also problematic: Virgil was certainly used for didactic purposes, and the status of the epigraphs that appear in both sections in such a scheme is unclear.

A sharper definition is provided by a consideration of metrical complexity. The collection opens with the Carmen paschale by Sedulius and the Carmen de septem diebus by Dracontius, both of which retell biblical stories in straightforward hexameters. There follows a collection of epigraphs in a mixture of hexameters and elegiac distichs, interspersed with carmina of Eugenius that are likewise restricted in metrical form (hexameters, elegiacs and trochaic tetrameters). The only other metrical form that appears among the Eugenian verse, the sapphic strophe Dura quae gignit, is placed at the end of the selection and was added by a different, albeit contemporary, scribe. Amid the epigraphs and the Eugenian carmina appear the Disticha Catonis, a collection of some one hundred and thirty moral maxims of the late third or early fourth century written in hexameter couplets. Also included are the elegiacs of Fortunatus and the hexameters attributed to Isidore. The final gathering of the Paris manuscript consists of Eugenius’ recensions of Dracontius, again in hexameters, and a number of poems of various authorship either in hexameters or elegiacs.

The subsequent Ausonius verse of Lei Voss. lat. F. 111 is composed in more complex metres: dactylic trimeter and tetramer catalectic, anapaestic monometer, dimeter procleukatic and trimeter catalectic, iambic dimeter and trimeter, trochaic tetramer catalectic, Phalaecian, choriambic trimeter, and numerous metres with lines of alternating constructions. Despite this variety in metrical forms, the technical mastery of Ausonius is most fully displayed in the more frequently employed hexameters and elegiacs; for example, Spes Deus aeternae from the Oratio urbiunm

38 For a conspectus of the metres employed by Eugenius, see MGH AA XIV, p. 443.
39 A conspectus of the metres employed by Ausonius is included in MGH AA V Pars posterior, pp. 295-6.
nobilium is in rhopalic hexameters (where each word contains one more syllable than the one before) and the Technopaegnion is a rhetorical showpiece in which each verse ends with a monosyllable. Although the exchanges between Paulinus and Ausonius copied after the main body of Ausonius’ works are less complex in form, the style is no less rhetorical; each employs a range of argumentative and literary device in an attempt to convince the other of their position.  

An equally stylised series of late antique poems including Claudianus’ rhetorical imitation of Petronius’ verse on dreams follows this exchange.  

The Leiden manuscript closes with various verse introductions that act as thematic summaries to the work of Virgil. Finally, the ninth gathering in Pa lat. 8093 transmits Foca’s Vita Vergillii composed in hexameters. Two incomplete verses follow a lacuna: the closing lines of Paulinus’ poem in praise of John the Baptist and the opening lines of Agrestius’ exposition of the faith addressed to Avitus.

A graded two-part structure can thus be discerned. The initial Paris gatherings transmit elementary material, the appreciation of whose structures requires only basic grammatical training; that is, an ability to recognise simple verse forms and to comprehend either literal or familiar linguistic content. In the second section, the Ausonius and late antique verse is more rhetorical in impulse, comprising complex lyric metres, exercises on stock themes, and epistolary exchange. Finally, the closing material relating to Virgil remains rhetorical in impulse in so far as it paraphrases and isolates arguments from stock material.

The precise implications of this progression from grammatical to rhetorical material are unclear. Whether the book was used for teaching purposes, or the compiler simply adopted a familiar scheme for purposes of imposing order on diverse material must remain an open question. Some hints about the reception of this compilation can nevertheless be gained from the work of scribe B, a contemporary reader of the initial compilation as evident from the note on fol. 11r of Lei Voss. lat. F. 111. The inserted folios written by scribe B contain, beside further poetry by

---

40 For an account of the rhetorical techniques used by Ausonius to coax his son from estrangement, see F. Raby, *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages I*, Oxford, 1934, pp. 61-4.  
41 Riese (ed.), *Anthologia Latina II*, 651 (Petronius) and 652 (Claudianus).
Spanish authors in the shape of Theodulf of Orléans and Isidore of Seville, the letter of Julian of Toledo to Bishop Modoin on the necessity of metrical (rather than rhythmical) and prose composition in learning. Whether or not the folios copied by scribe B were a contemporary insertion into the initial compilation, it would thus seem that the interests of at least one reader lay in metrical learning. Further to the folios copied by scribe B, an interest in metrical design is displayed by the metrical descriptions added to the Leiden manuscript by a contemporary hand writing visigothic minuscule.

i (b) Diacritical signs

Diacritical signs – an ‘acute’ accent ( '), a metrical long ( '), and a metrical short ( ' ) – have been added to verse contained in the Paris manuscript. Due to their minimal features, the date at which the signs were added is difficult to identify. Such signs were certainly known at the beginning of the ninth century since they were described in the first book of Isidore’s *Etymologiae*. Nevertheless, the application of these signs appears to have been rare. With this said, metrical symbols were added to certain early ninth-century manuscripts; metrical signs, for example, were added as part of the glosses to St Augustine’s *De musica* in Tou 286. If a date for the addition of these signs is sought, the fact that most of Palat. 8093 was copied in the

---

42 For Julian of Toledo’s prose text and verse, see Bischoff, ‘Ein Brief Julians von Toledo’, p. 293.
43 These metrical descriptions, which were added at the beginning of the Ausonius verses, are clearly visible in the facsimile preceding *MGH AA V Pars posterior*.
46 According to Lowe, in Beneventan script accent signs were practically unknown in the eighth and ninth centuries whilst metrical signs did not appear at all: Lowe, *Beneventan Script*, p. 275.
47 For the metrical signs in Tou 286, see the plate of fol. 58' in E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours II* (*Studies in the Script of Tours I*), Cambridge Mass., 1929, pl. xxx. Bischoff’s notes on ninth-century manuscripts held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich date the main script to s. ix and the marginal notes to s. ix.
ninth and tenth centuries and the absence of any additions to those folios made after
that period suggests that the signs fall within the boundaries of this study.

The application of diacritical signs follows a precise pattern. The ‘acute’
accent was added to long syllables in the second half of pentameter lines in elegiac
distichs. The only extension of this pattern is found on fol. 23, where a copying
error has obscured the metrical structure of lines 26-8 of Fortunatus’ *Aspera condicio.*
The last word of line 26, *aures,* was copied on the following line, thereby obscuring
the pentameter stucture of line 27. The accents added on line 27 and 28 confirm the
pentameter and hexameter structure and reveal the copying error:

```
xxvi  cum vult accipimus cum vult quoque redimus
      aures  | vult cito vita venit vult cito vita fugit
      Réx precor érgo poténs age quod tibi máxime prósit.
```

Both the general practice and the specific deviation indicate that the function
of accent marks in this manuscript was to clarify metrical structure.

Metrical signs appear frequently throughout all four books of Sedulius’
*Carmen paschale,* as well as over occasional later verses which are also hexameters.
The one partial exception is the addition of metrical signs to one *pent*ameter in the
elegiac distichs of *Aspera condicio.* In this case, the signs clarify an elision between
the first two syllables of the line:

```
xxvi  qui ambis summe pater pignera máter abet
```

Again, the motivation for adding such signs appears to have been a desire to
clarify simple metrical structures.

The implication of these signs is that some readers of the manuscript were
interested in a basic grammatical understanding of the poetry. The fact that no such

---

48 Both Lowe and Ker record that where the ‘acute’ accent was added in ninth- and tenth-century
manuscripts its function was to indicate long, rather than stressed, syllables.
signs appear in the Leiden manuscript assumes importance in this respect. It remains possible that the diacritical signs were added only after the Leiden gatherings had become separated. Even if this was the case, the lack of any independent signs in the Leiden material, and the fact that the structures clarified by these signs in Pa lat. 8093 are of such a basic nature, points to a reception of the Leiden poetry that was distinct from such elementary learning in grammar.

i (c) Notation

Musical notation has also been added only to the Paris manuscript. Five verses in Pa lat. 8093 were notated: O mortalis homo, Vae michi vae miser, O mors omnivorax, Sume miser and Dura quae gignit. All the verses except Sume miser, a pseudo-Isidorean verse, were composed by Eugenius of Toledo. All were composed in simple metres: two dactylic hexameters (O mortalis homo and Sume miser), two elegiacs (Vae michi vae miser, and O mors omnivorax) and one sapphic strophe (Dura quae gignit). Each of the musical notations was added by a different scribe.49

The five notated texts in Pa lat. 8093 share common topics. O mortalis homo enjoins the reader to call to mind his death as a way of resisting the temptations of the world, for 'That alone will remain after the deeds of death, / Whatever you yourself did well, whatever justly, whatever rightly'.50 In Vae michi vae miser, death hangs over a body and soul weighed down by the evil of the world, and a plea is made to Christ to alleviate present suffering.51 In O mors omnivorax a complaint is made to Death itself, but judgement is more to be feared and the author, finally revealed as Eugenius, prays for indulgence.52 A similar lamentation of sins which defile both body and mind is articulated in Sume miser.53 Death alone would detain wretchedness, but would also invoke deeds committed; it only remains to appeal to

---

49 For reproductions, transcriptions and full descriptions of the notations, see II: 1-5.
50 Id solum tecum post mortis facta manebunt / Quod bene, quod iuste, quod recte feceris ipse. For the full text, see MGH AA XIV, p. 234 (carmen II).
51 See MGH AA XIV, p. 242 (carmen XIII).
52 See MGH AA XIV, p. 244 (carmen XIV).
53 See PL Supplement IV, col. 1864.
Christ for mercy. Finally, in *Dura quae gignit* all the same elements are present—torments, impending death and a prayer for relief—but in this case the content is a catalogue of the cruel weather and ‘dangerous creatures of summer’. 54

What the notated texts thus share is a rhetorically heightened concern for worldly suffering and death that stands apart from other references to such topics in this collection (such as in the numerous epitaphs). The mode of address is also similar: all feature a personal invocation. These two properties are placed in relief when the immediate circumstances of the texts are considered. First, the rubrics of these texts are striking and provide a clue to how the texts were perceived by contemporaries. The majority of the verse rubrics in Paris 8093 detail subject matter or function; for example, *De mentis humane mutabilitate* and *Contra ebrietatem*, or *Epitaphion proprium* and *Item ad Eusicium presbiterem*. However, the rubrics for the notated texts describe an activity: *Commonitio mortalis humane* (A Recollection of Mortal Man) for *O mortalis homo*, *Querimonia egritudinis propriè* (A Lament of Personal Sorrow) for *Vae michi*, *vae misero*, *Lamentum de adventL1 propriè senectutis* (A Lament for the Approach of One’s Old Age) for *O mors omnivorax*, and *Confessio beati Isidori* for *Sume miser* (A Confession of the Blessed Isidore). *Dura quae gignit* again forms an exception, but one that reveals an axis of similarity with the other texts. Its rubric reads *Versus de estate Eugenii* and the use of the genitive may indicate that the subject matter relates an experience proper to the author. This implication is also made in the rubrics of *Vae michi*, *vae misero* and *O mors omnivorax*. Further, Eugenius is named as the subject of the experiences in *O mors omnivorax*, while the rubric for *Sume miser* contains the suggestion that not simply authorship, but also the experience, of the confession was proper to pseudo-Isidore. 55

A second way in which features of the notated texts are placed in relief is through the phenomenon of selecting for notation specific passages within an individual text. In particular, the notation of *O mortalis homo* does not extend over the whole of its poem, but only lines 37-80. The poem, which begins *Inpia iam*

---

54 See *MGH AA XIV*, pp. 269-70 (*carmen Cl)*.

55 Only one other verse is prefaced by a rubric describing action and authorship—*Oratio beati Eugenii iunioris* (A Prayer of the Blessed Eugenius the Younger) for *Rex Deus immense*. 40
miserum, contains three distinct metres: elegiac distichs (lines 1-6 and 37-80), five-line strophes of iambic senarius (lines 7-36) and sapphic strophes (lines 81-100). The difference between the notated section and the others is clear: only lines 37 to 80 contain personalised speech. The opening lines (lines 1-6) establish the topic of old age and promise a song of lament, before which is introduced a section that describes the effects of old age and rejects worldly comforts in the face of death (lines 7-36). The notated middle section (lines 37-80) consists of Eugenius’ complaint to Death and an appeal to God for mercy, whilst the third section (lines 81-100) returns to a description of the effects of age and signals the close of the song.

In sum, a consideration of the notated texts in Pa lat. 8093 within their immediate manuscript context points in two directions. On the one hand, the appearance of notation only within the section of the manuscript concerned with simpler grammatical material and alongside diacritical marks suggests that the addition of notation was the outcome of an interest in verse structure per se. On the other hand, the notated texts show characteristics of personalised address and reflection upon suffering that are not shared with the surrounding verse and whose discrete rhetorical quality may have motivated musical delivery.

ii Pa lat. 2832

ii (a) Texts

An indication of the provenance of Pa lat. 2832 is provided by an ex-libris on folio 1r: *VOTO BONAE MEMORIAE MANNONIS / LI-BER / AD SEPULCHRUM SANCTI AUGENDI OBLATUS*. This ex-libris of Manno of St Oyan (now St Claude, Jura) is also found in five manuscripts that transmit works from the circle of Florus of Lyons. On the grounds of scribal similarity, four further manuscripts have also been

---

56 *MGH AA XIV*, pp. 243-5.

57 For details of the manuscripts containing Manno of St Oyon’s ex-libris, see L. Delisle, ‘Note sur trois manuscrits à date certaine’, *BEC XXIX* (1868), pp. 217-9, and Tafel, *The Lyons Scriptorium*, pp. 49-51.
associated with Manno of St Oyon. Not only did these nine manuscripts share a common provenance in the ninth century, but several shared a subsequent history: five, possibly six, of the manuscripts can be identified in the eleventh-century catalogue of St Oyon, and a further five formed part of the Bouhier collection.

Despite this wealth of material, the precise relation between Pa lat. 2832, Manno, the circle of Florus and Lyons is difficult to establish. As early as 1893, Traube noted that Manno of St Oyon did not necessarily copy all the books that contain his ex-libris, although the presence of the inscription suggested that the manuscripts were copied before his death. In 1926, Wilmart responded to the posthumous publication of Tafel’s papers on the Lyons scriptorium by highlighting contradictions in the lists of manuscripts associated with Manno. Further to this, Wilmart called for a full palaeographical study to substantiate claims that individual manuscripts were copied by either Florus or Manno. Such counsels went unheeded by Charlier, who suggested precise origins for several of the above manuscripts from the Lyons region, including a claim that Manno himself copied Pa lat. 2832.

---

58 See Charlier, ‘Une oeuvre inconnue’, p. 91.
59 For the catalogue fragment of St Oyon, see L. Delisle, Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale III, Paris, 1881, pp. 385-7. Charlier assigned the catalogue fragment to Bar-sur-Aube rather than St Oyon on the grounds that none of these manuscripts appears in the 1492 St Claude catalogue, whereas two entered the Bouhier collection of c. 1669 from Bar-sur-Aube. However, the gap of some six centuries between the catalogue fragment and the Bouhier collection, as opposed to only one and a half centuries between the Manno dedications to St Oyon and the eleventh-century catalogue, means that an ascription to St Oyon remains more probable: see Charlier, ‘Une oeuvre inconnue’, pp. 86-93.
60 For details of the Bouhier collection, see Delisle, Le cabinet des manuscrits II, Paris, 1874, pp. 266-79.
63 Charlier assigned Pa lat. 2832 to Manno on the basis of similarities with the script of Florus as observed in marginal notes, and the use of a punctuation system claimed as distinctive to Florus. No systematic justification for either claim was presented; see Charlier, ‘Une oeuvre inconnue’, pp. 93-4.
The identification of Manno is also problematic. Most early commentators held the view that he was not only the provost at St Oyon but also director of the palace school under Charles the Bald.\(^{64}\) Traube, however, suggested that there were two Mannos: the first, born in 843, made a priest in 876, and a teacher at the court of Charles the Bald between 864 and 893; the second, a provost at St Oyon who died in 880.\(^{65}\) The division of evidence between Laon and St Oyon sources, and the close cultural circle witnessed by the manuscripts containing Manno’s ex-libris lends weight to Traube’s suggestion. There is thus no direct evidence for the assertion that Manno was a pupil or disciple of Florus,\(^{66}\) or even that Manno was active within circles at Lyons. In the absence of secure information, further examination of the manuscript may establish its more immediate historical circumstances.

Pa lat. 2832 transmits a collection of verse by Eugenius of Toledo, followed by Eugenius’ recension of Dracontius’ *De laudibus Dei*, a verse by Cyprian (*Cum te diversis*), one by Prosper of Aquitaine (*Qui centum quendam*), a collection of verse by Florus of Lyons, Wandalbert of Prüm’s *Martyrologium, Horologium* and *De creatione mundi*, a collection of hymns and epitaphs, and finally a selection of varied verse including the *versus in bibliotheca* of Theodulf of Orléans.\(^{67}\) The hands that copied Pa lat. 2832 were dated to 9\(^{m-\frac{3}{4}}\) by Bischoff.\(^{68}\) Internal evidence supports this date: the manuscript cannot have been copied earlier than 848, for it was by this date that the verse martyrology of Wandalbert of Prüm was completed.\(^{69}\)


\(^{66}\) As claimed in Charlier, ‘Une oeuvre inconnue’, p. 89. Charlier’s earlier suggestion that Manno’s ex-libris was modelled on that of Florus is also without secure foundation. Charlier took his model of Florus’s ex-libris from an inscription in which, by his own admission, the name of the donor is illegible: see C. Charlier, ‘La compilation augustinienne de Florus sur l’Apôtre’, *RB* LVII (1947), p. 157 (n. 3).

\(^{67}\) For the full contents of Pa lat. 2832, see P. Lauer, *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris* III, Paris, 1952, pp. 128-32.

\(^{68}\) As recorded in Bischoff’s notes in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.

\(^{69}\) See M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* I, Munich, 1911, p. 557 (n. 1).
Examination of the material in Pa lat. 2832 reveals a connection with other manuscripts of Lyons provenance. With one exception, the order of the Eugenius verse is identical to that of the first group in Pa lat. 8093. Moreover, this sequence is unique to Pa lat. 8093 and Pa lat. 2832.\textsuperscript{70} The only difference between the two manuscripts concerns the verse Spes mihi, which does not appear with the rest of the Eugenian verse in Pa lat. 2832, but among the hymns and epitaphs. The verse is an epitaph for Nicholas Evantius (Archdeacon of Toledo in 586) and is the only epitaph by Eugenius in Pa lat. 8093 that was not for himself. The removal of this verse to a later section in Pa lat. 2832 demonstrates a degree of planning in the copying of the latter manuscript that renders the collection more than the sum of smaller anthologies.\textsuperscript{71}

The verse immediately following the Eugenian sequence provides a second instance of a connection between Pa lat. 2832 and manuscripts of Lyons provenance. The version of Cum te diversis transmitted in Pa lat. 2832 includes only the first sixty lines of the eighty-line poem.\textsuperscript{72} This abbreviated version in no way represents a shorter alternative of the verse since it ends abruptly mid-way through a sentence of reported speech. Despite the incomplete nature of this text, the same interrupted version along with the same rubric is transmitted in one other manuscript – Pa lat. 2772, a manuscript also thought to be from the vicinity of Lyons from the first half of the ninth century.\textsuperscript{73} An intermediary source remains a possibility, but even in the

\textsuperscript{70} For the contents and order of other manuscripts transmitting Eugenian verse, see MGH AA XIV, pp. xxxviii-ii. Vollmer's stemma codicium indicates a common ancestry although an intermediary was supposed: see Vollmer, MGH AA XIV, p. xlvi. Little can be deduced from the similarity of the rubrics in Pa lat. 8093 and Pa lat. 2832 since the rubrics for the verse of Eugenius remained stable across all sources.

\textsuperscript{71} This contradicts Traube's assessment of the manuscript as 'ein Miscellenband, in dem man leicht mehrere verschiedenartige Sammlungen unterscheidet': Traube, 'Zur Überlieferung', p. 286.

\textsuperscript{72} For text and philological apparatus, see R. Peiper (ed.), Cypriani Galli Heptateuchos (CSEL XXIII), Vienna, 1891, pp. 227-30.

\textsuperscript{73} The verse is copied on fol. 54' of Pa lat. 2772. Besides the two Eugenian anthologies (Pa lat. 8093 and Pa lat. 2832), this compilation contains the only other example known to me of notation in a ninth-century manuscript from the Lyons region. Aquitanian neumes were added to the prose O alma trinitas in the right-hand margin of fol. 49'. See Lauer, Catalogue général III, p. 71.
unlikely scenario that an incomplete text was reproduced in three sources, it can be stated that the version presented in Pa lat. 2832 was one already in circulation in Lyons circles in the early ninth century.

The remaining material in the manuscript also bears witness to activity at Lyons. Pa lat. 2832 is the unique source for almost all the poems of Florus of Lyons. The majority of this verse has some connection with the town and its environs: after five poems on general topics (three Gospel paraphrases, a parallel of Old and New Testament miracles, and an account of saint’s feasts and offices), verses with more local references are grouped together (a lament on the state of the Frankish church, two poems addressed to Modoin of Autun, of which the second relates to injustices in the church of Lyons, hymns for local saints, a vote of thanks to Bishop Bernard of Vienne, and a series of inscriptions from churches in Lyons). The martyrology of Wandalbert of Prüm that follows also has a direct connection to Lyons; as stated in the prose preface, it was Florus who provided Wandalbert with a reliable manuscript of Bede’s martyrology from his library.\textsuperscript{74} The martyrology is succeeded by verse on similar topics: Wandalbert’s poem on the various qualities of the twelve months, and the same author’s Horologium in which is described the manner in which the sun couples certain months together.

A collection of epitaphs for saints follows. Here ordering seems to be an outcome of the sources used rather than any hierarchy accorded to the saints: after two hymns to Gallic saints (SS Denis and Lupus of Troyes) two epitaphs for St Paula taken from St Jerome’s letter to Eustochium were copied. Next a series of epitaphs derived from local buildings, which for the most part commemorate bishops of Vienne, was copied; this is followed by Spanish epitaphs that reproduce a sequence of five verses found in Pa lat. 8093 with a single interpolation for Fortunatus. Two

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ope et subsido praecipue usus sum sancti et nominatisiimi viri Flori Lugdunensis ecclesiae subdiaconi, qui, ut nostro tempore revera singulari studio et assiduitate in divinae scripturae scientia pollere, ita librorum authenticorum non mediocrì copia et veritate cognoscitur abundare, Wandalbert of Prüm, Proemium ad Martyrologium, MGH PAC II, p. 569. ‘I took advantage of the work and distinguished assistance of the holy and most celebrated man Florus, subdeacon of the church of Lyons, who as he is in our time understood truly to flourish in singular study and application to knowledge of divine Scripture, so he is understood to be rich in the truth and no moderate supply of authentic books’.'
pseudo-Eugenian epitaphs continue the Spanish theme before epitaphs for the heretics Nestor and Pelagian, and Dynamus (rector of Marseille) and his wife Eucheria. There follow epitaphs for members of the Merovingian dynasty, Alcuin, Bishop Nicholas Evantius, an anonymous person and Seneca. The collection closes with verses on the apocalypse and poems by Theodulf of Orléans. Again, several of the latter appear in Pa lat. 8093, although in this instance there is no reproduction of sequence.

The poetic collection in Pa lat. 2832 thus appears to represent a compilation of material that circulated in Lyons at the time of Florus. There is a certain amount of small-scale association within the collection — the reproduction of the Eugenius ordering from Pa lat. 8093, the two single verses on public morals, the movement from general topics to local references in the poems of Florus, the martyrology of Wandalbert following immediately, and the groups of epitaphs discerned above. The revealing feature of this collection, however, is not so much the ordering, as the specificity of its material. The majority of the texts copied in the manuscript can be traced back to the interests of the circle of Florus of Lyons: the Eugenius verse was in all probability copied from a manuscript known to Florus (Pa lat. 8093); the following two verses concern regulation of public life (a passion of Florus made evident in his poems to Modoin and on the division of the Frankish empire); part of the Wandalbert verse is indebted to Florus and all of it is a product of Florus’s own attempts to expand the martyrology; while the epitaphs continue this interest through the combination of commemoration and biographical information. This proximity to the interests of the immediate circle of Florus raises the possibility that the manuscript was owned by him — this at least was the speculation of Tafel, who tentatively assigned both Pa lat. 8093 and Pa lat. 2832 to the library of Florus.  

Until a full study of the Lyons scriptorium is undertaken, this possibility must remain in the realm of speculation. Even so, a second type of specificity may be noted: neither the popular Christian poets (Sedulius, Iuvencus, Prudentius, Fortunatus), nor the ‘school’ poetry of pagan poets (the Disticha Catonis and the fables of Avienus), nor liturgical hymnic poetry is included. Instead, a degree of exclusivity is lent by the selection of poetry drawn from local circulation. Indeed,

75 Tafel, The Lyons Scriptorium, p. 67.
pseudo-Eugenian epitaphs continue the Spanish theme before epitaphs for the heretics Nestor and Pelagian, and Dynamus (rector of Marseille) and his wife Eucheria. There follow epitaphs for members of the Merovingian dynasty, Alcuin, Bishop Nicholas Evantius, an anonymous person and Seneca. The collection closes with verses on the apocalypse and poems by Theodulf of Orléans. Again, several of the latter appear in Pa lat. 8093, although in this instance there is no reproduction of sequence.

The poetic collection in Pa lat. 2832 thus appears to represent a compilation of material that circulated in Lyons at the time of Florus. There is a certain amount of small-scale association within the collection – the reproduction of the Eugenius ordering from Pa lat. 8093, the two single verses on public morals, the movement from general topics to local references in the poems of Florus, the martyrology of Wandalbert following immediately, and the groups of epitaphs discerned above. The revealing feature of this collection, however, is not so much the ordering, as the specificity of its material. The majority of the texts copied in the manuscript can be traced back to the interests of the circle of Florus of Lyons: the Eugenius verse was in all probability copied from a manuscript known to Florus (Pa lat. 8093); the following two verses concern regulation of public life (a passion of Florus made evident in his poems to Modoin and on the division of the Frankish empire); part of the Wandalbert verse is indebted to Florus and all of it is a product of Florus's own attempts to expand the martyrology; while the epitaphs continue this interest through the combination of commemoration and biographical information. This proximity to the interests of the immediate circle of Florus raises the possibility that the manuscript was owned by him – this at least was the speculation of Tafel, who tentatively assigned both Pa lat. 8093 and Pa lat. 2832 to the library of Florus.  

Until a full study of the Lyons scriptorium is undertaken, this possibility must remain in the realm of speculation. Even so, a second type of specificity may be noted: neither the popular Christian poets (Sedulius, Iuvenccus, Prudentius, Fortunatus), nor the 'school' poetry of pagan poets (the Disticha Catonis and the fables of Avienus), nor liturgical hymnic poetry is included. Instead, a degree of exclusivity is lent by the selection of poetry drawn from local circulation. Indeed,

75 Tafel, The Lyons Scriptorium, p. 67.
pseudo-Eugenian epitaphs continue the Spanish theme before epitaphs for the heretics Nestor and Pelagian, and Dynamus (rector of Marseille) and his wife Eucheria. There follow epitaphs for members of the Merovingian dynasty, Alcuin, Bishop Nicholas Evantius, an anonymous person and Seneca. The collection closes with verses on the apocalypse and poems by Theodulf of Orléans. Again, several of the latter appear in Pa lat. 8093, although in this instance there is no reproduction of sequence.

The poetic collection in Pa lat. 2832 thus appears to represent a compilation of material that circulated in Lyons at the time of Florus. There is a certain amount of small-scale association within the collection — the reproduction of the Eugenius ordering from Pa lat. 8093, the two single verses on public morals, the movement from general topics to local references in the poems of Florus, the martyrlogy of Wandalbert following immediately, and the groups of epitaphs discerned above. The revealing feature of this collection, however, is not so much the ordering, as the specificity of its material. The majority of the texts copied in the manuscript can be traced back to the interests of the circle of Florus of Lyons: the Eugenius verse was in all probability copied from a manuscript known to Florus (Pa lat. 8093); the following two verses concern regulation of public life (a passion of Florus made evident in his poems to Modoin and on the division of the Frankish empire); part of the Wandalbert verse is indebted to Florus and all of it is a product of Florus’s own attempts to expand the martyrlogy; while the epitaphs continue this interest through the combination of commemoration and biographical information. This proximity to the interests of the immediate circle of Florus raises the possibility that the manuscript was owned by him — this at least was the speculation of Tafel, who tentatively assigned both Pa lat. 8093 and Pa lat. 2832 to the library of Florus.75

Until a full study of the Lyons scriptorium is undertaken, this possibility must remain in the realm of speculation. Even so, a second type of specificity may be noted: neither the popular Christian poets (Sedulius, Iuvenicus, Prudentius, Fortunatus), nor the ‘school’ poetry of pagan poets (the Disticha Catonis and the fables of Avienus), nor liturgical hymnic poetry is included. Instead, a degree of exclusivity is lent by the selection of poetry drawn from local circulation. Indeed,

75 Tafel, The Lyons Scriptorium, p. 67.
without needing to relate the manuscript to Florus directly, the combination of a civic concern with an interest in the uncommon points to a learned audience.

**ii (b) Notation**

The suggestion that Pa lat. 2832 was the outcome of a learned interest in collecting poetic material has implications for evaluation of the notation. Yet since notation was a product of the later reception of these texts, any assessment is complicated by the subsequent history of the manuscript. If the notations were added before 880 then they were added to a book probably conceived for and owned by an educated individual. If they were added after this date, they were added to a manuscript held as a library book. One of the notations in this manuscript, that of *Judicii signum*, falls outside the chronological bounds of this study since it dates at the earliest from the eleventh century. Notations for two other texts were added at some time during the ninth and tenth centuries and may fall either side of the 880 date.

Even if the notation was added after 880, an educated audience may still be supposed. As is evident from an eleventh-century catalogue fragment, the library of St Oyon was among the richest in the Frankish kingdom, containing numerous theological *florilegia*. In the field of verse in particular, alongside the compilation Pa lat. 2832 and a collection of Ausonius verse, were held the *carmina* and *epigrammata* of Prosper,76 *carmina* of Juvenal and Flaccus,77 and a magisterial poetic collection described in the eleventh-century catalogue as follows:78

---

76 Number 87 in the catalogue reads: *Item quaterniones ubi sunt Prosperi libri metrici II, unus de providentie divina, alter contra Pelagianos, sed et portio quedam epigramm*, Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits* III, p. 386

77 Number 88 in the catalogue reads: *Item liber carminum Juvenalis et Flacci; see idem, Le cabinet des manuscrits* III, p. 386.


This manuscript, which contained such rare poetic treasures as Nemesianus’ Cynegeticon, of which only two medieval manuscripts survive,79 is now lost. It is possible that it also reached St Oyon via the private library of Manno. Even if this did not occur, both the personal library of Manno and the institutional library of St Oyon evidently acted as repositories for a strand of literary learning in Frankish culture. Once collected into a monastic library, manuscripts such as that of Ausonius, or Pa lat. 2832, or the lost compilation, could have served little immediate functional purpose. The motivation for preservation was more likely an interest in the collection of cultural artefacts, the same bibliographic tendency evident in both the composition and the collection of the manuscripts in Manno’s library.

The two texts with early notations in Pa lat. 2832 were both composed by Florus of Lyons. Hac locuples is an epigraph for the tomb of St Cyprian;80 Iohannis Paulique is described in its rubric as an Ymnus in natale sanctorum Iohannis et Pauli.81 A striking feature of these two notated texts is their rarity: both texts are unica, and both texts are the only surviving notated poems by Florus of Lyons. These two factors suggest in themselves that there was no widespread oral tradition lying behind these notations. Indeed, if the scribes had intended to record widely known melodies, then the addition of notation only to verses by Florus is striking, for this manuscript transmits verses by Eugenius of Toledo that were notated in several other manuscripts, including one that appears to have had a direct relation to Pa lat. 2832.82

79 For details, see Reynolds (ed.), Texts and Transmission, pp. 246-7.
80 See MGH PAC II, pp. 541-2.
81 See MGH PAC II, p. 546.
82 All four notated poems by Eugenius of Toledo in Pa lat. 8093 are included without notation in Pa lat. 2832. For further instances of notation added to poems by Eugenius of Toledo, see Y.-F. Riou, ‘Les
The routine nature of the metres employed in these two texts also suggests that notation was not the outcome of an interest in poetic structure: Hac locuples is in dactylic hexameters and Iohannis Paulique is in elegiac distichs. If notation was added as an aid to understanding these two structures then one might expect more extensive notation, as well as possibly diacritical signs or metrical descriptions, throughout the manuscript. Further, the content of the two notated texts speaks against any idea that they were routinely sung in the Mass or Office. Hac locuples describes the translation of the relics of Saint Cyprian, along with those of SS Speratus and Pantaleonis, from Carthage to Lyons during the time of Charlemagne. Iohannis Paulique, despite the appearance of the term ymnus in its rubric, could only exceptionally have been used as a liturgical hymn since all non-biblical material was banned from the liturgy in Lyons by Agobard in 838 and not officially re-admitted until the twelfth century.83

Rather than a widespread tradition of oral song or a technical interest in metre per se, the two notated poems suggest a concern to record music for verse whose circulation was restricted. For Hac locuples, a particular local significance can be reconstructed. The importance of the translation of the bones of St Cyprian for Lyons is described in another verse by Florus, Rector magnificus, in which Cyprian is invoked as a powerful new protector and intermediary for the diocese.84 Moreover, the rubric for Hac locuples underlines the degree to which Cyprian was now claimed as local patron: it reads Ubi ossa sancti Cypriani Lugduni condita habentur. An earlier rubric in Pa lat. 2832 for the verse Cum te diversis provides further evidence of enthusiasm for the new cult of St Cyprian as it ascribes authorship to the Saint

---


84 See MGH PAC II, pp. 544-5.
himself: *Versus sancti Cypriani episcopi et martiris ad quendam senatorem ex christianae religione ad idolorum servitutem conversum.*

No similar local significance can be traced for *Iohannis Paulique*. However, the rubric, with its specific label *Ymnus in natale*, points to ritual use on a specific day. This leads to the suspicion that notation for *Iohannis Paulique*, along with that for *Hac locuples*, records a melody that was used in some form of local rite or rites whose precise contents remain beyond reach. Even if this hypothesis is not accepted, the authorship of Florus and the local veneration of Cyprian stand as sufficient witnesses to the local significance of the notated texts. Furthermore, the contents of the two notated texts alone stand as special cases of an interest in martyrs that was an ongoing concern in the region of Lyons. In sum, whatever the precise function of the notated melodies, the same tendency to record texts of local significance that informed the compilation of Pa lat. 2832 can be detected in the addition of notation.

### iii Ma 10029

#### iii (a) Texts

Much less is known about the circumstances in which Ma 10029 was written than for either Pa lat. 8093 or Pa lat. 2832. The date of copying has repeatedly been estimated as either 9-10 or 10th, but there has been no attempt to assign either provenance or origin beyond a general ascription to Spain. In the absence of any palaeographical

---

85 The same ascription to St Cyprian is found in the earlier Pa lat. 2772. The true author of this verse remains unknown: see Peiper, *CSEL* XXIII, p. xxviii.

86 In addition to Florus' martyrology, in c. 865 Ado of Vienne published his 'Small Roman Martyrology', which he claimed as an ancient papal version discovered in Italy. For a concise summary of the various martyrologies in circulation in Lyons during the ninth century, see J. Dubois, *Les martyrologes du moyen âge latin* (Typologie de sources XXVI), Turnhout, 1978, pp. 39-45.

87 The following commentators have ventured dates for the copying of Ma 10029: Ewald (10, with later tenth-century additions), in P. Ewald, 'Reise nach Spanien im Winter von 1878 auf 1879', in *NA* VI (1881), pp. 316-8; Loewe and Hartel (9-10), in W. von Hartel and G. Loewe, *Bibliotheca patrum Latinorum Hispansionis* I, Vienna, 1887, pp. 284-90; Traube (10), in *MGH PAC* III, pp. 125-6; Anglès (9-10), in H. Anglès and J. Subira (ed.), *Catálogo musical de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid* I,
information relating to origin, the inclusion of a number of poems by Cordoban authors is the strongest indication of locale.88 There is, nevertheless, a significant difficulty in ascribing a uniform date or place of origin to Ma 10029 as the manuscript is a multi-partite compilation.

Ma 10029 was copied by several scribes. The main changes of hand are as follows:


88 The final section of Ma 10029 (from fol. 129\textsuperscript{v} to the end) consists almost entirely of poetry with some connection to Cordoba, including poetry by Cyprian of Cordoba (archpresbyter of Cordoba, late 9\textsuperscript{th} century), Samson (abbot of Cordoba, d. 890) and Albarus of Cordoba (b. c. 800) on St Eulogius (Cordoban martyr, d. 859). On the revival of poetic composition in Cordoba in the mid-ninth century and the possibility that it was inspired by St Eulogius’ transmission of metrical texts and learning, see R. Collins, ‘Poetry in ninth-century Spain’, Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar IV (1983), pp. 181-95.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date of Main Scribes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r</td>
<td>Preface to Dracontius De laudibus Dei (mutil.) – Eugenius of Toledo</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundry pentrials and re-writing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v</td>
<td>Four epitaphs for Constantia (Queen of Alfonso VI) – Alo</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r</td>
<td>Eugenius of Toledo recension of Dracontius De laudibus Dei epistola to</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Visigothic king concerning the recension – Eugenius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v</td>
<td>periochae to In laudem Iustini minoris – Cor ipus</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v</td>
<td><em>Inmensum silvum</em> – Cor ipus</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>In laudem Iustini minoris</em> – Cor ipus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantemus socii – Sedulius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solverat antiquas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Eugenius of Toledo (<em>MGH AA XIV</em> nos. 13, 15, 16-19,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29, 23, 30-36, 38, 42-69, 70. 1-3, 71-96, 70. 4-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Martin of Duma (<em>ICUR II</em>. 1, pp. 269-70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portante me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61v</td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Eugenius of Toledo (<em>MGH AA XIV</em> nos. 6-13, 14, 15-18,</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19, 21. 1-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69v</td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Pseudo-Eugenius (<em>MGH AA XIV</em> app. nos. 27-48, 1-25)</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Immortale nihil</em> – Iuvencus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vulnus insanabile</em> – Acillus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Disticha Catonis</em> (mutil.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Quis mihi mesta</em> – Verecundus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Evangelium libri quattuor</em> – Iuvencus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Has mea mens</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aspera condicio et sors</em> – Fortunatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Cyprian of Cordoba (<em>CSM2</em> nos. 1-7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>carmina</em> – Samson of Cordoba (<em>CSM2</em> nos. 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139v</td>
<td><em>Vale paule</em> (prose) – Jerome</td>
<td>10med-es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Scipio quam genuit</em> – Jerome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Respicis angustum</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Verbis in crede</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Quadam nocte niger</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Quo valet artifico</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ars mea multorum</em> – Foca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the discontinuity in copying evident from this table, there are two lacunae in the manuscript. From the gathering signatures it is clear that two gatherings are missing between folios 68 and 69. The discrepancy in material confirms this lacuna: the verse that closes fol. 68v is cut short after ten lines and there is no indication that the verse that begins fol. 69r is no longer part of the collection of Eugenian verse. Later in the manuscript, between folios 92 and 93, there is a complete gathering missing from the Iuvenecus. 89

The impact of such lacunae on the integrity of the verse collection is evident from the selection of verse by Eugenius of Toledo. The selection is not a full edition, but two separate florilegia whose conflation leads to the repetition of certain poems within the space of twenty folios. 90 The second of these florilegia (fols. 61r – 68r) forms a complete gathering that was copied by several scribes writing in poor quality scripts.

Despite these inconsistencies, there is a guiding principle evident behind the compilation in Ma 10029 – in general, the poetry copied is simple in structure. With the exception of a few Eugenius verses, the verse compiled before the mid-tenth

---

89 As noted in Ewald, ‘Reise nach Spanien’, p. 318.
90 As observed by Vollmer in MGH AA XIV, pp. xxxviii-il. A further repetition of material within the manuscript is Iuvenecus Immortale nihil mundi (fols. 74r and 81r).
century consists entirely of hexameters and elegiacs.\textsuperscript{91} The verse added in the later tenth century is only slightly more complex: besides hexameters and elegiacs are included iambic trimeters (*O vos amici* and *Resultat toga*), asclepiads (*Almi nunc*), and rhythmical imitations of trochaic septenarii (*Inclite parentis* and, imitating the first half of the line only, *Deus miserere mei*).

iii (b) Diacritical signs

The diacritical marks that occur throughout the manuscript confirm that formal considerations played a part in the reception of Ma 10029. As in Pa lat. 8093, there is no sure way of dating the addition of these marks, but several features point to the tenth century. Since the signs were added over both the earlier and later portions of the manuscript without any difference in principle, a late ninth or early tenth century date for these signs is unlikely. A more likely date of addition is provided by the fact that the majority of additions to the manuscript were made in the mid- to late-tenth century, and that the signs of musical notation were also probably added during this period.\textsuperscript{92}

Both scansion signs and accent marks were added to Ma 10029. In general, the former were added over the opening lines of hexameters, and the latter were added throughout elegiac distichs. The use of accent marks over the distichs follows a consistent pattern: a ' sign is used to indicate a change of foot (or the *ictus*) on the following syllable, and an extended acute accent is added to the final syllables of the two membra of the pentameter line.\textsuperscript{93} As an illustration of this practice, two lines from *Cantemus socii* are reproduced:

---

\textsuperscript{91} The Eugenius verse includes sapphics (17), trochaic tetrameters catalectic (77 and 89), distichs with a hexameter followed by a variously composed second line (66, and 86-88), three minor ionics (79), a phalaecian (9) and internal sections of iambic senarii and saphhic strophes (14). Despite the apparent variety, almost ninety per cent of the Eugenius verse is composed in either hexameter lines or elegiac distichs.

\textsuperscript{92} For scansion signs in a Visigothic manuscript copied in 946, see P. Ewald and G. Loewe (eds.), *Exempla scripturae Visigoticae*, Heidelberg, 1883, pl. 22.

\textsuperscript{93} The only extension of this practice is the occasional addition of signs to *Plangit me cuncti* (fol. 54'). The rationale behind the signs, which resemble the *tractulus* of Spanish notation and were described by
The fact that when these signs were added all lines were marked suggests that the elegiac structure caused some degree of difficulty to the reader. One further feature of the marking of elegiac distichs is that scansion signs were occasionally added to the final two syllables of the hexameter line, the lengths of which could not be deduced by simple rules.

Scansion signs were in general added to the opening lines of hexameters, although on occasion they were also added to internal or final lines. In several cases, scansion signs are accompanied by the ' sign indicating the beginning of new feet. Given that both sets of signs were used in hexameters, the question arises as to why only two out of twelve elegiacs are accompanied by scansion signs. The reason for the disparity is apparent in the disposition of scansion signs over these two elegiacs:

\[\text{Aspera condicio et sors inrevocabilis hore} \]
\[\text{Quum gene'ri huma'no, tristis o'rigo dedit} \]

The final syllables of the pentameter \textit{membra} are not assigned scansion signs, but instead receive accents. The absence of a scansion sign indicates that these syllables were regarded as extrinsic to the metrical pattern, or what would be termed 'supernumerary' in rhythmic verse. It appears that the pentameter was regarded as deviant from a normative model embodied by the hexameter in which the feet in a line are always regular and complete. It was this deviant status that appears to have motivated the addition of signs throughout elegiacs.

Anglès as 'semi-musicales', is not clear. See Anglès and Subira, \textit{Catálogo}, pp. 3-4. It should be noted that the other signs labelled by Anglès as 'semi-musicales' are a combination of the ' sign and scansion marks.
This distinction in Ma 10029 between accent signs for elegiacs and scansion signs for hexameters mirrors the practice in Pa lat. 8093. In the reception accorded both manuscripts the structure of the pentameter line caused difficulty and required clarification. Further parallels may be made between Ma 10029 and the opening thirty-two folios of Pa lat. 8093. Both transmit Eugenian verse (including the Dracontius recension), the Disticha Catonis, epigraphs, and a hexameter summary of biblical narrative (in Pa lat. 8093 the Carmen Paschale by Sedulius, in Ma 10029 the Evangelium libri quattuor by Iuvencus). The restriction to simple poetic structures is also shared, and in both material continued to be added to both collections at later stages. These shared characteristics suggest a similar rationale informing the selection of material; namely, that Ma 10029 was a manuscript compiled with a concern for technical difficulty.

The clearest indication of a teaching function are the glosses in Ma 10029. Two of the extended poems are accompanied by extensive marginalia: Cor ipsum In laudem Iustini minoris and Iuvencus Evangeliorum libri quattuor. The marginalia added to the Cor ipsum take the form of summaries inserted next to chapters and at various other points through the poem. These marginalia are evidently derived from the same stock as the opening periochae, whose content they summarise and expand where opening comments are lacking.94 Less frequent, although more revealing, are occasional comments about formal properties of the text, such as anastrophe id est ordo verborum preposterus (fol. 24r), disce cola et coma (fol. 26r) and, on several occasions, comparatio. The glosses to the Juvencus are more extensive, providing translation to the vulgar tongue, explanations of case, corrections, single word equivalences, basic information and quotations of scriptural passages alluded to in the text.95

94 For a comparison between the marginalia and the periochae, see MGH AA III. 2, pp. 111-4.
95 For these glosses, see J.-J Delgado, ‘Juvenco en el códice Matritense 10.029’, Helmántica XIX (1968), pp. 309-18 (§ III ‘Las glosas de Juvenco en el cod. de Madrid’).
This distinction in Ma 10029 between accent signs for elegiacs and scansion signs for hexameters mirrors the practice in Pa lat. 8093. In the reception accorded both manuscripts the structure of the pentameter line caused difficulty and required clarification. Further parallels may be made between Ma 10029 and the opening thirty-two folios of Pa lat. 8093. Both transmit Eugenian verse (including the Dracontius recension), the Disticha Catonis, epigraphs, and a hexameter summary of biblical narrative (in Pa lat. 8093 the Carmen Paschale by Sedulius, in Ma 10029 the Evangelium libri quattuor by Iuvencus). The restriction to simple poetic structures is also shared, and in both material continued to be added to both collections at later stages. These shared characteristics suggest a similar rationale informing the selection of material; namely, that Ma 10029 was a manuscript compiled with a concern for technical difficulty.

The clearest indication of a teaching function are the glosses in Ma 10029. Two of the extended poems are accompanied by extensive marginalia: Cor iPS In laudem Iustini minoris and Iuvencus Evangeliorum libri quattuor. The marginalia added to the Cor iPS take the form of summaries inserted next to chapters and at various other points through the poem. These marginalia are evidently derived from the same stock as the opening periochae, whose content they summarise and expand where opening comments are lacking.94 Less frequent, although more revealing, are occasional comments about formal properties of the text, such as anastrophe id est ordo verborum preposterus (fol. 24'), disce cola et coma (fol. 26') and, on several occasions, comparatio. The glosses to the Juvencus are more extensive, providing translation to the vulgar tongue, explanations of case, corrections, single word equivalences, basic information and quotations of scriptural passages alluded to in the text.95

94 For a comparison between the marginalia and the periochae, see MGH AA III. 2, pp. 111-4.
95 For these glosses, see J.-J Delgado, ‘Juvenco en el cédice Matritense 10.029’, Helmantica XIX (1968), pp. 309-18 (§ III ‘Las glosas de Juvenco en el cod. de Madrid’).
Two earlier glosses reveal the level of metrical appreciation brought to these verses. The first is appended to Quem meror and reads simply lambo metro.96 This verse, however, is not iambic in structure, but consists of elegiac distichs.97 The difficulties that readers evidently faced in identifying even hexameters is made more explicit in a note that precedes Iuvencus Inmortale nihil on fol. 81:

His versis* exameter metro currente locis paribus dactilo continent, exscepto regio sexta terminatur troceus. Sin alii velis spondio locis omnibus preferamir preter quintum regionem quem dactilus convenit esse.

* A later scribe has added ‘-bus’.

These verses comprise a hexameter in dactylic metre proceeding with equal divisions, with the exception that the sixth region is marked off by a trochee. If however you should wish something different in all places we may prefer a spondee except for the fifth portion which ought to be a dactyl.

This succinct explanation of hexameter structure, with its oversimplification of the metrical properties of the final foot, reinforces evidence from the restricted range of metres in the manuscript and the schematic addition of diacritical signs that the appreciation of formal structures remained at a basic level of competence.

iii (c) Notation

Notation was added to five texts by five different scribes.98 Four of these texts were added from the mid-tenth century onwards (Deus miserere mei, Inclite parentis, Imperat omnipotens and Iam dudum Saulus), and one was copied as part of the earlier collection (Sum noctis socia). Given the predominance of hexameter forms in the manuscript, the variety of structures represented by these texts is striking: (in the above order) 4 x 8p, 3 x 8p + 7pp, elegiacs (arranged into strophic form consisting of two distichs, with a pentameter refrain), hexameters and a single elegiac distich.

96 An indication of the early date at which this gloss must have been added is the open a employed in the script.
97 See MGH AA XIV, p. 241 (carmen XI)
98 For reproductions, transcriptions and full descriptions of these notations, see II: 8-12.
The content of the notated texts directs attention to possible motivations for the addition of notation. Both Inclite parentis and Imperat omnipotens are anonymous continuations of verses by Eugenius that share a common topic: they are both simple prayers for protection from demons during sleep.\(^9\) Sum noctis socia, by contrast, is a nightingale song by Eugenius of Toledo. It is possible that the notation was intended to serve for the subsequent nightingale poems by Eugenius (In somnem filomela, Die filomela and Vox filomela) that are also composed of elegiacs and elsewhere copied as a single unit.\(^10\) Whatever is the case, the initial distich resembles the didactic genre of the aenigma in so far as a normally wordless object defines itself whilst postponing disclosure of its identity:\(^11\)

\[
\text{Sum noctis socia, sum cantus amica;} \\
\text{Nomen ab ambiguo, sic filomela gero.}
\]

Vincentius’ Deus miserere mei is a confession of sins and plea for forgiveness in which Vincentius is identified as the penitent. As with the two prayers before sleep, supplication ends in praise of the Godhead. Finally, Damasus’ Iam dudum Saulus also identifies its author, Damasus, as the narrator:\(^12\)

\[
\text{Versibus his breviter, fateor, sanctissime doctor} \\
\text{Paule, tuos Damasus volui monstrare triumphos.}
\]

Paul is held up as an exemplum of the faith, a teacher who endured despite suffering. Confession is thus again a central topic, although in this case a confession of Christian belief.

---

\(^9\) For the texts of these two verses, see CSM II, pp. 690-1. For the Eugenius poems which these texts quote in their openings, see MGH AA XIV, p. 264 (nos. LXXVII, LXXVIII and LXXIX).

\(^10\) In Be 36 (fol. 139v) the three nightingale poems by Eugenius are copied as a single unit. For a transcription of the notation over the Sum noctis socia distich in Be 36, see II: 15.

\(^11\) ‘I am a consort of the night, a mistress of sweet song; / From dark sayings I take my name "nightingale"’. Latin text reproduced from MGH AA XIV, p. 253 (carmen XXXII).

\(^12\) ‘In these verses, I confess briefly, most holy teacher / Paul, that I, Damasus, wished to demonstrate your triumphs’. Latin text reproduced from M. Ihm (ed.), Damasi epigrammata (Anthologiae Latinae supplementa I), Leipzig, 1895, p. 3.
These five notated poems demonstrate two common features. First, all are 'voiced'; that is, none is reported in the third person, but all are rather expressed in the first person or narrated by an identified speaker. Second, all the poems feature a mixture of moral and didactic topics. The moral concern is evident in the spiritual discipline promoted by the two prayers and confession and in the raising up of Paul as an exemplum; more obscure is the danger in darkness and excess hinted at in the Sum noctis socia distich. The didactic element is in part one of literary learning: Inclite parentis and Imperat omnipotens appear to be exercises in parody, whilst Sum noctis socia could be read as an aenigma which reveals its subject in the final clause. In part, however, the didacticism resides in an implied exhortation to an imitatio of the practices and figures featured in the poems.

The notations themselves vary in their complexity of formal repertory and execution of forms. At one extreme, the notation for Deus miserere mei (II: 9) is characteristic of a 'school' script; that is, a formal script as used in Graduals, Tropers and Sequentiaries. At the other extreme, the notation for Imperat omnipotens (II: 11) resembles diacritical signs in its restricted range of forms and systematic disposition. In sum, a twofold impulse can be distinguished in both the content of the texts and the notations themselves: on the one hand, a tendency towards didacticism; on the other, a tendency towards song-like characteristics.

**Summary**

The evidence assembled here suggests that Ma 10029 was a manuscript used to aid a learning of basic metrical structures. This didactic purpose, however, was not secondary to higher learning or more elevated cultural concerns. As in Pa lat. 8093, a teaching of metrical forms was coterminous with a certain form of 'voiced' or direct expression, and a teaching of basic morals intrinsic to Christian culture itself.

A glimpse of the cultural role of Ma 10029 can be gained from Paul Alvar's Vita of Eulogius (d. 859), copied towards the end of the manuscript. Alvar relates
that Eulogius discovered a number of poetic texts in the kingdom of Pamplona and that their return to Cordoba marked the first study of poetry in the peninsula since the fall of the Visigothic kingdom in 711. Alvar further describes how Eulogius used a period of imprisonment to gain ‘a mastery of Latin metrics’ and subsequently instructed his friends ‘in the metrical arts’.

It is evident from Alvar’s account that the general standard of metrical learning in Spain was low. The restricted range of forms in Ma 10029 and the evident difficulties encountered with even the simplest structures should therefore not be dismissed as school learning. Rather, the learning of basic metrical structures was a part of the upper sphere of cultural activity.

It is also evident that metrical study had a broadly political importance. Eulogius was no disinterested scholar of the humanities – his interest in metrics was part of a wider attempt to revive the Christian inheritance of the Visigothic past in the face of a rising tide of Arabic culture and conversion to Islam. This attempt had already led to his imprisonment for supporting the martyr movement and was eventually to lead to his death. Much of the content of Ma 10029 was composed in Cordoba and was the product of the same political tension. As witnessed by Alvar, within the political and cultural tensions of Spain in the ninth and tenth centuries the practice of metrics was in itself an assertion of a Christian identity and history. As argued here, the notation in Ma 10029 was an extension of this practice – the product of an activity in which the didactic, the moral, the lyrical and the political were inseparable.
Be 455 is a late ninth-century verse compilation that transmits a selection of hymns and non-liturgical verse alongside Boethian and Prudentian \textit{metra}. The main body of the manuscript was copied by a single scribe, but material continued to be added and erased through to the twelfth century. In its current state, there are several significant \textit{lacunae} in the manuscript – most notably, the first two gatherings are now lost and two bifolia are missing from the final gathering.\footnote{Gathering signatures begin on the second surviving gathering with IIII (fol. 15v). The sixth and final gathering consists of only two bifolia; it is evident from the discontinuity of the text that the two central bifolia are missing from the gathering.}

Contreni established that several additions to the manuscript were made at Laon in the tenth century, and his identification of Adelem of Laon as the scribe of one of these additions indicates that the manuscript was at the cathedral school by 930 at the latest.\footnote{J. J. Contreni, \textit{The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930: its Manuscripts and Masters} (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung XXIX), Munich, 1978, pp. 160-1.} As regards origin, Bischoff was unwilling to be more specific than ‘Frankreich (Einflußzone von Paris?)’.\footnote{KFH, no. 599. The tentative suggestion of Paris appears to have been influenced by the inclusion of hymns for SS Germanus and Denis (see below, p. 64).} Contreni, recognising that the manuscript was not of Laon origin, suggested the region of Tours, Orléans and Auxerre. This suggestion was made on the basis of the connections of these monasteries with Laon, and the fact that six other manuscripts of Laon provenance can be traced to this region.\footnote{Contreni, \textit{Cathedral School}, pp. 44-5.}

The strongest internal indication of the provenance of Be 455 before its arrival at Laon is the selection of hymn texts. The hymns are drawn from the New Hymnal as disseminated in continental manuscripts from the early ninth century.\footnote{On the relation between the Old and the New Hymnals, see Gneuss, \textit{Hymnar und Hymnen}, pp. 10-55. For the contents of the New Hymnal as known in England in the late tenth century see \textit{idem},}
selection begins with hymns for the Proper of the Time and Proper of Saints before passing to the Common of Saints.\(^\text{109}\) It is therefore likely that the two gatherings now missing from the beginning of the manuscript would have transmitted remaining hymns for the Common (ferial hymns and hymns for summer and winter). The Proper cycles are unusual in two respects. Firstly, the series in Be 455 is more extended than any of its Carolingian counterparts.\(^\text{110}\) The second unusual feature is the inclusion of hymns for SS Germanus and Denis – the only other saints who are assigned hymns are Mary, John the Baptist, and SS Peter and Paul. The appearance of Germanus and Denis in an otherwise general sequence suggests inclusion for local reasons; in particular, the coupling of these two saints points to the diocese of Paris. The specific hymn texts chosen for the two saints likewise suggest local and, in particular, Parisian influence: *Iste confessor Domini* is assigned to St Germanus although it is a general hymn for confessors; and *Caei cives adplaudite* was composed by Hilduin of St Denis specifically to promote the cult of this saint.\(^\text{111}\)

The possibility that Be 455 originally had a connection with Paris is strengthened by the inclusion later in Be 455 of the commentary of Lupus of Ferrières

---


\(^{110}\) The Common of Saints is somewhat disordered. It begins inappropriately with a hymn for virgins, before proceeding with the correct liturgical hierarchy of apostles, several martyrs, one martyr, confessors, holy women and the consecration of a church. A further unusual feature is the inclusion of several hymns for the Proper of Saints within this sequence; in particular, hymns for SS Benedict and Michael.

\(^{111}\) *Caei cives adplaudite* is attributed to Eugenius in Pa lat. 2832 (fol. 111'). It is now, however, thought to have been composed by Hilduin of St Denis, who mentions it in a letter to Louis the Pious that outlines all the known details about the saint’s life: *MGH Epp.* III, Berlin, 1899, p. 331 (line 5). Hilduin was instrumental in promoting the cult of St Denis on the basis of an erroneous identification with the fifth century Pseudo-Denis the Aeropagite, who himself had claimed to be Dionysius the disciple of St Paul. The ascription to Eugenius, repeated by Hilduin, seems to have been an attempt to claim authority for the new legend that made Clement of Rome responsible for sending St Denys to France in apostolic times.
on the *metra* of the *De consolatione philosophiae*.\textsuperscript{112} This commentary survives in only five other manuscripts from the ninth century: Or 270 (9\textsuperscript{1-2/4}, Fleury/Auxerre-Fleury), Na IV. G. 68 (9\textsuperscript{4/4}, St Gall), Lo Harley 2685 (9-10, Cologne), Tou 803 (9-10, Tours) and La 439. The last of these was copied at St Germain-des-Près at the close of the ninth century and arrived shortly afterwards at Laon.\textsuperscript{113} The witness provided by La 439 for the presence of Lupus’s commentary at St Germain-des-Près, for an interest in metrical learning at this centre, and for direct contact between the two institutions, lends support to the hypothesis that Be 455 originated from the same centre.

The nature of the metrical learning promoted by Be 455 is revealed by an analysis of the metres in the collection.\textsuperscript{114} In the following table, italicized incipits indicate the presence of musical notation:


\textsuperscript{113} On this manuscript, see Contreni, *Cathedral School*, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{114} In the following table, the metres of the *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius are derived from the *conspectus metrorum* in K. Büchner (ed.), *Boethius philosophiae consolationis libri quinque*, Heidelberg, 1977, pp. 118-22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Versus de adventu Domini</td>
<td>Conditor alme siderum</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td>Hymns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de natale Domini</td>
<td>Veni redemptor gentium</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alium</td>
<td>A solis ortu cardine</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in epiphania</td>
<td>Hostis Herodes impia</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in purificazione Sanctae Mariæ</td>
<td>Quod chorus vatum</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alium</td>
<td>Fit porta Christi</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de pascha</td>
<td>Ad cenum agni</td>
<td>4 x 8pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de ascensione Domini</td>
<td>Aeterne rex altissime</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de Sancto Johanne Baptista</td>
<td>Ut queant laxis</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de Sancto Petro et Paulo</td>
<td>Aurea luce</td>
<td>3 x iambic trimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de Sancto Germano</td>
<td>Iste confessor Domini</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de Sancto Dionisio</td>
<td>Caeli cives adplaudite</td>
<td>4 x 8pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de virginibus</td>
<td>Virginis proles opifex</td>
<td>3 x (5p + 6p), 5p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in natale apostolorum</td>
<td>Apostolorum principem celsa</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alium</td>
<td>Apostolorum passio diem</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in natale Sancti Benedicti</td>
<td>Christe sanctorum decus</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de martyribus</td>
<td>Aeterna Christi munera</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alium</td>
<td>Rex gloriose martyrum</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de uno martyre</td>
<td>Martyr Dei</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alium</td>
<td>Deus tuorum milium</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de confessoribus</td>
<td>Ihesu redemptor omnium</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in natale omnium sanctorum</td>
<td>Sanctorum meritis inclita</td>
<td>3 x Asclepiads, Glyconic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de virginibus</td>
<td>Ihesu corona virginum</td>
<td>4 x iambic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in natale Sancti Michaelis</td>
<td>Christe sanctorum decus</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus in dedicatione ecclesiae</td>
<td>Christe cunctorum dominator</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nocte surgentes</td>
<td>3 x (5p + 6p), 5p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecce iam noctis</td>
<td>Sapphic strophe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus de accipitre et pavone</td>
<td>Avis haec magna</td>
<td>6 x 5p</td>
<td>Varied Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Fortunati in honore</td>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>4 x 8pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancte Crucis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item versus Fortunati ad</td>
<td>Aspera conditio et sors</td>
<td>Elegiacs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilpericum regem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus de Iacob et Ioseph</strong></td>
<td>Tertio in flore</td>
<td>4 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus de Herico</strong></td>
<td>Mecum Timavi</td>
<td>5 x 5p + 7pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Zmaracdi</strong></td>
<td>Sume plectrum</td>
<td>3 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alium</td>
<td>Qui cupis esse bonus qui</td>
<td>Elegiacs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Eugenii</strong></td>
<td>O mortalis homo</td>
<td>2 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Iuvenci</strong></td>
<td>Immortale nihil mundi</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Sedulii</strong></td>
<td>Cantemus socii Domino</td>
<td>Elegiacs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Virgilii</strong></td>
<td>Tityre tu patule</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii exconsule ordinari metrum dactilicum tetrametrum constat spondeo dactilo catalectic item dactilo spondeo incipit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum pindaricum constans dimetro catalecto</td>
<td>O stelliferi</td>
<td>4 x Anapaecstic acatalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dactilicum dimetrum catalecticum cui est nomen adonio catalecticus autem versus dicitur cui una syllaba deest</td>
<td>Nubibus atri</td>
<td>4 x Adonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum parhemiacum quod constat dimetro catalectico</td>
<td>Felix nimium prior</td>
<td>2 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter (first two lines used as a refrain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Boetii</strong></td>
<td>Quanta rerum flectit</td>
<td>4 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum falleucium cui adheret dactilicum archilochium tetrametrum catalecticum in quo tamen pro spondeo sive dactilo imparibus locis trocheum reperies</td>
<td>Quamvis se Tyrio</td>
<td>2 x Phalaccian / Alcaic ten syllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Virgilii</strong></td>
<td>Tityre tu patule</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii exconsule ordinari metrum dactilicum tetrametrum constat spondeo dactilo catalectic item dactilo spondeo incipit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum pindaricum constans dimetro catalecto</td>
<td>O stelliferi</td>
<td>4 x Anapaecstic acatalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dactilicum dimetrum catalecticum cui est nomen adonio catalecticus autem versus dicitur cui una syllaba deest</td>
<td>Nubibus atri</td>
<td>4 x Adonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum parhemiacum quod constat dimetro catalectico</td>
<td>Felix nimium prior</td>
<td>2 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter (first two lines used as a refrain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Boetii</strong></td>
<td>Quanta rerum flectit</td>
<td>4 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum falleucium cui adheret dactilicum archilochium tetrametrum catalecticum in quo tamen pro spondeo sive dactilo imparibus locis trocheum reperies</td>
<td>Quamvis se Tyrio</td>
<td>2 x Phalaccian / Alcaic ten syllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Virgilii</strong></td>
<td>Tityre tu patule</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii exconsule ordinari metrum dactilicum tetrametrum constat spondeo dactilo catalectic item dactilo spondeo incipit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum pindaricum constans dimetro catalecto</td>
<td>O stelliferi</td>
<td>4 x Anapaecstic acatalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dactilicum dimetrum catalecticum cui est nomen adonio catalecticus autem versus dicitur cui una syllaba deest</td>
<td>Nubibus atri</td>
<td>4 x Adonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum parhemiacum quod constat dimetro catalectico</td>
<td>Felix nimium prior</td>
<td>2 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter (first two lines used as a refrain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Boetii</strong></td>
<td>Quanta rerum flectit</td>
<td>4 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum falleucium cui adheret dactilicum archilochium tetrametrum catalecticum in quo tamen pro spondeo sive dactilo imparibus locis trocheum reperies</td>
<td>Quamvis se Tyrio</td>
<td>2 x Phalaccian / Alcaic ten syllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Virgilii</strong></td>
<td>Tityre tu patule</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii exconsule ordinari metrum dactilicum tetrametrum constat spondeo dactilo catalectic item dactilo spondeo incipit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum pindaricum constans dimetro catalecto</td>
<td>O stelliferi</td>
<td>4 x Anapaecstic acatalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dactilicum dimetrum catalecticum cui est nomen adonio catalecticus autem versus dicitur cui una syllaba deest</td>
<td>Nubibus atri</td>
<td>4 x Adonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum parhemiacum quod constat dimetro catalectico</td>
<td>Felix nimium prior</td>
<td>2 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter (first two lines used as a refrain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Boetii</strong></td>
<td>Quanta rerum flectit</td>
<td>4 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum falleucium cui adheret dactilicum archilochium tetrametrum catalecticum in quo tamen pro spondeo sive dactilo imparibus locis trocheum reperies</td>
<td>Quamvis se Tyrio</td>
<td>2 x Phalaccian / Alcaic ten syllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Virgilii</strong></td>
<td>Tityre tu patule</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii exconsule ordinari metrum dactilicum tetrametrum constat spondeo dactilo catalectic item dactilo spondeo incipit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum pindaricum constans dimetro catalecto</td>
<td>O stelliferi</td>
<td>4 x Anapaecstic acatalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dactilicum dimetrum catalecticum cui est nomen adonio catalecticus autem versus dicitur cui una syllaba deest</td>
<td>Nubibus atri</td>
<td>4 x Adonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum anapesticum parhemiacum quod constat dimetro catalectico</td>
<td>Felix nimium prior</td>
<td>2 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter (first two lines used as a refrain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Boetii</strong></td>
<td>Quanta rerum flectit</td>
<td>4 x Anapaesic catalectic dimeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum falleucium cui adheret dactilicum archilochium tetrametrum catalecticum in quo tamen pro spondeo sive dactilo imparibus locis trocheum reperies</td>
<td>Quamvis se Tyrio</td>
<td>2 x Phalaccian / Alcaic ten syllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versus Virgilii</strong></td>
<td>Tityre tu patule</td>
<td>3 x Daeclyc hexameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lyric Metres
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Meter/Line Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>archilochium dimetrum acatalectum</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 x Phalaecian / Sapphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boetii</td>
<td>Huc omnes pariter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum trochaicum alcmanium constans dimetro acatalecto sane metra trochaica locis</td>
<td>Quos vides sedere</td>
<td>3 x Trochaic acatalectic dimeter + Ionic acatalectic dimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dimetrum trochaicum tribarchin et non numquam dactilum paribus vero cum supradictos tum etiam spondeum et anapestum recipiunt hui cautem subdidit feracetum quod pro spondeo interdum recipit anapestum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boetii</td>
<td>Bella bis quinis</td>
<td>Sapphic lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Prudentii</td>
<td>Per quinquennia iam</td>
<td>Glyconic / minor asclepiad / major asclepiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum dactilicum trimetrum hypercatalectic constat tribus dactilis et semipede quod est eptimereris heroica Versus ante cibum</td>
<td>O crucifer bone</td>
<td>3 x Daecylic hypercatalectic trimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum falleucium primus pes spondeus secundus dactilus et tribus trocheis clauditur Versus post cibum</td>
<td>Pastis visceribus</td>
<td>3 x Phalaecian hendecasyllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum asclepiadeum constat ex spondeo et duebus coriambis et pirrichio vel iambus claudit Versus ad incensum lucernae</td>
<td>Inventor rutili dux</td>
<td>4 x Minor asclepiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrum iambicum dimetrum catalecticum constat primo loco spondeo vel iambus secundo semper iambus tertio iambus vel spondeo et syllaba Versus ante somnum</td>
<td>Ades pater supreme</td>
<td>4 x Iambic catalectic dimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iambicum trimetrum acatalecticum primus iambus senarius secunda regio semper incipit iambus alia spondeus vel iambus Versus ieiunantium</td>
<td>O nazarene lux</td>
<td>5 x Iambic senarius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Metrum saphicum primo loco | Christe sanctorum regimen | Sapphic strophe |
| semper habet trocheum | | |
| secundo spondeum semper vel | | |
| trocheum tertio dactilus et | | |
| duobus trocheis clauditur | | |
| Versus post ieunium | | |

| Inicipit versus omni hora | *Da puer plecruit* | 4 x Trochaic catalectic tetrameter |
| | *Deus ignee fons* | 4 x Anapaestic catalectic dimeter |

| Anapesticum dimetrum brachi catalecticum constat ex tribus anapestis et syllaba et alia quando recipit spondeum | | |
| | Versus circa exequias defuncti | | |

| Versus in honore decem et octo martyrum Caesar Augustanorum | *Bis novem noster* | Sapphic strophe |

| Versus Sancti Cypriani episcopi | *Punica terra tulit* | Dactylic hypercatalectic trimeter |
| Versus in honore Eulaliae virginis | *Germine nobilis* | 5 x Dactylic hypercatalectic trimeter |

| Versus de natale Domini | *Quid est quod artum* | 4 x Ambrosian, iambic dimeter |
| Versus Psychomachia | *Senex fidelis prima* | 5 x Dactylic catalectic pentameter |

| Versus de penitentia | *Ad caeli clara* | 3 x (5p + 7pp), 5p |
| Versus de die iudicii | *Apparebit repentina dies* | 2 x 8p + 7pp, 4p + 5p |

**Notes:**

1. Later tenth-century additions are not included in this table. For details of the more substantial later additions see H. Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana)* (Bern, 1875), pp. 396-400.

2. '⁺' is used to differentiate the first and second halves of a line, and '⁻' indicates different schemes for alternate lines.

In this table, four different sections have been distinguished according to the complexity of verse structure. The third and fourth sections correspond to new gatherings, whereas the first two sections proceed without any discernible break. The hymns demonstrate a limited range of metric forms: principally iambic dimeter and sapphics, with one iambic trimeter and one asclepiad strophe. The following selection of verse on varied themes is likewise restricted to simple metric forms, featuring adonics, elegiacs, hexameters, a trochaic septenarius, iambic dimeter and trimeter.
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The Boethian and Prudentian lyrics are more complex. An interest in the form rather than the content of these lyrics is betrayed by several features. First, only the opening lines of each *metra* are copied. Second, the *metra* have been arranged into strophic units despite their continuous nature. Third, the lyrics are prefaced by metrical descriptions formally presented as *tituli* and copied by the main text scribe. The Boethian rubrics, as noted above, are taken from the metrical commentary of Lupus of Ferrières on the *De consolatione philosophiae*. No ultimate source for the Prudentian rubrics can be identified, but closely related rubrics are found in contemporary manuscripts and metrical descriptions date back to the earliest sixth-century sources.\(^{115}\)

The final point to be made about these *metra* concerns the criteria governing their selection. The Boethian *metra* all use either complex patterns or patterns with fixed syllable counts (sapphics, adonisics, phalaecian, alcaics, glyconics, and minor asclepiads).\(^{116}\) None of the simpler metric forms in the *De consolatione philosophiae*, whether in continuous or alternate form, is represented by this selection.\(^{117}\) The selected Prudentian *metra* likewise avoid the simpler forms: the only metre not represented from the *Liber cathemerinon* is the simplest, the Ambrosian iambic dimeter.\(^{118}\) Following the selection of *metra* from the *Liber cathemerinon* are three from the *Peristephanon*, the other lyrical composition of Prudentius. The next *metrum*, *Quid est quod artum*, is taken from the *Liber cathemerinon* and initially looks

\(^{115}\) For a discussion of Prudentian metrical descriptions and a list of manuscripts whose rubrics are related to those of Be 455, see M. Cunningham, ‘A Preliminary Recension of the Older Manuscripts of the “Cathemerinon”, “Apotheosis” and “Hamartigenia” of Prudentius’, *Sacris erudiri* XIII (1962), p. 37.

\(^{116}\) Anapaestic dimeters are treated by Boethius in a varied manner: in the catalectic form none of the elements is fixed; in the catalectic form the second half of the line is fixed in syllable count.

\(^{117}\) The simpler metrical forms in the *De consolatione philosophiae* are in *Carmina qui quondam* and *Rupis Achaemeniae* (I: 1 and V: 1, dactylic hexameters), *Quamvis fluente* (III: 3, iambic trimer / dactylic pentameter), *Quicumque solam* (II: 7, iambic trimer / dimeter), *Sunt etenim* (IV: 1, alcmanian / iambic dimeter) and *Tunc me discussa* (I: 3, dactylic hexameter / tetrameter).

\(^{118}\) None of the four appearances of the iambic dimeter in the *Liber cathemerinon* is included in the initial series in Be 455; that is, *Ales diei nuntius* (I), *Nox et tenebrae* (II), *Quid est quod artum* (XI) and *Quicumque Christum* (XII).
misplaced as it is one of the four iambic dimeters omitted from the earlier selection. The final metrum in this section is the preface to the Psychomachia of Prudentius. Unlike the previous metra, these final five verses do not present a systematic selection: not only are the verses taken from a number of different works, but they are not presented in strict order (the selections from the Peristefanon are numbers 4, 13 and 2 respectively). These closing verses appear to have been inserted to fill up remaining space in the gathering.

The two poems that follow the Boethian and Prudentian lyric metres both use innovative rhythmical forms; that is, rhythmical verse not directly based on a metrical pattern. Ad caeli clara features an imitation of the sapphic strophe that adds an extra final syllable to the first three lines. Apparebit repentina dies mixes an imitation of the standard trochaic septenarius with an irregular refrain. Although it is dangerous to extrapolate from only two verses, the evidence of the other sections of the manuscript suggests that the final section originally contained more of such forms.

The ordering of poetic material in the manuscript thus appears to proceed from simple to complex forms. Four distinct groups can be identified: basic hymnic forms, more varied forms (although still ones commonly encountered), lyric metres and innovative rhythmical forms. This organisation according to progressive difficulty strongly suggests a didactic intent in the compilation of the manuscript.

iv (b) Notation

Later textual additions provide a clue to the period during which notation was added to Be 455. The hand of Adelem of Laon, identified by Contreni in a textual emendation and addition of verses to fol. 22', may have also been responsible for the neumes that were added to both O mortalis homo and its additional verses. If this

---


120 See S. Barrett, 'Music and Writing: On the Compilation of Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 1154', EMH XVI (1997), pp. 94-5. The basis for this assertion was the similarity in ink colour, thickness of stroke and detail of formation between the text and neumes.
was so, then Adelem’s death date of 930 becomes a *terminus ante quem* for the presence of at least some notation in Be 455. The neumes and text of *Virgini virginum* (fols. 43r-44v), and the antiphons for the Vigil of St Anstrude (fols. 43r-44v), also appear to have been added at the same time during the tenth century. Finally, other minor textual additions (such as practice letters and the copying of passages on the same page) have been dated to the tenth century by Bischoff. These three instances indicate that the manuscript remained in use during the tenth century and that in all probability it was no later than the tenth century that the majority of notation was added.

Notation was added to Be 455 by numerous hands. Including the notations added to the Boethian and Prudentian *metra*, at least twenty different scribes can be identified, almost all of whom wrote neumes for only one verse. All except three scribes wrote neumes in a messine style. The three exceptions are: the notation for *Ihesu redemptor omnium* (II: 13), whose restricted range of forms resists classification; the notation for the Prudentian *metrum Per quinquen""""na""""n a* (fol. 31v), the neumes of which are Palaeofrankish in style; and the notation added to another Prudentian *metrum, O nazarene lux* (fol. 33v), which features northern French notation of the Arras type.

Within the remaining messine notations there is a wide range of subtlety with which notation is employed. The majority of the notations do not indicate diastematy through the heightening of signs, although a degree of relative diastematy is indicated in *Nocte surgentes* (II: 14) and *O mortalis homo* (II: 18). The repertory and execution of signs also varies widely. In some notations only a few basic forms are employed, such as in *Sume plectrum* (II: 16) and *Ihesu redemptor omnium* (II: 13), whilst in others a whole range of messine forms are displayed, such as in *O mortalis homo* (II: 18). The degree of variation in the formation of signs also differs from script to script: despite their restricted range of signs, *Sume plectrum* (II: 16) and *Qui signati*...
estis Christo (II: 19) feature a wide range of internal variation; by contrast, in O mortalis homo (II: 18) the range of signs is wide, but the execution of these signs is restricted. The amount of notation added to the individual poems also varies widely, from a few initial signs (such as for Nocte surgentes, II: 14), to sporadic notation over a longer span of text (such as for Avis haec magna, II: 15), to full notation for initial strophes (such as for Qui signati estis Christo, II: 19), and extensive notation beyond the first strophe (such as for Ihesu redemptor omnium II: 13), as well as notation throughout (such as for O mortalis homo, II: 18).

The number of hands and the wide variation in notational quality suggests that Be 455 was used as a codex in which notation itself could be practised. The copying in the margin of various words that appear on the same page points to a similar motivation as far as text in concerned. On fol. 22r, an overlap between these two practices can be observed, for a scribe copied both words and neumes of the two lines added to O mortalis homo by Adelem of Laon.123

A further index of the reception accorded Be 455 is the relative disposition of notation within the separate sections of the manuscript: only two of the twenty-five hymns are notated, as compared with four of the eleven poems of varied content, eleven of the twenty-six Boethian and Prudentian metra, and one of the two surviving rhythmical poems. In short, whilst the ratio of notated to unnotated poems is one to twelve for the hymns, it is near to one to two for the remaining poems. One reason for this disparity appears to be the same as that which governed the ordering of verse texts, namely an interest in technical structure. This formal appreciation would explain why in the whole collection the same metre was notated on only two occasions, and why the hymn texts (with only four different metres among twenty-seven texts) were sparsely notated.124 Expressed in another way, whereas only eighteen of the total of sixty-six poems were notated (roughly a quarter), sixteen of the twenty-seven different metres were notated (almost two-thirds).

123 See Barrett, 'Music and Writing', pp. 94-5.
124 The metres notated twice are adonics (Avis haec magna and Nubibus aritis) and the anapaestic catalectic dimeter (Qui se volet and Deus ignee fons). In the former pair, the length of strophe is different for the two poems and thus their equivalence is not absolute.
A second reason for disparity in the disposition of notation is the differing status of hymnic and non-liturgical verse. No notated hymnal survives from before the eleventh century, whereas there are numerous notated manuscripts of verse not destined for use in Mass or Office.  

This striking difference could be due simply to the expendability of hymnic sources in the light of revisions to the hymn repertory undertaken during the ninth century. Yet the absence of a single notated hymnal among surviving ninth and tenth century sources, even among those that were later transformed into study texts, suggests that there was a more fundamental difference between verse that was sung in Mass or Office and verse that had no such performance.

The most obvious difference is one of medium. Hymn melodies and texts sung in Mass or Office would have been known primarily through regular liturgical performance. For verse not performed under such circumstances, there was most probably no such regulative practice. What this would have meant in practice was that a widespread notation of hymn melodies of Mass or Office was inappropriate: the melodies for these texts would already have been known. This would negate the need for either mnemonic notation or for notation that was the result of an individual scribe’s attempt to understand verse structure. In reading the text of a hymn, the melody would automatically come to mind and aid comprehension of the verse form. The only motivation for recording such a hymn melody would be to practise writing neumes. The occasional notated hymns on flyleaves and the cursive nature of the two hymn notations in Be 455 support this hypothesis.

There remains one further observation to be made concerning the texts to which notation was added in Be 455. Alongside the role of music in reading the

125 Besides the twenty manuscripts considered here, Riou lists some twenty-four manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries transmitting notated antique verse: see Y.-F. Riou, ‘Chronologie et provenance des manuscrits classiques latins neumés’, in RHT XXI (1991), pp. 106-13. To the total number are also to be added several notated ninth and tenth century manuscripts of early medieval authors such as Prudentius, Boethius and Capella.

A second reason for disparity in the disposition of notation is the differing status of hymnic and non-liturgical verse. No notated hymnal survives from before the eleventh century, whereas there are numerous notated manuscripts of verse not destined for use in Mass or Office. This striking difference could be due simply to the expendability of hymnic sources in the light of revisions to the hymn repertory undertaken during the ninth century. Yet the absence of a single notated hymnal among surviving ninth and tenth century sources, even among those that were later transformed into study texts, suggests that there was a more fundamental difference between verse that was sung in Mass or Office and verse that had no such performance.

The most obvious difference is one of medium. Hymn melodies and texts sung in Mass or Office would have been known primarily through regular liturgical performance. For verse not performed under such circumstances, there was most probably no such regulative practice. What this would have meant in practice was that a widespread notation of hymn melodies of Mass or Office was inappropriate: the melodies for these texts would already have been known. This would negate the need for either mnemonic notation or for notation that was the result of an individual scribe’s attempt to understand verse structure. In reading the text of a hymn, the melody would automatically come to mind and aid comprehension of the verse form. The only motivation for recording such a hymn melody would be to practise writing neumes. The occasional notated hymns on flyleaves and the cursive nature of the two hymn notations in Be 455 support this hypothesis.

There remains one further observation to be made concerning the texts to which notation was added in Be 455. Alongside the role of music in reading the

---

125 Besides the twenty manuscripts considered here, Riou lists some twenty-four manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries transmitting notated antique verse: see Y.-F. Riou, ‘Chronologie et provenance des manuscrits classiques latins neumés’, in RHT XXI (1991), pp. 106-13. To the total number are also to be added several notated ninth and tenth century manuscripts of early medieval authors such as Prudentius, Boethius and Capella.

structural properties of the texts, the extent to which notation was the outcome of reflection upon the content of the texts to which it was appended merits consideration. In this manuscript, however, the notated texts do not stand out from the rest of the collection; rather, the combination of moral regulation (Qui cupis esse bonus qui, O mortalis homo, Qui signatis estis Christo and Ad caeli clara) and praise (Ihesu redemptor, Nocte surgentes, Avis haec magna and Sume plectrum) reflects the dichotomous subject matter of the whole collection. The common ground between these two subjects is song, and it is the quality of the texts in Be 455 as strophic song that unites the collection in terms of content. In other words, although Be 455 was evidently compiled for didactic purposes its contents were not entirely determined by formal considerations. Neither epitaphs, nor extended stichic poetry, nor aenigmata, nor verse epistles were included. Rather, the collection concentrates on texts that were suited to musical realisation. So it is that all the verse in the collection is strophic in organisation, and the amount of notation added to this manuscript is far in excess of all but one contemporary verse collection.

Summary

Of the manuscripts so far discussed, Be 455 is the most unequivocal example of a ‘schoolbook’: it contains the hand of a known schoolmaster; the material is organised according to progressive complexity; rubrics explaining metrical structure are copied alongside the most complex verse; simple textual additions appear throughout (practice letters and copying passages on the same page); there are numerous notations apparently all by different scribes and displaying a range of notational principles; and the transmitted material is known to have been used for teaching. Despite this wealth of evidence, the precise function of the manuscript remains elusive.

The suggestion that Be 455 was used for didactic purposes places it within a group of ninth-century manuscripts that include hymns alongside ‘school’ texts.127

127 The Murbach hymnal, Ox Junius 25, transmits alongside a hymnal works such as Aethicus on cosmography and Alcuin on rhetoric. The earliest example of the New Hymnal, StPa 25. 2. 31b, also transmits hymns alongside texts with an apparent didactic function such as a Vita of Virgil,
Two sequences of hymns of particular relevance in the light of the possible Parisian connections of Be 455 are those in Pa lat. 14088 and Pa lat. 528. The former was written at Corbie around the turn of the ninth century, but arrived some time later at St Germain-des-Près.128 Besides hymns, Pa lat. 14088 transmits canticles, as well as material relating to grammar, *computus* and astronomy.129 Pa lat. 528, on the other hand, was copied at St Denis. Again the manuscript is a veritable miscellany that transmits material relating to both grammar and *computus*.130 A further indication of the alignment of hymns and didactic texts is the placement of hymnals within library catalogues: in the library of St Gall, hymnals were grouped with grammatical and school texts, rather than with liturgical books, as early as the eighth century.131

v          Pa lat. 1154

v (a)  Texts

Pa lat. 1154 is a multipartite manuscript consisting of a litany of saints, a collection of prayers, an extract from Isidore of Seville’s *Synonyma* and a poetic collection. All four sections were copied in the late ninth or early tenth century.132 Identification of grammatical, astronomical and other excerpts. For full details, see Gneuss, *Hymner und Hymnen*, pp. 21 and 42, and the extended discussion on the didactic role of hymnals in ch. 9 (‘Die Expositio Hymnorum’).

129 The contents of Pa lat. 14088 are indicated in L. Delisle, ‘Inventaire des manuscrits latins de Saint-Germain-des-Près’, *BEC* XXIX (1868), p. 255. The canticles included among the hymns are the second half of the Christmas canticle *Populus qui ambulat* (Isaiah 9. 4-7), and *Laetare Jerusalem* (Isaiah 66. 10-16).
130 The hand of Bernard Itier, the twelfth-century librarian of St Martial de Limoges, is contained on fol. 1° of Pa lat. 528. For the full contents, see Lauer, *Catalogue général* I, pp. 184-6.
132 The most significant ascriptions of date include the late ninth century dating given in B. Bischoff, ‘Gottschalks Lied für den Reichenauer Freund’, *MAS* II, p. 27, and the 9-10 dating given by Bischoff in *MAS* I, p. 154 (n. 14). Gaborit-Chopin also assigned a date of 9-10 to the manuscript: see D. Gaborit-Chopin, *La décoration des manuscrits à Saint-Martial de Limoges et en Limousin du IXe siècle au XIIe siècle*, Paris and Geneva, 1969, p. 188. Chailley was probably too conservative in his tenth-century
the origin and provenance of the manuscript has proved problematic. The prominence of St Martin’s name within the litany of saints, as well as several later additions and emendations relating to St Martial, has led most commentators to assign the manuscript to a West Frankish monastery dedicated to St Martin before its adaptation for use at St Martial of Limoges in the eleventh century. Further observations on the content of the manuscript have hinted at modifications to this model. Bischoff noted that the opening litany showed signs of Breton influence, and several commentators on the versus section have suggested a clerical or lay orientation for the manuscript before its arrival at St Martial of Limoges.

The nature of Pa lat. 1154 as a penitential florilegium has long been recognised. I have demonstrated elsewhere the extent to which the material of the prayer and verse sections was arranged according to the same basic pattern that informed Isidore of Seville’s Synonyma. By aligning distinct thematic groups within the three sections an underlying structure of confession, conversion and praise was observed.

estimate, but noted that, because of the sectional construction of the manuscript, conclusions drawn from the first section of the manuscript did not necessarily apply to the others: J. Chailley, L’École musicale de Saint-Martial de Limoges jusqu’à la fin du XIe siècle, Paris, 1960, pp. 75-8. However, despite differences in script between the first section and the rest of the manuscript, the physical structure and the ruling are identical: for full details see Appendix I, no. 5.

133 For a full survey of the evidence relating to SS Martin and Martial in Pa lat. 1154, see S. Barrett, The Writing of Paris 1154, M. Phil diss. Univ. of Cambridge – Faculty of Music, 1996, pp. 9-20.

134 Bischoff, ‘Gottschalk’s Lied’, p. 27.

135 Huglo has argued that Pa lat. 1154 originated from a chapter and singled out St Martin of Brive; see M. Huglo, ‘Chant liturgique et chanson profane au moyen-âge’, Musique et société: hommages à Robert Wangermée (ed. H. Vanhulst and M. Haine), Brussels, 1988, p. 26 (n. 4). Richter had earlier argued for an unspecified lay orientation: L. Richter, ‘Die beiden ältesten Liederbücher des lateinischen Mittelalters’, in Philologus CXXIII (1979), p. 64. McKitterick, on the basis of observations by Dronke, suggested that the more ‘colloquial’ language of poetry such as that contained in Pa lat. 1154 ‘may well be the slim remainder of aristocratic “courtly” or secular literature from the ninth century’: R. McKitterick, The Carolingians and the Written Word, Cambridge, 1989, p. 231. The likelihood of compilation for an aristocratic audience with respect to the contents and compilation of the whole manuscript is also discussed in Barrett, ‘The Writing’, pp. 63-7.

136 See Chailley, L’École musicale, p. 73.

The penitential structure that informed the compilation of Pa lat. 1154 can also be traced in the construction of individual poems. In discussing recently recovered strophes of *Ut quid iubes*, Bischoff observed that Gottschalk’s religious poems were *confessiones* in the fullest sense, for in these poems human confession was linked with both praise and prayer. What was expressed in these *confessiones* was thus a two-fold movement – a consciousness of sin and divine praise. Von Moos developed this suggestion by tracing the double meaning of medieval *confessio* to an Augustinian fusion of previously separate traditions: the *confessio peccati* and the *confessio laudis*. This Augustinian duality, most famously expressed in the structure and content of his *Confessiones*, was inherited and adopted by Carolingian scholars.

The impact of this concept of *confessio* on the structure of ideas in Gottschalk’s *O mi custos* was traced by Von Moos. The seventy-two strophe poem was shown to fall into three parts: i) invocation of the triune God by a sinner ready to repent; ii) the *exemplum* of the prodigal son and the goodness of the Father towards his creature; iii) the redemption of Christ and the raising of Lazarus, the granting of grace by the Holy Spirit, and a Trinitarian doxology. This three-part structure is an elaboration of the same structure of *confessio* as traced above: i) a detailed confession of sins; ii) paradigms and requests for purification; iii) eschatology. According to Von Moos, not only did this structure inform *O mi custos* and other religious poems by Gottschalk, but it underpinned all other Carolingian penitential poetry.

---

140 *Confessio ista propter hoc quod sequitur*: "Peccavimus cum patribus nostris", gementis est. *Sed quoniam* 'Alleluia' praecedet, oportet eamdem confessionem in laude Dei accipere, quia nulla *confessio* est pia et utilis, nisi in qua Deus laudatur, Remigius of Auxerre, *Enarratio in psalmos*, PL CXXXI, cols. 688-9. ‘This confession because of what follows’, "We have sinned with our fathers", is one of lamenting. But since "Alleluia" precedes, it is proper to accept the same confession in praise of God, since no confession is pious and effective unless in it God is praised’.
141 The other Carolingian and pre-Carolingian rhythmic poems cited by Von Moos as following this structure of ideas are *Ad te Deus* (carmen LXVII) and *Anima nimis misera* (carmen LXVIII), *MGH*
The importance of this association between structures of confession and the structure of individual poems for an understanding of Pa lat. 1154 is twofold. First, recognition of an Augustinian model of confessio supports the claim that the prayers, the verse collection and the Synonyma followed the same pattern of confession, prayer, conversion, exempla and praise. Second, the association directs attention to the extent to which the principles that guided the compilation and use of the manuscript also governed the composition of individual verse. Further investigation of the latter is critical to any attempt to understand the contents of Pa lat. 1154. As a starting-point for this investigation, the contents along with the grouping of material previously suggested for Pa lat. 1154 are reproduced in Table 6:

---

142 For this structure in the individual sections of Pa lat. 1154, see Table 8 in Barrett, ‘Music and Writing’, p. 82.
A passage from confession of sins to praise is most marked in the opening group of penitential poems and Gottschalk’s *Ut quid iubes*. Ad *caeli clara* opens with a confession of sins that, although expressed in the first person, is nevertheless general.
and conventional – from strophes 4-10 the confession follows the personified vices.\footnote{144} The request for strength to put aside sin occurs from strophe 11 onwards; confession of faith follows in strophes 21-24 in which the poet protests his orthodoxy.\footnote{145} The remaining poems in the opening penitential group of Pa lat. 1154 also follow the three-fold structure outlined above: confession, request for purification and an eschatological vision of salvation. In Ad te Deus there is first a confession of wrongdoing (strophes 1-6), followed by an appeal for clemency and reflection on the day of judgement (strophes 7-10 and 11-20), before an appeal for forgiveness (strophes 21-4).\footnote{146} The same passage from confession to a plea for mercy in the hope of gaining eternal salvation is found in Anima nimis misera and Tocius mundi.\footnote{147} In O Deus miserere, the eschatological appeal takes the form of a minor litany with saints entreated to remember the confession and ensure a heavenly place for the poetic subject (strophes 13-20).\footnote{148}

The remaining verse in Pa lat. 1154 retains both the dichotomy of lament and praise, and an eschatological perspective on salvation. Working across the grouping according to theme signalled in Table 6 are several distinct modes of address: lament, prayer, narrative and exhortation. The verses of lament are akin to confessional verses in which personal remorse for sin is transformed into a sense of communal grief at the loss of a prominent person. In Mecum Timavi, a three-part structure is retained: remorse (strophes 1-4), praise and grief for the recently departed (strophes 5-12), and a plea that he be granted a place in paradise (strophes 13-14).\footnote{149} Both A solis ortu usque and Hug dulce nomen also feature lament, panegyric and a call for a final resting place – in the former a plea is made to Columbanus for intercession to secure a heavenly dwelling for Charlemagne; in the latter a more worldly appeal is made to

\footnote{144}{For the text of Ad caeli clara, see D. Norberg (ed.), L'oeuvre poétique de Paulin d'Aquilée, Stockholm, 1979, pp. 126-30.}
\footnote{145}{A fuller discussion of the structure of Ad caeli clara upon which this summary is based is to be found in Norberg, L'œuvre poétique, pp. 53-4.}
\footnote{146}{See AH XIX: 42.}
\footnote{147}{For the full texts, see AH XXIII: 70 and 71.}
\footnote{148}{See AH XXIII: 73.}
\footnote{149}{For a fuller discussion of the structure of Mecum Timavi and the text itself, see Norberg, L'œuvre poétique, pp. 34-8 and 100-2.}
establish a tomb for Hugh at Charroux.\textsuperscript{150} \textit{Aurora cum primo} provides a variation on this pattern. The poem takes the form of a personalised lament on the Battle of Fontenoy which is described as a day of final reckoning (strophes 12-13), and after which all that can be done is to pray for mercy on behalf of the souls of those who fought (strophe 15).\textsuperscript{151}

The prayer verses retain the first person address of the verses of confession and lament, but attention is directed more towards a \textit{confessio laudis} than a \textit{confessio peccati}. This change of emphasis is reflected in an increased use of the first person plural. \textit{Christus rex vita} is a communal prayer for \textit{caritas} which, although emphasising the necessity for penitence and the brevity of human life, ends in praise and expectation of eternal reward (strophe 14).\textsuperscript{152} \textit{Christe rex regum} and its imitation \textit{Spes mea} are appeals to Christ for correction and redemption – the wretchedness of the speaker is acknowledged, but the emphasis is on the power of Christ to effect the \textit{correctio} necessary for salvation.\textsuperscript{153} The two so-called double \textit{cursus} verses, \textit{Sancte Paule} and \textit{Dulce carmen}, likewise detail the unworthiness of the subjects but primarily take the form of praise of one who has interceded to secure a place in the heavenly kingdom.\textsuperscript{154}

The narrative poems likewise display a concern for heightened rhetorical expression, \textit{exempla}, moral conduct, death and the afterlife. Paulinus of Aquileia’s \textit{Fuit Domini}, of which only the first third appears in Pa lat. 1154, recounts the Gospel story of Lazarus.\textsuperscript{155} The two omitted sections, which provide first an allegorical, and then a tropological and moral interpretation of the story,\textsuperscript{156} point to the reason for including \textit{Fuit Domini} in this collection: Lazarus is interpreted as the soul of every

\textsuperscript{150} See \textit{MGH PAC I}, p. 435 and \textit{MGH PAC II}, p. 139.
\textsuperscript{151} For the text, see D. Norberg, \textit{Manuel pratique du latin médiéval}, Paris, 1968, pp. 165-72.
\textsuperscript{152} See \textit{AH XXIX}: 41.
\textsuperscript{153} See, respectively, \textit{AH I}: 222 and \textit{AH XIX}: 10.
\textsuperscript{154} See, respectively, \textit{AH XXIII}: 449 and 447.
\textsuperscript{155} For the text, of which only the first 24 strophes are copied in Pa lat. 1154, see Norberg, \textit{L’oeuvre poétique}, pp. 103-13. Godman has suggested that the shorter version may have been intended specifically for recital: see Godman, \textit{Poetry}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{156} On the three-fold division of \textit{Fuit Domini}, see Norberg, \textit{L’oeuvre poétique}, p. 42.
sinner, a soul in need of confession of penitence. A second feature of the Lazarus *rhythmus* is its exceptionally sustained and dramatic use of direct speech, itself a part of the overall heightened pathetic quality of the Gospel story as recounted by Paulinus.

The other narrative poem by Paulinus, *Gloriam Deo*, retells the story of Christ’s birth, the adoration of the shepherds and magi, and the massacre of the Innocents. The dramatic potential of the biblical story, with its passages of direct speech and juxtaposition of character, is in this case relatively unadorned. An eschatological perspective is nevertheless retained as the final strophes depart from the biblical narrative to contrast the damnation of Herod with the eternal felicity of the Innocents:

Herodes iacet in profundo tartari
combustus flammis, laceratus vermibus,
pice decoctus, dissipatus sulphure,
inflex ille.

In paradiso vos, famosi pueri,
aureas domos fontesque lactifluos,
mellitos modo possidetis rivulos,
semper felices.

Herod lies in the depth of hell
consumed by flames, torn apart by worms,
boiled by pitch, wasted by brimstone,
accursed man.

In paradise, you, celebrated boys,
now possess golden palaces,
lactiferous springs and honeyed brooks,
eternally blessed.

The remaining biblical narratives are more restricted in dramatic effect, but continue the interest in death and final judgement. *Tristis venit* is an unglossed account of the appearances of Christ after his death and resurrection. *Homo quidam* tells of the other Lazarus and the beggar, with an additional strophe to make

---

157 This interpretation is made explicit in strophes 51-3 and 57 of *Fuit Domini*. For texts and translation, see Godman, *Poetry*, pp. 102-5.


159 The following two verses are reproduced from Norberg, *L'oeuvre poétique*, p. 137.

160 See *AH* XXIX: 16.
explicit the moral imperative of the tale given the life to come. Finally, the version of Anno tertio transmitted in Pa lat. 1154 provides a foreshortened version of the story of Judith and Holofernes. The poem ends having described the preparations of Holofernes for war, the sufferings of the Jewish people, and Holofernes binding Achior for an impending death.

The exhortatory verses are similarly concerned with moral regulation, death and the Last Judgement. These verses are distinguished by a solely third person form of address, yet in Quique de morte and Judicii signum the rhetorical quality still exceeds that of all the other verse in the collection. The former enjoins its audience to prepare for Judgement Day (strophe 1), describes that day in great detail (strophes 2-10), and ends with a plea for redemption (strophe 11). The latter is a verse of the Erythraean Sibyl – a graphic portrayal of the Last Judgement whose acrostic bore witness to the coming of Christ. Less extreme in expression is Beatus homo, a juxtaposition of the beatitudes with their nearest deadly sin. The Boethian metra also fall into this category of moral regulation and judgement of the individual: O stelliferi concerns the harshness of worldly fate and appeals to the deity to maintain a stable law; Bella bis quinis describes the labours of Hercules as an exemplum for

161 For the text, see MGH PAC IV. 2, p. 537. The additional strophe reads: Christiani qui adestis, cavete divitias, / Ne sicut dives ille fecit, pereatis invicem; / Perpetuam mortem fugite, vitam concuspiscite.

162 For the text of Anno tercio, see MGH PAC IV. 2, p. 459.

163 See Norberg, Manuel pratique, pp. 155-64.

164 The acrostic reads: IESOUS CHREISTOS UIOS SOTER ('Jesus Christ God's Son Saviour'). For the verse text as transmitted in Augustine's Sermo contra Judaeos, Paganos et Arianos, see PL XLII, col. 1126.

165 The juxtaposition of virtues with their contrary vices formed the structure for the sixth book of Halitgar of Cambrai's De vitiis et virtutibus et de ordine paenitentium libri quinque, one of the earliest Carolingian attempts to replace the canonic penitentials with more private handbooks: see PL CV, cols. 651-78.

overcoming fate;\textsuperscript{167} and \textit{Qui se volet} counsels self-overcoming as the only road to virtue.\textsuperscript{168}

The closing group of hymnic verses are the most removed from any confessio peccati. The themes of sinfulness, exempla, purification and the afterlife are still present but are for the most part divorced from self-reference. In the first of the hymnic verses, \textit{Festiva saeclis}, the wretchedness of the subject and an appeal for redemption remains a theme.\textsuperscript{169} In the remaining verses, however, the release from sin and gaining of eternal reward has already been effected through the suffering of intercessors: in \textit{Germine nobilis} through the martyrdom of Eulalia,\textsuperscript{170} and in \textit{Pange lingua} and \textit{Tellus ac aethra} through the passion of Christ.\textsuperscript{171}

In sum, the structure and content of a twofold confessio can be seen to underpin the varied subject-matter of the almost all the verses in \textit{Pa lat. 1154}. The penitential verse and the verses of lament are both first-person utterances which follow a threefold structure: remorse, exemplars or request for purification, and a vision of eschatological redemption. The prayer verses are likewise first person in address and follow the same threefold mode, yet although the wretchedness of the subject is referred to in these verses, more emphasis is placed on the appeal to an intercessor to effect salvation. The narrative verses mix first and third person address and feature the same topics of moral exemplars and a vision of death and final judgement. The penitential element in these verses is not lost, but transferred: it is the role of the audience to draw out the moral exegesis and repent (as made explicit in \textit{Fuit Domini} and \textit{Homo quidam}). A similar transference is assumed in the exhortatory verses: the audience is to engage in penitence in the light of impending death and the Last Judgement. In all these categories, the vision is ascetic and the structure is one of penitential confessio. Only in the final section of hymnic verse is self-reflection absent and the dual movement of confessio transformed into a hymnic laus Dei.

\textsuperscript{167} See Stewart, Rand and Tester, \textit{Boethius}, pp. 380-3 (Bk. IV: \textit{metrum} vii).
\textsuperscript{168} See Stewart, Rand and Tester, \textit{Boethius}, pp. 252-3 (Bk. III: \textit{metrum} v).
\textsuperscript{169} See \textit{AH II}: 80.
\textsuperscript{170} See \textit{AH I}: 32.
\textsuperscript{171} See \textit{AH I}: 71 and 79 respectively.
Both the overall structure and content of the verse collection and the specific structure and content of its individual verse thus point to private confession. For practical evidence of contemporary reception, it is necessary to turn to later additions to Pa lat. 1154 and in particular the notation.

v (b) Notation

The addition of musical notation to the poetry in Pa lat. 1154 is as follows:\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{172} For reproductions, transcriptions and descriptions of these notations in Pa lat. 1154, see II: 21-37.
Table 7  Notated verse in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 21-37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Notator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99v</td>
<td><em>Ad caeli clara</em></td>
<td>A, j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102f</td>
<td><em>Ad te Deus</em></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104v</td>
<td><em>Anima nimis misera</em></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105v</td>
<td><em>Si vis celsi</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106v</td>
<td><em>Tocius mundi</em></td>
<td>A, k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110v</td>
<td><em>Fuit Domini</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113v</td>
<td><em>Christus rex vita</em></td>
<td>A, l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116v</td>
<td><em>Mecum Timavi</em></td>
<td>A, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118v</td>
<td><em>O stelliferi</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119v</td>
<td><em>Bella bis quinis</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121v</td>
<td><em>Quique de morte</em></td>
<td>A, n, o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122v</td>
<td><em>Judicii signum</em></td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123v</td>
<td><em>Gloriam Deo</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131v</td>
<td><em>Ut quid iubes</em></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132v</td>
<td><em>A solis ortu usque</em></td>
<td>F, p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133v</td>
<td><em>Hug dulce nomen</em></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136v</td>
<td><em>Aurora cum primo</em></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Scribes denoted in lower case notated extracts within, rather than at the beginning of, versus.
2. The sequence *Concelebremus sacrum* (fol. 142v) is also notated by A but falls outside the design of the versus collection and the scope of this study.

It is apparent from this table that scribe A was responsible for the vast majority of the notations in Pa lat. 1154. I have observed elsewhere that the notation of scribe B may have been the earliest notation to be added to the manuscript. By virtue of being added to the versus that was central to the design of the collection, I suggested that this notation could be considered a rhetorical extension of the penitential structure.\(^\text{173}^\)

For scribe A, no such correlation between the design of the compilation and the notated texts could be detected. A consideration of the notations of scribe A, as well as...
as those of the remaining scribes, in relation to the design of the individual verse texts does, however, reveal a significant correlation.

The most striking aspect of the disposition of notation in Pa lat. 1154 is that none of the hymnic texts that constitute the final section of the collection was notated. Two reasons for this omission may be suggested. First, as remarked in relation to Be 455, hymns were not routinely notated before the eleventh century. For these texts the addition of notation would have been superfluous if associated melodies were widely known and regulated through repeated renditions in liturgical performance. Secondly, as remarked in the previous section, the hymn texts are of a different quality to the rest of the collection. These hymnic texts lack any self-reflexive element and thus the twofold content and structure of confessio variously encountered in the other verses is absent.

Taken together, these two suggestions do not entirely account for the addition of notation. Not all the non-hymnic texts are notated, and there is a wide disparity in the amount of notation added to the different types of verse identified in the previous section. To investigate further the rationale that guided the addition of notation to the verse in Pa lat. 1154, it is therefore necessary to return to an examination of individual texts.

The most direct contrast to the hymns are the penitential verses which place the most emphasis on a personalised confessio peccati. Of the opening five penitential verses four received notation: the three texts described as penitential in their rubrics were all notated by A, Ad te Deus (labelled a ritmus) was notated by a naïve scribe (C), while O Deus miserere (labelled an oratio and differing from the others in its inclusion of a minor litany) was left unnotated. The other verse with an explicit progression from confessio peccati to confessio laudis, Ut quid iubes, was notated by F.

The other category of verses with a strong emphasis on personal suffering, the verses of lament, also received a high proportion of notation. Indeed, all four of the verses in this category were notated: Mecum Timavi, Aurora cum primo and A solis
ortu usque and Hug dulce nomen. None of the verses of prayer, on the other hand, with their emphasis on confessio laudis and weakened personal appeal through recourse to the first person plural, were notated.

The two remaining categories – narrative and exhortatory verse – both move away from personalised subjects, although as noted above the rhetoric of a confessio peccati is retained through transference to the audience. It is indeed this rhetorical quality which distinguishes the notated from the unnotated verse in these categories. Paulinus of Aquileia’s extended dramatic narratives, Fuit Domini and Gloriam Deo, were notated by A, whereas the more straightforward re-tellings of Tristis venit, Homo quidam and Anno tercio were left unnotated. Of note here is also the fact that in Fuit Domini the two most heightened passages of direct speech within the narrative received further neumes.\(^{174}\) In a similar fashion, the graphic depictions of Quique de morte and Judicii signum received notation, whereas the more restrained Beatus homo did not. Finally, it must be noted that two out of the three Boethian metra received notation: the ‘voiced’ prayer of O stelliferi and the extended description of the Herculean labours, Bella bis quinis, but not the sober moral lesson of Qui se volet.

From this survey, it would appear that notation was added to those texts with a heightened rhetorical quality. Notation was not added to the formal categories of hymns and prayer verses, but those with a strongly developed inner voice. The formulation that would most closely describe these texts is ‘religious lyric’, although it is approached with caution since the texts in this category are far from uniform in quality and the formulation itself is open to anachronistic misinterpretation. A more empirical account of the notated texts described above serves to identify three overlapping groups: the direct personal appeal of the penitential lyric that is broadened to include lament and moral exhortation; the dramatic address of the

---

\(^{174}\) The relevant passages are the lament of the two Marys that Lazarus has died, in which neumes are added to the words desolatas, heu, relinquit (strophe 8), and Christ’s questioning of Martha as to whether she believes in the resurrection Credis hoc, Martha? (strophe 15). The importance of the second passage, in which Martha is faced with a trial of faith, is drawn out later in the full version of the poem (strophe 54).
narratives of Paulinus of Aquileia; and the more reasoned appeal of the Boethian *metra.*

**Summary**

Of the notated *florilegia* examined, Pa lat. 1154 approximates most closely to what might be termed a songbook. Not only are its texts the most personal in subject matter and rhetorical in address, but its notations are the most expansive in number and melodic gesture. Nevertheless, the term ‘songbook’ creates a false image of autonomous artworks and obscures the structures which guided the compilation and composition of the transmitted verse.

Direct evidence for the reception of the material in this manuscript is slim. An added prayer for absent family, a few practice letters, roughly drawn pictures, and the occasional poorly formed notation might suggest a teaching function. Yet the additions of a *Confiteor*, a verse to St Martial, a notated response in a consistent hand, and alterations to the litany suggest a book with connections to some form of ritual.175 Given the absence of precise information, and the indication from what does survive that the manuscript had a variety of different uses and users, it is safest to avoid generic terms such as classbook, library book and songbook. The focus of attention should rather remain on the nature of the activities represented by the material in the manuscript, its specific structures and historical constructions.

One possible context for the structures of *confessio* uncovered in the compilation and composition of the verse in Pa lat. 1154 is Carolingian penance. In the Carolingian era, penitential practice was itself twofold: on the one hand, penal penance was strengthened through an attempt to re-assert patristic authority and older conciliar decrees.176 On the other hand, confession was internalised through an official attempt to provide a basis for the private and popular forms of penance that

175 For these later additions, see Barrett, ‘The Writing’, pp. 12-6.
176 Symptomatic of these developments are the Pseudo-Cummaen penitential canons and the Pseudo-Isidorean decreals. For a summary of the importance of these collections, see R. Pié, ‘The Frankish Penitentials’, *Studies in Church History* XI, Oxford, 1975, pp. 36-7.
had previously circulated in unregulated *florilegia*.\(^1\) By virtue of its combination of litany, prayers and verse, and by virtue of the structures of the individual verses it transmits, the compilation of *Pa lat. 1154* would fall into this second category. In short, it would appear that *Pa lat. 1154* was a manuscript compiled for private use by individuals.

vi Br 8860-8867

vi (a) Texts

Br 8860-8867 transmits a substantial number of verses composed by a number of Christian poets. The collection has evidently undergone transformations since its initial compilation since, as the signatures indicate, two gatherings are missing from the opening of the manuscript.\(^2\) Besides an erroneous switch of gatherings, the only other significant later alteration to the manuscript occurs in the shape of a number of marginal additions, all of which are accompanied by neumatic notation (see Table 9 below).

On the basis of the later additions, one of which includes antiphons for St Otmar, early editors of the *Poetae aevi Carolini* series presumed the manuscript to have been copied at St Gall.\(^3\) This view has since been challenged by Bischoff, who identified characteristics of a Franco-Saxon style and assigned the manuscript to a north-eastern Frankish cloister, most probably St Bertin, in the third quarter of the ninth century.\(^4\) Bischoff also stipulated that the later additions were the product of

\(^{1}\) See R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and Carolingian Reforms 789-895*, London, 1977, ch. v ("*Florilegia*").

\(^{2}\) In its current state, the manuscript begins with the closing verses of *Anno tercio*. The first signature (III) is found at the end of the first surviving gathering (fol. 7').


\(^{4}\) Bischoff, "Gottschalks Lied", *MAS II*, p. 26 (n. 4).
the tenth century and that for these the manuscript must have travelled South, possibly, although by no means necessarily, to St Gall. This suggestion of a southern migration has more recently been challenged by Schwab on the basis of a close reading of the Old High German line added to folio 15°. She has proposed that the manuscript remained in the area of Liège, and that additions were added by a scribe trained in the St Gall style who had moved to this region (such as Notker of Liège). Whilst Schwab’s suggestion remains possible, in the absence of any evidence that Otmar was celebrated in the region of Liège it remains subject to further confirmation.

Aside from questions of origin, a consideration of textual contents and presentation sheds some light on the processes of compilation and subsequent use of the manuscript. As Bischoff has observed, the verses copied in Brussels 8860-8867 are for the most part neither narrowly didactic nor liturgical in orientation. Rather, the verses consist of summaries of biblical stories, moral exhortations, or laments for sins that would seem to reflect some form of popular piety. A closer examination of the disposition of these verses reveals three separate groups within the single collection.

---


The entry in Bischoff’s catalogue ascribes all the additions to a St Gall hand: see Bischoff, KFH, no. 726.


183 Schwab rightly notes that Otmar was celebrated in many places other than the final resting place of his relics at St Gall. However, the other centres where the saint was either venerated or to which his relics were translated were all south-eastern Frankish centres: see J. Duft, Sankt Otmar in Kult und Kunst I Der Kult, St Gall, 1965, pp. 18-49 (esp. pp. 46-9).


185 The presence of three distinct groups of versus within Br 8860-8867 was suggested in Barrett, ‘Music and Writing’, pp. 65-9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>The ordering of verse in Br 8860-8867</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rubric</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incipit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lacuna)</td>
<td>Anno tercio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De diebus tredecim vel quid Domini in his operam egit</td>
<td>Tertio in flore mundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De adnuntiatione Sancte Mariae</td>
<td>Angelus Domini Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De fecunditate Sanctae Mariae</td>
<td>A superna caeli parte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De nativitate Christi</td>
<td>Alta prolis sanctissime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De habitu et conversatione monachorum</td>
<td>Adeptus quisque munere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De accusatione hominis erga Deum</td>
<td>Audi me Deus piissime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item unde supra</td>
<td>Audi me Deus peccatorem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De commendatione uniuscuiusque animae</td>
<td>Age Deus causam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De nativitate Domini sicut prexixit angelus</td>
<td>A solis orturcardine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Enoch et Haeliae</td>
<td>Apparebunt ante somnum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De castitate iuvenum</td>
<td>Audax est vir iuvenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De passione ac resurrectione Domini</td>
<td>Audite omnes gentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Christo Domino</td>
<td>Agnus et leo mitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De die iudicii</td>
<td>Apparebit repentina dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item de accusatione facinoris</td>
<td>Audi me Deus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sancta Hierusalem caelesti</td>
<td>Alma fulget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De caritate et avaritia</td>
<td>Alma vera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De laude et preces Sanctae Mariae</td>
<td>Aurora dicta sermone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sancto Iohanne</td>
<td>Amicus sponsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De adventu Domini et die iudicii</td>
<td>Quicque de morte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De castitate corporis</td>
<td>Qui cupis esse bonus qui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De aebrietate cavenda</td>
<td>Qui cupis esse bonus et vis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item contra crapulam</td>
<td>Propre stomachum qui farcit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precepta salutis</td>
<td>O mortalis homo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Title</td>
<td>Latin Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verba philosophie ad suos sectatores</td>
<td>Quisque alumnus veris varias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magister exortans discipulos</td>
<td>Discite nunc pueri docilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magister comminans discipulis</td>
<td>Quemlibet hic segnum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magister discipulo</td>
<td>Haece rogo parva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De resurrectione Domini</td>
<td>Surrexit Christus ad soporem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De passione Domini</td>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De laude Dei</td>
<td>Ante saecula et tempora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De obitu Karoli</td>
<td>A solis ortu usque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De caritate</td>
<td>Congregavit nos in unum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item de nativitate Domini</td>
<td>Gratuletur omnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De novo ac veteri Testamento a Sancto Sedulio dictatum</td>
<td>Cantemus socii Domino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De annuntiatione ruinae</td>
<td>Criminux mole gravatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De laude diei conceptione Mariae</td>
<td>Canamus omnes laudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De resurrectione Domini</td>
<td>Refulgit omnis luce mundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De nativitate Domini nostri Ihesu Christi</td>
<td>Gloriam Deo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De resurrectione Christi</td>
<td>Tristis venit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymnus Eulogii diaconi [sic]</td>
<td>O triplex honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymnus in honore sanctorum XVIII martyrum Cesar Augustarum</td>
<td>Bis novem noster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incipit hymnus in honore beatissimorum martyrum fructuosie</td>
<td>O triplex honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pie ecclesiae terraconensis et augurit et Eulogii diaconi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Bede presbiteri de die iudicii</td>
<td>Inter florigeras secundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incipit versus Furtunati [sic] ad Hilpericum regem et Fredegundem reginam</td>
<td>Aspera conditio et sors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disticon in phylomella</td>
<td>Sum noctis socia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hymnic 1 Christ-centred**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrum apocope evangeliorum cum apoclypsis a luvenco presbitero dictatum</th>
<th>Inmortale nihil mundi</th>
<th>Iuvenus (early 4th century)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Sancto Quintino martyre</td>
<td>Militem Christi</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ymmus de die palmarum</td>
<td>Magnum salutis gaudium</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De morte Lazari et eius resurrectione</td>
<td>Fuit Domini</td>
<td>Paulinus of Aquileia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De fide et caritate seu cavenda cupiditate</td>
<td>Christus rex via vita lux</td>
<td>s. viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sancto Stephano martyre</td>
<td>Christus est vita veniens</td>
<td>s. vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sancto Martino episcopo</td>
<td>Christo rex noster via</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item de Sancto Martino episcopo</td>
<td>Venerabilem virum</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De gloria apostolorum</td>
<td>Apostolorum gloriam ymnis</td>
<td>Bede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sancto Petro apostolo</td>
<td>Beatus Christi famulus</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De divite et Lazaro</td>
<td>Homo quidam</td>
<td>s. vii/vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De initium quadragesimae</td>
<td>Insigne sanctum tempus</td>
<td>Paul the Deacon? (d. c. 799)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The entries in the table are reconstructed according to the original order of the manuscript. Dates and attributions to authors are for the most part reproduced from ICL. Attributions to Paulinus of Aquileia follow D. Norberg, *L’oeuvre poétique de Paulin d’Aquilée*, Stockholm, 1979.

The first identifiable group of verses in Br 8860-8867 consists of eighteen alphabetical verses (*Angelus Domini* to *Amicus sponsi*). This distinctive mode of verse composition took as its model Sedulius’ *A solis ortucardine*. Not only was the technique of beginning each strophe with a successive letter of the alphabet imitated, but also the didactic tone and popular style. What is notable about the alphabetic verses in this Brussels manuscript is that apart from *A solis ortucardine* none is by a known author. Rather, the verses are anonymous compositions from the seventh through to ninth centuries that for the most part survive in only this one manuscript.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁶ Eleven of the alphabetical verses in this first section are *unica*. Four verses are found in only a few other manuscripts: *Angelus Domini* and *A superna caeli parte* (both in Lei Voss. lat. Q. 69), *Apparebunt ante somnum* (in Pa lat. 16668), and *Adeptus quisque munere* (in Br 1511-28). Three verses display a more widespread distribution: *Alma vera, Alma fulget* and *A solis ortu usque.*
The second group consists of verses for the most part by Eugenius of Toledo and Hibernicus Exul (*Quicque de morte* to *Disce libens iuvenis*). The common theme of these verses is exhortation directed towards young people, in which it is suggested that eternal life can only be gained through a rejection of the transitory things of this world and a fixing of the mind on higher things. The final group is made up of hymnic verses. These verses are not hymns routinely performed in the Office, but verses that appear to have moved in and out of the Mass. Within this group there is a certain amount of gathering according to common themes in which it is suggested that eternal life can only be through a rejection of the transitory things and a fixing of the mind on higher things. Both the ordering and contents, however, are far from strictly observed – a lament for Charlemagne appears amid hymns on the life of Christ, and Eugenius of Toledo’s mélange of nightingale poems is copied among verses on the deeds of Saints.

It remains to enquire into the significance of these three groups for the compilation of Br 8860-8867. Strong indications of the methods of compilation are to be found by examining script and layout. Before examining these features, however, it may be noted that in addition to a grouping on the basis of content and organisation, a grouping according to compositional style is evident. With the single exception of *A solis ortu cardine* (included among the alphabetical verse), metrical verse is confined to two distinct groups: the verses of moral exhortation as noted above, and a

---

187 For the Eugenian verses, see *MGH AA* XXIV, pp. 233-8. The verses by Hibernicus Exul are edited in *MGH PAC* I, pp. 402-3.

188 Several of these verses are also copied in liturgical manuscripts: *Pange lingua* (numerous manuscripts), *Fuit Domini* (PaA 227), *Magnum salutis gaudium* (Mu clm 3005), *Homo quidam* (Lo Add. 19768) and *Gratuletur omnis* (Pa lat. 1240, RoA 123). In addition, three verses are referred to as *ymni* in the rubrics of Br 8860-8867: *O triplex honor, Bis novem noster* and *Magnum salutis gaudium*.

189 *A solis ortu usque* is also copied among a series of *ymni* in Ver XC (85). For the full contents of this manuscript, see G. G. Meersseman, ‘Il codice XC della capitolare di Verona’, *Archivio Veneto* CIV (1975), pp. 14-23.

190 See *MGH AA* XIV, pp. 253-4 (nos. 30-3). The rubric *Disticon in Phylomella* is correctly applied only to the first of these poems.
sequence within the group of hymnic material (*O triplex honor* on fol. 53r to *Magnum salutis* on fol. 66r).\(^{191}\)

Turning to scribal procedure, it can be observed that the collection was copied by several hands writing a similar Caroline minuscule of the last quarter of the ninth century.\(^{192}\) Changes in hand often correspond to new gatherings, as at the openings of current gatherings III, IV, V, VI, VII, X and XI. These changes are also on occasion co-ordinated with the beginning of a new verse text, as for current gatherings VI, VII and X. Where the text is continuous, two strategies of text preparation are evident: either the text is continued without any interruption in presentation,\(^{193}\) or the continued verse text is compressed into space left at the beginning of the new gathering for the rubric of the next verse text.\(^{194}\)

This scribal practice indicates that several scribes copied this collection in proximity, although the degree to which they co-ordinated their work varied. The absence of any correspondence between changes in gatherings and the changes in the groups of material identified above speaks against the possibility that the collection was made simply by joining together existing *libelli*. Nevertheless, it remains possible that scribes copied from *libelli*, for pre-existing collections would provide a means for co-ordinating changes of hands between gatherings whilst assuring a continuity of text. As for the reason why separate gatherings were copied by separate scribes, this cannot be stated with any certainty, although the most immediate

---


\(^{192}\) For further details, see the manuscript description in Appendix no. 6.

\(^{193}\) This occurs at the beginning of current gatherings V, IX and XI.

\(^{194}\) As at the beginning of the current gathering IV, where the final strophe of *Agnus et leo mitis* is compressed into the first line of the new gathering. In the previous gathering, the strophes are laid out on two lines each.
explanation would be that this method of copying enabled production to proceed more swiftly.\textsuperscript{195}

A third and final consideration that sheds light on the question of the origins and use of this manuscript is size. Br 8860-8867, at 150mm x 115mm, is by some degree the smallest of the verse collections considered here.\textsuperscript{196} This pocket format may in part be read as a reflection of status. None of the verse collections considered here is a \textit{de luxe} or prestige manuscript, and the smaller dimensions of this Brussels manuscript might be considered a sign that the collection was intended as a portable object. Something of the implications of the small format may be grasped through comparison with similar manuscripts: in broad terms, smaller manuscripts appear to have been directed towards private use – whether in the form of books of rules for self-conduct, learned notebooks and glossaries, or devotional books.\textsuperscript{197}

The three indices considered here – the grouping of material, the copying by gathering and the diminutive size – do not lead to any clear conclusions about the functions fulfilled by Br 8860-8867. Nevertheless, a number of circumscribed observations may be made about the nature of this collection. First, the manuscript is not a miscellany since a degree of order has been imposed upon the material through alignment and rubrics. Second, the manuscript is not of a high grade: the changes of hand are not always well co-ordinated, and at least one hand is of poor calligraphic quality. Third, due to its small dimensions the manuscript appears to be suited to use as a pocket book. Fourth, the contents appear to reflect some form of popular devotional piety, a consideration which when combined with the diminutive size would suggest a book which could be used for some form of personal edification.


\textsuperscript{196} The dimensions of the other manuscripts considered in this chapter are: 277 x 200 mm. (Pa lat. 8093), 215 x 147 mm. (Pa lat. 2832), 245 x 167 mm. (Ma 10029), 210 x 150 mm. (Pa lat. 1154), and 215 x 165 mm. (Be 455).

\textsuperscript{197} For full references to this range of early medieval manuscripts copied in small formats, see B. Bischoff, \textit{Latin Palaeography. Antiquity and the Middle Ages} (trans. D. Ó Cróinín and D. Ganz), Cambridge, 1990, p. 25.
vi (b) Notation

The strongest indication of the reception afforded to Br 8860-8867 are the later marginal additions with musical notation.

Table 9  Marginal additions to Br 8860-8867

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>Hierez runeta (II: xvi)</td>
<td>Old High German line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15'-16'</td>
<td>Solve lingua (II: 38)</td>
<td>Versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>Fulgentibus palmis</td>
<td>Antiphon for Palm Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&quot;-20'</td>
<td>Avarus maximam cupiditatem</td>
<td>Versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74v-76r</td>
<td>Mendaces ostendit</td>
<td>Otmar antiphons (CAO 3743)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>Gloria patri (x 2), Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first sight, these texts show few signs of similarity. Beginning with the texts added to folio 15\textsuperscript{v}, nine Old High German words appear in the upper margin: *Hierez runeta hintun in daz ora vildu noh hinta*.\textsuperscript{198} Immediately below was added the first verse of *Solve lingua*, a poem of praise and supplication to St Peter.\textsuperscript{199} In the right hand margin appears *Fulgentibus palmis*, elsewhere recorded as a processional antiphon for Palm Sunday.\textsuperscript{200} Although these three texts are diverse in genre, they share identical scribal characteristics and were in all probability added by the same hand. Furthermore, the notation for *Hierez runeta* is, allowing for slight differences due to the syllable count, identical to that for *Solve lingua*.\textsuperscript{201} This musical association provides a point of departure for investigating the motivation for recording additional texts in Br 8860-8867.

\textsuperscript{198} 'The hart whispered into the hind's ear, / Will you hind?'. Translation from B. Murdoch, *Old High German Literature*, Boston, 1983, p. 109.

\textsuperscript{199} See *AH* II, 545.

\textsuperscript{200} *Fulgentibus palmis* appears as a processional antiphon for Palm Sunday in the following antiphoners inventoried by Hesbert: StG 390-1 (s. x-xi), Ba lit. 23 (s. xii) and Zu Rh. 28 (s. xiii). For full details, see *CAO* II, no. 68, and III, no. 2909.

\textsuperscript{201} The correlation between the two set of neumes was first noted in Müllenhoff and Scherer, *Denkmäler* II, p. 57.
The existence of a formal connection between Latin versus and Old High German poetry is by no means unique since much Old High German literature is to some extent a translation from Latin.\textsuperscript{202} What is of interest here is that the association of Old High German and Latin verse, an appeal to St Peter and proximity to a processional piece (in this case Fulgentibus palmis) is one found elsewhere. The Petruslied, an Old High German poem consisting of three two-line strophes each followed by the refrain Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, describes the power given to St Peter to admit men to heaven and begs him to intercede on behalf of sinners.\textsuperscript{203} Although far from a translation, the Petruslied has close parallels to Aurea luce, a processional hymn to St Peter.\textsuperscript{204} The importance of this parallel to the texts added to fol. 15\textsuperscript{V} of Br 8860-88867 lies not in the precise relationship between the various elements, but in the shared mixture of popular and devotional elements with material on the edges of the liturgy.

Besides a shared register of address, what is striking about the additions to folio 15\textsuperscript{V} is their exemplary quality. All three texts appear here in their earliest redaction and are to some degree unique. Hierez runeta is a unicum and consists of a metrically ambiguous mix of alliteration and rhyme. Solve lingua, which is found in only two other sources,\textsuperscript{205} is composed in a rare rhythmical form (3 x 6p), and Fulgentibus palmis is here in its earliest surviving version. The rarity of this material suggests that its copying was to some extent motivated by a desire to write out novel

\textsuperscript{202} On the secondary nature of most Old High German survivals in relation to Latin texts see the summary with further references provided in D. Green, Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800-1300, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 47-50.

\textsuperscript{203} The Petruslied is recorded in Mu clm 6260, fol. 158', where it is notated throughout. The main body of the manuscript was copied in the third quarter of the ninth century and the Old High German addition was made in a hand of c. 900 or the early tenth century: see Bischoff, ‘Paläographische Fragen’, p. 88. For the text, see Müllenhoff and Scherer, Denkmäler, no. 9 (I, pp. 21-2 and II, pp. 61-4). On the neumes, see H. Hücke, ‘Die Neumierung des althochdeutschen Petruslieds’, in Organicae voces. Festschrift Smits von Waesberghe (ed. P. Fischer), Amsterdam, 1963, pp. 71-8.

\textsuperscript{204} See AH LI, 188.

\textsuperscript{205} Solve lingua is also copied in the eleventh-century Novalese trope (Ox Douce 222, fol. 28'), where it is presented as an introductory trope to the Offertory for St Peter. The only other appearance of Solve lingua is as a later textual addition to Vat reg lat. 215 (9\textsuperscript{a}, Tours), fol. 106'.
or experimental forms. This demonstrative intent is signalled by the manner in which *Hierez runeta* and *Solve lingua* are copied immediately above each other, a practice which serves to direct more attention to their shared features than to their own integrity for, as indicated in the table above, the strophes of *Solve lingua* are dispersed along several margins.

This way of copying additional texts across several margins, including texts written in the side margins reading both up and down the page, was also used for *Avarus maximam cupiditatem* and the Otmar antiphons. Not only does this practice make singing directly from the manuscript almost impossible, but it also poses significant problems to any reconstruction of the order of the strophes. The criterion of novelty also applies to these two later marginal additions.206 *Avarus maximam cupiditatem*, a rhythmical verse on the subject of wealth, is another *unicum* and one whose rhythmical structure is in certain respects unique.207 The antiphons for St Otmar, on the other hand, are here recorded in their earliest form.208 In a manner similar to *Fulentibus palmis*, the neumes for these antiphons are concordant with those found for the same texts in the earliest St Gall antiphoner, the Hartker codex (c. 1000).209

The existence of these musical concordances serves to strengthen the case for a St Gall association for the marginal additions. Indeed, the presence of other notated

206 The *Gloria* and *Agnus Dei* additions are not discussed here as the ink is badly faded on fol. 76v, thereby rendering a full reconstruction impossible.

207 The rhythmical structure of *Avarus maximam cupiditatem* is at root an imitation of a trochaic septenarius (8p + 7pp), but the syllable count fluctuates widely. Norberg draws similarities between the variation in *Avarus maximam cupiditatem* and that of *Alta urbs et sparsitosa*, which was composed in Milan c. 739: see D. Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification médiévale* (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia V), Stockholm, 1958, p. 144.


209 *Fulentibus palmis* is copied on p. 175, and the Otmar antiphons on p. 153, of the Hartker codex. See J. Froger (ed.), *Antiphonaire de Hartker, manuscrits Saint-Gall 390-391* (Paléographie musicale I/1), Bern, 1970 (new ed.).
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Old High German verse at St Gall,²¹⁰ the St Gall origin of the Otmar antiphons,²¹¹ and the ample documentation of a wider interest in singing Latin verse at St Gall,²¹² all point towards St Gall as a likely place of origin for the later additions.

To draw these observations together, the marginal additions to Brussels 8860-8867 display several prominent characteristics. First, the material is popular and devotional in tone. Second, the additions are novel in either age or structure. Third, most of the texts are copied at varying angles and across several margins in a manner that renders reconstruction a complex task. Fourth, the musical content of these additions displays a high level of stability, especially with broadly contemporary recordings made at St Gall. None of these features in itself suggests a specific mode of reception for the verse collection; in other words, just as the diverse contents of the verse collection cannot be assigned any unitary function, neither can the manuscript. Nevertheless, taken together these features point to a redaction of extraordinary material in a personalised format. What can be identified then is not so much a singular mode of reception as a set of conditions that informed the writing of the manuscript; that is, a concern to gather together, impose significant order upon and exemplify material in contemporary circulation that would ordinarily resist written classification.

²¹⁰ An Old High German ‘spottverse’, Liubene ersatza sine gruz, is recorded with neumes on p.1 of StG 30 (c. 900). For a facsimile, see Schwab, ‘Das althochdeutsche Lied’, p. 120.
²¹¹ According to Ekkehard IV, antiphons for St Otmar were composed by Notker II (d. 975): De notikero vero doctore pictore et medico cum materiam grandis voluminis habeamus succincte quidem ad alia festinando dicenss...Ficet enim otmaro decoras illas antiphonas, Ekkehard IV, Casus sancti Galli, ch. CXXIII. ‘Since we have material in a large volume concerning Notker, a true teacher, painter and physician, we shall speak indeed succinctly hurrying on to other things...Indeed he composed those seemly antiphons for Otmar’. The Latin text is taken from H. Haefele (ed.), Ekkehard IV. St. Galler Klostergeschichten (Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters X), Darmstadt, 1980, p. 238. On the implication of the term antiphonas in this passage for the development of an St Otmar Office, see W. Berschin, ‘Sanktgallische Offiziendichtung aus ottonischer Zeit’, in Lateinische Dichtungen des X. und XI. Jahrhunderts. Festgabe für Walther Bulst zum 80 Geburtstag (ed. W. Berschin and R. Düchting), Heidelberg, 1981, pp. 29-35.
3 Principles of Compilation

The predominant impression that remains from a close study of notated ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections is one of variety. Nevertheless, the scope of this variety may be described and the conditions for its existence identified. In this final section I shall outline the conventions that can be observed for the material in these notated collections, firstly in relation to content, secondly in relation to ordering, and lastly in relation to musical notation and diacritical signs.

i Content

A single principle according to which the contents of these poetic collections were drawn up remains elusive. The distinction made in this study between antique and post-antique verse does not appear to have been a major consideration in the compilation of these collections: all six collections considered include antique alongside post-antique poetry.\(^\text{213}\) A clearer division was made between Christian and pagan authors. Yet even this division was not maintained absolutely, as witnessed by the inclusion in these collections of the *Disticha Catonis* (Pa lat. 8093), epitaphs for secular figures (Pa lat. 2832), Virgilian hexameters (Be 455), Boethian *metra* (Be 455 and Pa lat. 1154) and, albeit in the form of an addition, Old High German lines on the hind (Br 8860-8867).

One feature that has been repeatedly observed in the collections considered here is the moral-didactic quality of the poetry. Such a concern accounts for both the continuity between Christian antique and Christian post-antique authors, and the inclusion of certain pagan writers of high moral tone and exemplary grammatical status. Yet although a moral-didactic quality may be taken as a general rule, it does

\(^{213}\) Pa lat. 8093 includes the *argumenta Vergiliana*, as well as poetry by Damasus, Serbastus Junior, Petronius, Claudian and Augustus. Pa lat. 2832 includes epigrams by Seneca and Martial, and *Judicii signum*. In the remaining collections, Ma 10029 includes poetry by Juvencus and Damasus, Be 455 includes Virgil's *Tityre tu patule* and Prudentian *metra*, while Pa lat. 1154 includes *Judicii signum* and Br 8860-8867 includes poetry by both Juvencus and Prudentius.
not serve as a sufficient description of the principles governing the contents of these collections for at least two reasons. First, certain verses, such as the epitaphs or *tituli* transmitted in Pa lat. 2832, or the extended panegyric on the Emperor Justinian (565-78) by Corripus in Ma 10029, can be considered neither particularly moral nor didactic in tone. Second, if a moral-didactic quality was the sole criterion then one might expect more aphoristic poetry, such as *aenigmata* or *sententiae*, to be included in these collections. Other criteria therefore must also have influenced selection.

In the absence of any apparent organisation according to author or subject, early editors of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* believed that the metrical or rhythmical structure of the poetry governed the compilation of ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections. Dümmmer’s initial survey of the sources for Carolingian poetry was organised firstly according to author or subject matter (such as epitaphs or inscriptions) and secondly according to individual manuscripts. In describing the latter, Dümmmer was led to identify a core of manuscripts that transmitted rhythmical verse: Pa lat. 1154, Fulda (lost), Tri 133, Ver XC (85), Br 8860-8867 and Ver LXXXVIII. In 1900, von Winterfeld added Ver CVII (100) to Dümmmer’s body of manuscripts transmitting rhythmical poetry. In 1909, Strecker added Lei Voss. lat. Q. 69 to the list of collections of rhythmical verse as well as examining the transmission of individual pieces in several other manuscripts including Be 455. While questioning the editorial principles of the *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* series, Norberg retained the idea that there survive a group of manuscripts identifiable as rhythmical collections. More recently, a distinction between metrical collections, hymnals and rhythmical collections has been maintained by Bourgain.

Whilst it is certainly true that the manuscripts identified by the editors of the *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* series transmit substantial amounts of rhythmical verse, whether they had a shared identity as rhythmical collections in the ninth and tenth

---

214 See Dümmmer, ‘Die handschriftliche Überlieferung’, pp. 87-159 and 239-322.
218 Norberg, *La poésie rythmique*, ch. XI (‘Les recueils de chants rythmiques’).
centuries is open to question. In practice, the rhythmical collections examined here (Br 8860-8867, Pa lat. 1154 and Be 455) transmit substantial amounts of metrical verse; so much so that in the case of Be 455 more metrical than rhythmical verse is included. The presence of greater or lesser amounts of metrical verse alongside rhythmical verse would seem to cast doubt upon the conviction that the collections were compiled on the basis of structural principles. An examination of remaining collections, however, suggests that some sort of structural distinction was maintained, for in contrast to the mix of metrical and rhythmical verse, the three remaining collections considered here (Pa lat. 8093, Pa lat. 2832 and Ma 10029) transmit metrical verse exclusively. It seems that there existed two separate practices – purely metrical collections, and mixed rhythmical and metrical collections – rather than a simple dichotomy of metrical and rhythmical collections. Closer examination of the metrical collections points to specific reasons for such a structural distinction.

The three collections that include no rhythmical verse all have strong connections with Spain. Pa lat. 8093 was copied in Lyons by Spanish émigrés and for the most part transmits poetry by Spanish authors (Eugenius, Isidore, Damasus and Spanish epigraphs). Ma 10029, which was copied in Spain, likewise consists almost exclusively of poetry by Spanish poets (Eugenius, Iuvenecus, Damasus, Martin of Duma, Cyprian, Samson, Reccesvinth, Vincent, and Alvar). Pa lat. 2832, on the other hand, by dint of its proximity to Pa lat. 8093 in the selection and ordering of Eugenius and epitaphs, as well as through the inclusion of a sequence of verses by Theodulf of Orléans, demonstrates the continuity that existed between Visigothic culture and Frankish culture at Lyons.220

The significance of this association between purely metrical collections and Spain could lie in the fact that whereas rhythmical verse was composed by Merovingian, Lombardic and Anglo-Saxon scholars, the continuity of classical education in Spain into the seventh century was accompanied by a rejection of

---

220 For further material connections between Spain and Lyons, see in particular B. Bischoff, ‘Benedictine Monasteries and the Survival of Classical Literature’, in Manuscripts and Libraries, pp. 139-40. Theodulf of Orléans is known to have paid at least one visit to Lyons: see Tafel, ‘Die vordere’, p. 639.
rhythmical composition as unlearned. Aside from occasional rhythmical compositions by Valerius (d. 695)\footnote{See M. C. Diaz y Diaz (ed.), Anecdota Wisigothica, Salamanca, 1958, p. 144.} and Sisbert of Toledo (681-3),\footnote{See Sisbert of Toledo, Lamentum poenitentiae, MGH PAC IV. 2, p. 770.} Spanish scholars concentrated upon metrical verse.\footnote{That Eugenius composed metrical verse with specific deviations form classical prosody, rather than any form of rhythmical verse, is demonstrated in D. Norberg, 'Carmen oder rhythm?', Mitellateinisches Jahrbuch XIX (1984), pp. 63-72.} At the end of the seventh century, Julian of Toledo in a letter to Bishop Modo referred to authors of rhythmical verse as plebei.\footnote{For the full text of the letter, in which true learning is held to comprise composition in either prose or metre, but not rhythmical verse, see Bischoff, 'Ein Brief', MAS I, p. 293. Bischoff also notes that the association of rhythmical verse with vulgar speech was a tradition that extended back to antique grammarians and forward to Bede: idem, 'Ein Brief', MAS I, pp. 295-6.} This disparaging attitude towards rhythmical verse was retained in certain quarters during the ninth century: at Cordoba, Paul Alvar reported that both himself and Eulogius composed rithmi in their youth, but had since disdained such monstrosities.\footnote{Ergo vos, cigni lautique decore pavones. / Cum suavi meatim phlomela ducite carmen / Et pedibus metricis rithmi contemnite monstra. / Que – segnis herrans flokus – sic rancide sannas / Devio mugitu pangit, ut cantica turpet / Eclesie plevis, que semper fulgide claret. 'Therefore you, swans and peacocks elegant in splendour, / With the sweet nightingale lead the song along with me / And in metrical feet disdain the monstrosities of rhythms, / Which practice – the sluggish flock erring – thus rankly fixes / grimaces in erroneous rumbling, as it defiles the songs / of the people of the church, which ought always to shine brightly.' Latin text reproduced from MGH PAC III, p. 129.} This continued low estimation of rhythmical verse in Visigothic culture appears to have acted as a restriction on the entry of such verse into written circulation for although rithmi were denounced, they were rarely recorded.

In suggesting this association it is not intended to draw a sharp divide between Visigothic and Carolingian attitudes to verse. Metrical composition remained the touchstone of the Carolingian elite: it is probable that no rhythmical verse was composed at court,\footnote{According to Godman, few poems by authors associated with the royal entourage can be shown to have been written at court, and that 'most (perhaps all) of Paulinus of Aquileia's rhythmical verse was written after his departure from Francia': Godman, 'Louis "the Pious"', p. 241.} and the ability to compose metrical poetry remained a mark of
education. Furthermore, collections of metrical poetry such as those studied by Glauche were more numerous than those including rhythmical poetry during the Carolingian era. The distinction is rather between conservative cultural attitudes directed towards the preservation of a tradition of metrical composition, of which the Visigothic is one instance and the Carolingian compilations of early Christian poetry another, and traditions dedicated to more innovative forms of verse.

Closer examination of the rhythmical collections both lends weight to and modifies the hypothesis that structural considerations influenced the compilation of these collections, for in them less account is taken of metrical or rhythmical construction than of formal principles of organisation. So it is that in Br 8860-8867 alphabetical versus were placed together, even to the extent that Sedulius’ quantitative verse was included among poems whose construction is rhythmical. A similar interest in formal organisation can be observed in Be 455 and Pa lat. 1154. In Pa lat. 1154 the overriding technical consideration is strophic organisation: all the poems are strophic in form; even the stichic ludicii signum is re-organised into a refrain structure, thereby obscuring the prophetic acrostic. In Be 455 a fourfold separation was observed: hymnic forms, simple non-hymnic forms, lyric metres and complex rhythmical verse. What is striking about this ordering is that while it displays an awareness of metrical and rhythmical construction, it also works across these categories, for metrical and rhythmical principles of construction co-exist in the first two sections and are separated in the final two sections. The overriding criteria of selection in Be 455 are strophic form (all the stichic Prudentian and Boethian metra are re-worked into strophes) and complexity of organisation.

A consideration of the principles at work in the collections considered here does then reveal a basic structural distinction, but not the one suggested by the editors of the Poetae Latini aevi Carolini series. The distinction lies between collections of

227 A colourful account of the process by which pueri in the royal entourage received education in prose and poetry before proceeding to important bishoprics in Charlemagne’s kingdom is given by Notker Balbulus: see L. Thorpe (trans.), Einhard and Notker the Stammerer. Two Lives of Charlemagne, Harmondsworth, 1969, pp. 95-6.

228 See Glauche, Schullektiir e im Mittelalter, pp. 23-61.
stichic metrical verse and collections featuring strophic verse whether metrical or rhythmical in construction. On occasion strophic verse is to be found in the metrical collections and stichic verse in the strophic collections, yet such examples are not so much exceptions to the rule as signs of the overlap in principle that could exist between these two modes of organisation.229

Two considerations governing the selection of material in these collections have thus been identified: an overall moral-didactic content and a distinction between stichic and strophic verse. To these two parameters may be added the criteria that governed selection at the level of the individual collection. As has been shown, the material included in the collections was the outcome of the circumstances of compilation and the intended sphere of use—confessional poetry in Pa lat. 1154, poetry reflecting local clerical culture in Pa lat. 2832, poetry representing different degrees of structural complexity in Pa lat. 8093 and Be 455, contemporary Spanish poetry in Ma 10029, and (if only in the later additions) poetry reflecting local cults in Br 8860-8867. In sum, the selection of contents for these collections was not governed by a single principle. Instead, several overlapping levels of selection can be traced: a general concern for moral-didactic contents, a technical concern for certain types of verse structure, and material determined by the immediate circumstances of compilation and use.

ii Ordering

The poetry in these collections has been seen to be organised into distinctive designs: an ordering according to complexity in Pa lat. 8093 and Be 455; a penitential structure in Pa lat. 1154; multiple categories of material in Br 8860-8867; and small-scale associations according to type and subject matter in Ma 10029 and Pa lat. 2832. Having identified these designs, the question remains as to their significance. A direct association between designs that may be identified in the material and the uses to which individual manuscripts were put has not been made for two reasons. First, all except one of the manuscripts can be shown to have undergone significant changes

229 Stichic verse could, for example, be grouped into larger units of return (such as II: 9-11).
of shape or circumstance: Pa lat. 8093 was altered in shape by the removal of the Ausonius poetry; Pa lat. 2832 passed from clerical ownership to a monastic library; Be 455 was transported most probably from St Germain (Paris) to Laon; Pa lat. 1154 may well have passed from lay ownership to monastic use; and Br 8860-8867 travelled from north to south. The one remaining collection, Ma 10029, although containing no indications of undergoing a change of circumstance, was updated several times during the tenth century. Similarly, texts were added to and erased from Be 455 during the tenth century and texts were added to the margins of Pa lat. 2832, Pa lat. 1154 and Br 8860-8867.

Second, in most cases more than one mode of reception can be traced for a single collection. With regard to the original collection now transmitted in Pa lat. 8093 and Lei Voss. lat. F. 111, for example, the ordering of texts from simple to complex, the diacritical signs and the metrical descriptions suggest a grammatical interest in the technical structures of the verse. The addition of notation to poems of a heightened rhetorical status, however, points to an interest in the contents of the collection as discrete entities suited to musical performance. Finally, the influence of Pa lat. 8093, whether directly or indirectly, on the later copying of Pa lat. 2832 points to the employment of this collection as an archival resource. Although these three properties correspond to the traditional categories of ‘classbook’, ‘songbook’ and ‘library book’, there would seem to be no sharp distinctions between such genres of collection.230 Rather than books with single or even multiple distinct functions, what has been traced here are several overlapping concerns in the appreciation of single collections.

Musical Notation and Diacritical Signs

The addition of diacritical signs to Pa lat. 8093 and Ma 10029 indicates that certain readers were interested in the technical structures of the verse in these collections. The fact that the metrical schemes marked by these diacritical signs are restricted to the simple forms of hexameter and pentameter suggests that in these cases the level of technical appreciation brought to the collection remained at a basic level. The metrical summaries in Lei Voss. lat. F. 111 and Be 455, however, stand as evidence that in other cases more complex designs were potentially of interest to readers.

Musical notation is more difficult to evaluate in relation to the reception of these collections. Certain observations may nevertheless be made upon the basis of the texts to which notation was added. In three manuscripts notation was added to texts of heightened expression and personalised address (or modes of address other than the third person): in Pa lat. 8093 the poems notated are uttered by subjects recalling worldly suffering or death; in Ma 10029, the texts of the notated poems describe various forms of ascetic activity; while in Pa lat. 1154 the notated texts are characterised by confessional themes. In these three collections, a concern for the rhetorical qualities of the texts can thus be discerned in the addition of notation. In Be 455, in which few metres are notated more than once, the addition of notation appears rather to have been guided by structural considerations. In Br 8860-8867 and Pa lat. 2832, however, the notated additions are distinguished by their rarity, suggesting that the addition of notation was the outcome of a concern to record local or unusual material.

Besides indicating differing modes of reception, the addition of notation also highlights shared values. Two qualities have been observed as especially prominent in the notated texts: a ‘voiced’ address and a heightened expression. That genres of poetry might be distinguished according to the mode of address was familiar to the early middle ages through Bede’s De arte metrica, in which was drawn a threefold

---

231 These qualities can be observed in thirty-seven of the thirty-nine notated poems in the poetic collections. The two poems which feature neither voiced address nor heightened expression are Hac locuples (Pa lat. 2832, II: 6) and Avis haec magna (Be 455, II: 15).
distinction between active or imitative genres (in which speakers are introduced without comment by the poet), narrative or expository genres (in which the poet speaks in his own voice), and common or mixed types of poetry (in which both the poet speaks in his own voice and other characters speak). None of the genres transmitted by Bede corresponds precisely to the personalised expression observed in the notated poems in these collections; the extent to which voiced or personalised expression was recognised as a distinct category is therefore doubtful. Instead, the properties of ‘voiced’ address and heightened expression may be understood as symptoms of a more general tendency – a concern for directness of expression.

The direct expression shared by the notated texts is realised in several different ways, through choice of content, mode of address and literary style. A consequence of this variety in means is that a uniform identification of the characteristics of the ‘early medieval lyric’ is ruled out. Although a coherent set of stylistic features cannot be attributed to the notated texts, their rhetorical immediacy nevertheless is set in relief by the unnotated genres transmitted in these poetic collections; that is, epitaphs, *tituli*, biblical epics, and verse epistles. It seems then that there were shared conceptions concerning poetic characteristics suited to musical realisation and that these ideas were a clarity of expression, didactic and moral intent, and repetitive structure. In addition, it seems that such features were independent of the mode of poetic construction, for almost half the poems notated in these collections are metrical in structure.

---

No single model or function can be identified for the six notated poetic collections examined. The poetry in these collections was rather selected, arranged and updated according to local availability and the various ends which the manuscripts served. Beyond the variety observed in the individual collections, one general property of these collections has been identified; that is, moral-didactic content. Bridging this general feature and the specific designs is a tendency towards regulation as expressed through an imposition of order upon verse in contemporary circulation, an exhortation to amend behaviour, and a demonstration of rules of composition.

Later notations, whether in the form of diacritical signs or musical notation, extend the principles observed in individual collections. Diacritical signs manifest a technical interest in the structure of selected verses. Musical notations manifest a heightened form of declamation associated with cases of particularly heightened rhetorical address. The probable reasons for adding notation to these collections run parallel to the potential ends served by the poetic collections; that is, the musical notations function as didactic tools to clarify or make poetic structure memorable, as archival means for recording the melodies associated with selected texts, or as (artistic) exercises in inventing musical realisations for selected poems.
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Verse Notations: Words and Music

1 Introduction

The passage from classical quantitative verse to early medieval accentual verse has long fascinated Latinists.\(^1\) Early commentators tended to regard verse composed between the end of the fourth century and the beginnings of the twelfth as an imperfect product of a culture with poor standards of education and latinity.\(^2\) As

\(^1\) Modern interest dates back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, during which time comprehensive editions were first appearing in print. Three major series from this era remain the basis for research in this area: the texts of Christian Latin poets from Commodian (mid third century) onwards are edited in the series CSEL, and often in CCSL; liturgical poetry of all kinds is collected in the series AH; and Carolingian, as well as some Merovingian poetry, is compiled in the series MGH PAC. Also from this period is the exhaustive work that remained the basis for research into medieval poetic structure for the next half century: W. Meyer, Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Dichtung, 3 vols., Berlin, 1905\(^2\) and 1936.

\(^2\) A process of decline, relieved only by monastic preservation before the 'germanic Renaissance of the Franks', forms the historical backdrop to the survey of early medieval literature presented by Manitius: 'Das Römerreich trug in seiner eigene Größe den Kehnder Verfalls in sich, auch ohne die Einfälle der Barbaren der Zersetzung anheimgefallen; diese wurde durch die Völkerwanderung nur beschleunigt', M. Manitius, Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters I, Munich, 1911, p. 3. A transitional period of learning and verse composition was also portrayed by Raby: 'We have now traced the course of Christian Latin poetry through the space of a thousand years, from its beginnings in the middle of the third century under the shadow of the declining culture of the ancient world to its culmination in those two centuries, the twelfth and the thirteenth, which mark at once the height of the Catholic civilization of the Middle Ages and the starting-point of the Renaissance', F. Raby, A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages, Oxford, 1953 (2nd ed.), p. 452. Most extreme, however, are the remarks of Allen: 'For the purposes of appreciative comment and aesthetic criticism, the poetry of A.D. 580-880 is still an insoluble mess...Now there is a good reason why all this sorry balladry should be gathered, edited, and published -- for it has much to teach us as to the ways of European culture at the close of the Dark Ages.', P. Allen (with translations by H. Jones), The Romanesque Lyric, Chapel Hill, 1929 (repr. 1969), pp. 214-5.
knowledge of the resources and continuity of learning in these centuries has improved, so the vitality with which classical models were imitated and adapted during times of intellectual renewal and scholarly endeavour has been focussed upon. At the heart of this re-assessment has been an avoidance of a priori, often anachronistic, theories of metre and rhythm, accent and ictus, in favour of a more or less empirical account of verse structures. Following on from this re-evaluation, more fluid and complex models for verse composition have been proposed, invoking conflicting principles of design, wholesale transformation of classical models, and the influence of non-Latinate traditions. Most recently, an interest in the historical

---


4 Norberg summarised his empirical approach in response to a claim that the construction of Augustine’s Psalm against the Donatists was faulty: ‘Il est bien évident que c’est plutôt la théorie moderne qu’il faudrait réviser. Cet exemple montre bien les difficultés que nous éprouvons à nous libérer des préjugés dans le domaine de la métrique. Il devrait aussi nous servir d’avertissement afin que nous nous en tenions, dans la mesure du possible, à exposer les faits sans trop faire de théorie’, Norberg, *Introduction*, p. 5.

reception of this poetry has overlapped with a new interest in how it was understood and performed.\(^6\)

Almost all major philologists have assigned a significant role to music in the development of poetic structures during this period: for Meyer, music was the most important factor in the genesis of all poetic forms; for Norberg, the structural characteristics of the new rhythmical poetry were determined by melody; for Klopsch, music glossed over irregularity in much early rhythmical poetry.\(^7\) Musicologists, however, have been reluctant to study the notations that survive for this poetry. In part, this has been due to preconceived notions of historical and notational progress.\(^8\) In part, the reluctance has stemmed from a conviction that neumatic notation cannot afford significant melodic information.\(^9\) Most recently, neglect has been due to a tendency on the part of musicologists sympathetic to the possibilities of neumatic

---

\(^6\) The only comprehensive account of the reception of verse during this period is a survey relating to Germanic literature: D. Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800-1300*, Cambridge, 1994. Despite much recent interest in the historical reception of verse, technical questions relating to its sound have proved more difficult to assess. The most significant contributions in this area are: D. Norberg, *L'accentuation des mots dans le vers latin du Moyen Age* (Filologiskt arkiv XXXII), Stockholm, 1985; and idem, *Les vers latins iambiques et trochaïques au Moyen Age et leurs répliques rythmiques* (Filologiskt arkiv XXXV), Stockholm, 1988.

\(^7\) For a full discussion of these different positions, see below pp. 127-31.

\(^8\) 'It is highly improbable, however, that song and dance played no part in secular amusements at all levels of society. Unfortunately, information about these amusements before A.D. 1000 is scanty indeed, and whatever music there was has vanished. Not until the rebirth of European civilisation in the eleventh century did conditions become favourable for the development and preservation of secular songs', R. H. Hoppin, *Medieval Music*, New York, 1978, p. 256.

\(^9\) 'A number of MSS, some dating as far back as about the 9\(^th\)-11\(^th\) centuries, survive with melodies notated in staffless neumes; but since the singing of most of these non-liturgical melodies was not required year in and year out, as was that of the liturgical melodies, the neumes in these MSS were probably for the greater part as near to being dead letters when staff-notation and the later measuring of time-values became general as they are now', G. Reese, *Music in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1940, p. 198.
notation to direct attention towards more fully documented genres such as tropes and sequences.  

Questions that may be framed about the surviving neumatic notations for early medieval verse can be divided into three main areas: dissemination, sounding structure and status. With respect to dissemination, it is necessary to establish the type of verse was notated, how much was notated, who notated this verse, and where and when it was notated. Such questions have already been pursued here through a detailed account of six notated poetic collections, yet in order to assess the content of these notations an identification of notations with concordant texts beyond these collections remains to be done. With respect to sounding structure, information from notation is potentially of great value in the evidence it may bring to bear on debates concerning not only the relation between music and poetry, but also the relative roles of prose accent, metre and ictus in determining verse structure. In particular, neumatic notation may be examined for its indications of elongation or shortening, and more general observations relating to the musical treatment of poetic devices such as caesura, elision, hiatus or supernumerary syllables.

The question of the status of the recorded notations requires the most extended consideration. Comparisons of multiple notations for the same text promise information as to whether there existed a corpus of known melodies or whether melodic realisation was determined by other factors. A comparison of notations for similar verse forms promises information as to whether, and if so to what extent, there existed conventions for realising melodies. In undertaking both comparisons neumatic notations are to be considered as primary witnesses to the way in which sounding structures were understood by contemporaries. The information provided by neumatic notation is thus to be taken as the starting point for analytical enquiry in so far as the melodic features recorded in the neumes, even though inadequate for

---

10 Neither a full nor a partial bibliography of these studies can be attempted here, but the extent of the field can be judged by the inventory of manuscripts provied in H. Husmann (ed.), Tropen- und Sequenzenhandschriften (Répertoire international des source musicales B. V), Munich and Duisburg, 1964, and the collected papers in W. Arlt and G. Björkvall (eds.), Recherches nouvelles sur les tropes liturgiques (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia XXXVI), Stockholm, 1993.
modern purposes of reconstruction, are the only ones that can be safely assumed to have been significant to contemporaries.

The following discussion is divided into three sections: a survey of previous theories of relations between words and music, an analysis of the surviving notations and a conclusion placing the results of this analysis within current debates. In all sections, it is not intended to seek fixed rules of relation between music and poetry, but to describe flexible conventions as revealed in the analysis of individual results. It is through such an empirical account of the surviving notations in ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections and beyond that it is hoped to reach a better understanding of the relation between early medieval verse and music.
As observed in the introductory chapter, there have been few previous studies of the surviving ninth- and tenth-century musical notations of Latin poetry. Where substantial studies have been undertaken, interest has been primarily directed towards historical, rather than analytical, concerns. Attempts to deal with the material directly have been concerned with establishing the existence of a repertory; that is, cataloguing a body of disjunct survivals in order to demonstrate that the musical setting of poetry was a widespread historical phenomenon. As a result, little attention has been paid to the differing contents and techniques of setting evident in these notated poems. Where analysis has been pursued, it has been almost entirely in connection with transcribable diastematic notations of the eleventh century.

Within studies of broader scope, later repertories have been drawn on in an attempt to compensate for the lack of definite information about these notated poems: ninth- and tenth-century notations of poetry have been variously claimed as forerunners of the Aquitanian versus repertory, the conductus, troubadour song, modal rhythm and even modern tonality. However, the area that has been drawn on most often in an attempt to understand these settings is poetics; in particular, a sharply-drawn distinction between metre and rhythm. The characterisation of these terms, as well as the ends to which they have been applied, has varied. In this

---

11 Such is the main concern of the only two extensive studies of versus in this period to take account of musical settings: M. Berendes, The Versus and its Use in the Medieval Roman Liturgy, Diss. Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1973; and N. Sevestre, Du versus au conduit: contribution à l'étude du chant versifié latin dès Xe et XIe siècles, Diss. Univ. de Paris-Sorbonne, 3 vols., 1989.

section, the four main approaches to the realisation of metre and rhythm in early medieval song are considered through the work of four different writers.

For Coussemaker, writing in the mid-nineteenth century, the notated poems of the early middle ages represented both a link with the ancient world and the origin of modern harmony.\textsuperscript{13} It was self-evident that all music must be measured and have rhythm in order to have affect. This meant either a metrical realisation where longs were twice the length of breves, or a rhythmical one following supposed principles taken from Augustine’s \textit{De musica}. According to Coussemaker, rhythmical realisation in general entailed equal syllables, but certain syllables were either lengthened or shortened, rests were introduced, and there was an arrangement into divisible metres.\textsuperscript{14} The result, when combined with a creative reading of the neumes, were songs not far removed in style from those of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{15}

A similar approach was taken by Jammers over a century later.\textsuperscript{16} The longs and shorts of metrical verse were to be realised in a 2:1 ratio. This meant a 4/4 equivalence for hexameter verse (where “” was equivalent to a minim and two crotchets in his transcriptions) with melismas subdividing the beat as necessary. Direct transcription into modern notation was prevented by longer, often final, melismas. Nevertheless, even these revealed grouping into 4/4 patterns through their

\textsuperscript{13} ‘La tonalité de la “musique vulgaire” se rapprochait beaucoup de la tonalité de la musique moderne; elle en est, suivant nous, l’origine’ and ‘Quel était leur rythme musical? Leur versification ne peut, ce nous semble, laisser aucun doute sur ce point; c’était évidemment le rythme musicale des anciens.’ E. de Coussemaker, \textit{Histoire de l’harmonie au moyen-âge}, Paris, 1852, pp. 95 and 97.

\textsuperscript{14} The arrangement of melodies into four regularly spaced beats was later propounded by, among others, Riemann as a system of \textit{Vierhebigkeit} or \textit{Viertaktigkeit}. For a summary of this system, see B. Kippenberg, \textit{Der Rhythmus im Minnesang} (Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters III), Munich, 1962, pp. 78-83. The assumption that classically balanced phrase structures were aesthetically superior was so prevalent in the mid-nineteenth century as to elicit justification from Coussemaker for his arbitrary realisation of two melodies in triple metre: see Coussemaker, \textit{Histoire}, p. 100.

\textsuperscript{15} For these songs, see Coussemaker, \textit{Histoire}, ‘Monuments II. Traduction des Fac-Similés’.

\textsuperscript{16} E. Jammers, \textit{Aufzeichnungsweisen der einstimmigen ausserliturgischen Musik des Mittelalters} (Psalographie der Musik I. 4, ed. W. Arlt), Cologne, 1975, chs. 2 and 3 (‘Die Übertragung metrischer Verse’ and ‘Der silbenzählende Vers im Allgemeinen’).
distribution of key tones and gestures such as wide leaps. In contrast, rhythmical verse, which arose alongside metrical verse and eventually replaced it, was defined by fixed syllable count and syllables of equal length. According to Jammers, word accent, which was operative in both metrical and rhythmical verse, played an increasingly important role and by the twelfth century it was this which controlled the rhythmical realisation. Thus rhythmical verse was the direct antecedent to modal rhythm: its lines and half-lines of a fixed number of syllables were gradually reduced to smaller units, and it was within these fixed lengths that long and short syllables came to be exchanged.

At the root of Jammers’ approach was an attempt to show that the metrical and rhythmical properties of the poetry were reflected in the neume script. This was based on a conviction that neume script was itself derived from classical grammatical symbols, not only from accentual signs, but from a range of pronunciation signs, including signs for duration and breathing, as well as individual signs for vocal alteration. However, only in a few cases can it be shown that neumatic signs correspond to metrical or rhythmical articulation; in other cases, Jammers suggested

---

17 Jammers, Aufzeichnungsweisen, p. 23.
18 Jammers, Aufzeichnungsweisen, p. 37. Gillingham has recently extended the application of modal interpretation far beyond the cautious remarks of Jammers. Despite employing a rhythmically neutral method of transcription, Gillingham maintains that ‘the application of modality must have been a matter of performance practice for non-mensurally notated music in this period’, Gillingham, A Critical Study, p. 19.
22 See below, pp. 190-1.
a rhythmical script in evolution,\textsuperscript{23} or proposed that although correspondence between poetic and musical rhythms could only be observed at cadences, this did not rule out rhythmical performance for the rest of the line.\textsuperscript{24} Indicative of Jammers’ failure to correlate poetic structure and musical setting is the fact that his least qualified observation arose from a comparison of the exceptional setting of \textit{Judicii signum} with its simple recitational style in which textual properties are inconsistently observed.\textsuperscript{25}

Chailley in his analysis of one source from c. 900 was more circumspect about rhythmical performance: ‘Il est aussi abusif de transcrire les mélodies du X\textsuperscript{e} s. suivant la métrique du texte que selon les principes des modes rhythmiques’.\textsuperscript{26} Nevertheless, in trying to relate musical patterning to poetic structure, it was necessary to formulate a view of the properties of rhythmical verse.\textsuperscript{27} For Chailley, largely following Ferretti, the distinction between quantitative and accentual poetry was not absolute: metrical principles modified by accent, and accentual poetry occasionally supplanted by the accent of verse issuing from metrical schemes, were both regarded as operative.\textsuperscript{28} The passage between the two principles of verse construction was not solely a matter of poetic transformation, but was mediated by the


\textsuperscript{24} ‘Es ergibt sich, daß sich die Aufmerksamkeit bei den Fragen der Versrhythmik vor allem den Schlüssen zuwandte, ohne daß deshalb ein rhythmusloser Vortrag beim übrigen Verslauf gefolgt werden sollte’, Jammers, ‘Rhythmen und Hymnen’, p. 142.


\textsuperscript{26} J. Chailley, \textit{L’École musicale de Saint-Martial de Limoges jusqu’à la fin du XI\textsuperscript{e} siècle}, Paris, 1960, p. 175.

\textsuperscript{27} Only a summary of Chailley’s views on poetic structure was repeated in his book of 1960. See Chailley, \textit{L’École musicale}, pp. 161-3. For the earlier formulation, see J. Chailley, ‘Essai sur la formation de la versification latine d’accent au moyen âge’, \textit{Medium aevum} XXIX (1960), pp. 49-80. Despite the date of publication, this article was written before Norberg’s pivotal study of 1954.

\textsuperscript{28} On Latin accent, Chailley followed Ferretti’s summary of the work of, among others, Schoell and Vendryès. See P. Ferretti, \textit{Esthétique grégorienne, ou traité des formes musicales du chant grégorien} I (trans. A. Agaësse), Solesmes, 1938, pp. 5-14.
cursus of rhetorical prose; in particular, the cursus planus as found at the end of hexameters and in the opening line and closing adonic of sapphic verse. Further, in trying to account for the operation of accent throughout the poetic line through a theory of counter accent, Chailley was led to formulate exceptional rules and propose that incorrect accentuation arose from the influence of the vulgar tongue.

Despite an interest in the complexities of poetic structure and development, Chailley’s model for the performance of the versus remained plainchant as practised by the monks of Solesmes. Having ruled out a relation between the number of notes, or the direction of the melody, and verse accentuation, it was concluded that the setting of individual words broadly followed Ferretti’s principle of tonic accent. Although Chailley’s method of transcription was rhythmically neutral, the recommended style of performance would thus result in notes of roughly equal value shaped according to the rhythm of the words.

The fullest case for an isosyllabic (or equal syllable) mode of performance has been made by Stevens. The hypothesis proceeds from a distinction between musica

---

29 For a summary of the different types of rhetorical cursus in use from late antiquity through to twelfth century, see D. Norberg, Manuel pratique de latin médiéval, Paris, 1968, pp. 87-9.

30 Chailley, in contrast to the commonly held view that the regularisation of accent only occurred c. 1000, held that a coincidence of ictus and accent could be seen in poetry of the seventh and eighth centuries and that by the ninth century this practice was held as a principle of composition. Chailley, ‘Essai sur la formation’, pp. 61-5.

31 In rejecting the possibility that music reflected verbal lengthening, but observed stressed accentuation through pitch, Chailley was following Ferretti to the letter: see Ferretti, Esthétique I, pp. 14-25 and pp. 333-46; and Chailley, L’École musicale, pp. 172-5.

32 ‘Le musicien n’a peut-être pas senti le rythme du vers…il a senti et traduit le rythme du mot, suivant les mêmes principes dont usaient les musiciens grégoriens avec les textes liturgiques qui leur étaient soumis’, Chailley, L’École musicale, p. 175.

metrica and musica ritmica. The former is understood to refer to music measured according to the system of rhythmical modes. The latter is understood to refer to the domain of unmeasured music which includes monophonic song (with the exception of dance forms). It is in connection with this latter category of musica ritmica that isosyllabic performance is proposed.

Unlike the writers considered above, Stevens turned to contemporary theorists of music and verse to support his hypothesis. A fundamental distinction between metrum and ritmus was traced back to Bede’s formulation of the properties of rhythmical verse.34

videtur autem rhythmus metris esse consimilis, quae est verborum modulata compositio, non metrica ratione, sed numero syllabarum ad iudicium aurium examinata, ut sunt carmina vulgarium poetarum.

Stevens sought to extend this definition of ritmus according to number by arguing that certain theorists referred not only to an equality in the number of syllables, but also to an equality in the length of syllables. Direct evidence for this position was found in two later theory treatises. The first is from a treatise completed in 1332 by Antonio da Tempo and gives the following definition of rhythmical verse: consonans paritas syllabarum certo numero comprehensarum.35 The second is from Regule de rithmis, an anonymous treatise copied in an early thirteenth-century manuscript: ordinatio...sillibarum aequalitate prolata.36

recreation of pitch content, see U. Sesini, Poesia e musica nella latinità cristiana dal III al X secolo (Nuova Biblioteca Italiana VI, ed. G. Vecchi), Turin, 1949, ch. 9 (‘Canti epici e conviviali’) pp. 161-199.
34 Bede, De arte metrica, ch. XXIV (De rhythmo). ‘It seems however that rhythm is similar to metre – a measured arrangement of words, not weighed by metrical calculation, but by the number of syllables according to the judgment of the ears, as are the songs of common poets’. Latin text reproduced from H. Keil (ed.), Scriptores de orthographia (Grammatica Latini VII), Leipzig, 1880, p. 258.
Both these passages are ambiguous: the equality of syllables that is referred to may indicate either numerical structure or length.\textsuperscript{37} Even if it is accepted that the theorists are referring to equal-lengthed syllables, the implications of this for musical performance are far from clear. Stevens presents evidence both for and against the equation of verbal with musical performance.\textsuperscript{38} To the two contradictory statements cited by Stevens may be added a third which maintains a clear distinction between musical and verbal performance.\textsuperscript{39} The case for an equal syllable musical performance is therefore at best ambiguous. As regards the realisation of metrical verse, evidence for an association between the rhythmical modes and metrical composition amounts to no more than an aside in an English treatise of c.1300.\textsuperscript{40} In short, there is a lack of direct evidence to suggest an equation between modes of textual and melodic realisation.

The absence of evidence in the theoretical domain was repeated in other domains examined for hints of isosyllabic performance; that is, notation and genre.

\textsuperscript{37} The difficulty in assigning a precise meaning to the extract from Antonio is earlier signalled in Stevens, \textit{Words and Music}, p. 23. \textit{Consonans pariter} may simply mean lines of the same length. Although Antonio later says that \textit{rithmi} have either eleven or seven syllables per line, this does not preclude an ‘harmonious equality’ between all eleven and all seven syllable lines respectively. Similar problems surround interpretation of the passage in \textit{Regule de rithmis}, which can be understood to refer either to progression through the line and hence temporal equality, or to a structural progression of equal lines and hence numerical equality.

\textsuperscript{38} Stevens, \textit{Words and Music}, p. 422.

\textsuperscript{39} Huguccio of Pisa (d. 1210), for example, distinguishes between metre scanned with prose accents, singing which follows the demands of the melody, and a reading of verse as prose with normal accents: \textit{Prolationum alia metrica, que fit in metris sine accentus observatione, et isti adiacet tempus; alia melica, que attenditur in cantilenis, et isti adiacet neuma; alia prosaica, et isti adiacet accentus, De dubio accentu}, ed. G. Cremascoli, \textit{De dubio accentu. Agiographia. Expositio de Symbolo Apostolorum} (Bibliotheca degli Studi Medievali X), Spoleto, 1978, p. 86 (lines 267-9). ‘There is one metrical form of lengthening, which occurs in metres without an observation of accent, and duration draws together that kind; there is another musical form, which is observed in songs, and a phrase draws together that kind; there is another prose form, and accent draws together that kind’.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Longa autem apud priores organistas duo tantum habuit tempora sicut in metris}, Walter Odington, \textit{De speculatione musicae} ch. VI (\textit{De harmonia multiplici}), ed. F. Hammond, \textit{Walteri Odington De speculatione musicae} (Corpus scriptorum de musica XIV), 1970, pp. 127-8. ‘A long however among previous singers of organum had two times as much just as in metrics’.
According to Stevens, this lack of explicit indication was due to the fact that isosyllabism was implicit in the concept of *musica*: ‘it depends...on the concept of a *ratio*, a *numerus*, a pattern, which is basic both to the words and to the music, validating them both as separate entities, but allowing neither to predominate’.\(^41\) The direction of this argument, from aesthetic theory to practice, suffers from the same assumption signalled above; that is, the assumption that information can be transferred directly between two distinct domains.

A third weakness in the isosyllabic hypothesis is the distinction drawn between *ritmus* and *metrum*, a distinction that rests on a rigorous conception of the nature of rhythmical verse: ‘The one thing that binds and unites the non-quantitative verse is not accent, but, as I have already stressed, number. “Rhythmic” verse is in essence syllable-counting verse’.\(^42\) While this position is in accord with theoretical statements about rhythmical verse, it is more to difficult to reconcile with practice. Indeed, all major commentators have assigned a central role to accent in the formation of rhythmical verse.\(^43\) Stevens departs from these commentators by stressing autonomous numerical means of construction rather than derivative models. Whilst it is true that rhythmical verse is (for the most part) fixed in its number of syllables, and that this serves to differentiate it from metrical verse, it does not follow that number is its sole or even principal means of definition.\(^44\) By all accounts, properties such as accent (and arguably ‘structure’) defined the shape of Latin rhythmical verse in the

\(^{41}\) Stevens, *Words and Music*, p. 487.

\(^{42}\) Stevens, *Words and Music*, p. 420. Stevens did recognise the existence of accent in Latin verse, but did not regard it as a means of defining that verse: ‘Norberg appears to conflate the concepts of “rhythmic” verse and accentual, whereas *ritmus*, it seems to me, depends in the first instance on number (syllable-counting) and not necessarily on accent at all. Accent and (later) rhyme are the accidents rather than the essentials of the *musica ritmica* tradition’: Stevens, *Words and Music*, p. 97 (n. 28).

\(^{43}\) Accent was critical to theories of rhythmical verse developed by Meyer, Norberg and Klopsch. For their views and full references, see below pp. 127-31.

\(^{44}\) For a discussion of rhythmical verse with irregular number of syllables, see Norberg, *Introduction*, pp. 142-8.
Latin tradition. Yet to acknowledge a formative role for accent would be to undermine the isosyllabic hypothesis, for in so far as it was also operative in metrical verse the validity of an absolute divide between *ritmus* and *metrum* is called into question.

To draw these observations together, the four methods of interpretation discussed in this section rest on four different theories about the relationship between words and music. These methods of interpretation may be summarised as ‘modern’ (Coussemaker), ‘proto-modal’ (Jammers), ‘equal note’ (Chailley) and ‘isosyllabic’ (Stevens). Using Arlt’s pragmatic index for the relations between words and music, the theories may be categorised as follows:46

i) Musically determined: ‘modern’ and ‘equal note’
ii) Textually determined: ‘proto-modal’.
iii) A combination of musical and textual determination: ‘isosyllabic’.

Despite differences in interpretation, the writers share a common strategy. All four use theories of rhythm and metre drawn from philology at the point where information from notation is lacking; that is, in the domain of measured rhythm. The direction of theorising is thus always the same: an application of fixed notions of verse analysis to the performance of music, the effect of which is to reduce to a singular principle the complexity of practice and theory as observed in philology. Indeed, whilst it is broadly true that all the writers observe a 2:1 ratio for metrical verse and an equality for rhythmical verse, the variation in transcription is itself witness to the problems that result in applying general theories to practice.

---

45 The term ‘structure’ is used here to refer to the disposition of words within the poetic line which, according to Norberg, was the principal feature of metrical verse that was imitated in rhythmical verse. See Norberg, *Introduction*, pp. 94-7.
46 Arlt outlines these categories in the introduction to his edition of the *conductus* of the Beauvais Office. ‘Musically determined’ is where interpretation is guided by musical considerations alone; ‘textually determined’ indicates interpretation guided by textual properties alone: see W. Arlt, *Ein Festoffzium des Mittelalters aus Beauvais in seiner liturgischen und musikalischen Bedeutung II*, Cologne, 1970, p. xvii.
The variation also highlights the main weakness of these general theories: it has been assumed that there was only one correct way of performing metrical verse and one correct way of performing rhythmical verse. This stance has failed to address not only the amount of exchange between these systems, but also variation according to date, place and circumstance. It is questionable, for example, whether rhythmical performance was similar in late antique, Carolingian and troubadour repertories if only due to the differing properties of the language. Likewise, differences in setting and performance corresponding to different social circumstances and levels of complexity remain to be investigated. This assumes particular importance when it is remembered that there are several indications that schoolroom performance differed from more formal forms of recital.47

Besides reducing the scope of investigation, a shift in the axis of research also promises more concrete insight. In proceeding from verbal analysis to musical performance, significant questions concerning the sound of verse in performance have been overlooked: most notably, the effect of accent, ictus and caesura. Little is known about the role of these features in shaping the sound of poetry, so much so that it even remains uncertain whether the caesura was marked by a temporal break in the line.48 To investigate these phenomena, it is necessary to return to the musical notations without a priori theories of performance. Such an approach promises insight into the sound of verse in two ways: first, through an indication of details of performance as transmitted by the semiology of neumatic forms and additional letters; second, through an analysis of the musical patterns and their correlation with the poetic devices noted above. In many respects this is to reverse the line of investigation pursued by the writers discussed in this section by proceeding from musical analysis to an understanding of the interactions of text and melody. This axis of research, however, is more complex than the formulation suggests, for what is necessary is a broadly empirical account of musical structure, not aiming at a theory of performance, but at an understanding of how sounding structures interacted under specific historical conditions.

47 Norberg has argued on the basis of evidence drawn from theorists that metre was only scanned as a classroom activity: see Norberg, Les vers latins, pp. 13-6.
48 See Norberg, Introduction, p. 68.
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Among philologists there is a certain amount of common ground concerning the passage from quantitative to accentual verse. Almost all commentators agree that quantitative poetry opposed long and short syllables and that this was the principle of classical pronunciation. Accent was also present in the performance of classical poetry, but during the imperial epoch this accent, instead of being more or less musical, became an accent of intensity. By the time of St Augustine (354-430), according to his own testimony, a knowledge of long and short syllables had died out. Quantitative poetry continued to be written, but only by men learned of classical quantity. The new principle of poetic composition, based on spoken language, was dependent on an accent of intensity. This style of composition was termed ‘rhythmical’ by Bede, writing towards the beginning of the eighth century. About the nature of this rhythmical poetry, opinions diverge. There are three main theories: ictus alternation, prose and imitated structure.

The theory of ictus alternation holds that rhythmical poetry realised the quantitative system with the ictus replaced by accentual syllables. This entailed an alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables; for example, the regular alternation of Apparébit rèpentina dies mágna domínî. However, in many rhythmical poems word

---

49 The summary in this paragraph is based on Norberg, Introduction, p. 87.

50 Nam judicium aurium ad temporum momenta moderanda me posse habere non nemo; quae vero syllaba producenda vel corripienda sit...omnino nescio, Augustine, De musica, III. 3. 5, PL XXXII, col. 1118. ‘For I do not deny that I am capable of an aural judgment relating to how moments of time should be measured, however as to which syllable may be lengthened or shortened...I altogether do not know’.

51 Videtur autem rhythmus metris esse consimilis, quae est verborum modulata compositio, non metrica ratione, sed numero syllabarum ad judicium aurium examinata, ut sunt carmina vulgarium poetarum. Et quidem rhythmus per se sine metro esse potest, metrum vero sine rhythmio esse non potest, quod liquidius ita definitur: metrum est ratio cum modulatione, rhythmus modulatione sine ratione, Bede, De arte metrica XIV (De rhythmio), Keil (ed.), Scriptores, p. 258. ‘It seems however that rhythm is similar to metre – a measured arrangement of words, not weighed by metrical calculation, but by the number of syllables according to the judgment of the ears, as are the songs of common poets. And indeed rhythm can exist in itself without metre, metre however cannot exist with rhythm. It is defined more clearly thus: metre is calculation with measurement, rhythm is measurement without calculation’. 

127
accent and *ictus* do not coincide. Such cases have been explained by Germanic scholars through the concept of 'schwebende Betonung'; that is, where word accent was displaced by the *ictus* pattern.\(^{52}\) Other scholars have assumed a poor poetic technique or the influence of the vernacular on Latin pronunciation. A more recent refinement of this theory has been proposed by Klopsch who revived the concept of 'schwebende Betonung' as a true suspension of accent; that is, where verse *ictus* and word accent are both operative within the poetry as creative principles of structural tension.\(^{53}\)

A second theory, principally represented by Meyer, holds that rhythmical poetry was not verse, but prose: 'Ich habe stets als Ergebnis meiner Untersuchungen behauptet: die Zeilen der lateinischen und greichischen rhythmischen Dichtung sind Prosa mit einer bestimmten Schlußcadenz'.\(^{54}\) Although these fixed cadences weakly imitated the endings of quantitative poetry, in so far as they were accented either as paroxytones or proparoxytones and avoided final monosyllables, the decisive influence towards fixing these cadences was the *cursus* of rhetorical prose. These *cursus*, although taking many different forms in classical Latin prose, had been reduced to three main types by the end of the Roman Empire: the *cursus planus* (' ~ ~'), the *cursus tardus* (' ~ ~ ~') and the *cursus velox* ( ' ~ ~ ~ ~'). The second fundamental characteristic of this prosodic style was the principle of syllable counting. Meyer assumed that this derived from Jewish models via the Greek Christians. In these Jewish models, especially Syrian ones, the lines of poetry were ordered not by the length of syllables, but solely by their number (between 4 and 8), which were in turn grouped into long lines and strophes.\(^{55}\)

\(^{52}\) See, for example, J. Huemer, *Untersuchungen über die ältesten lateinisch-christlichen Rhythmen*, Vienna, 1879, pp. 24-8.

\(^{53}\) See, principally, Klopsch, 'Der Übergang', pp. 95-106.


\(^{55}\) This theory of Semitic origin did not find wider acceptance and was later definitively rejected. See H. Dihle, 'Die Anfänge der griechischen akzentuierenden Verskunst', *Hermes* LXXXII (1954), pp. 182-99.
A third theory, proposed by Norberg, is that the guiding principle of rhythmical verse was the structural imitation of classical models. This process of imitation occurred in two stages: first, classical verse was read with prose accent, although still taking account of the distribution of words and *caesurae*; second, classical verse was imitated without regard for quantity, but imitating the structure of the verse. Although accentual imitation of structure was the fundamental principle, other modes of imitation were also employed, including imitation of the number of words or the principal accents in classical verse. The principal means of imitation in the early Middle Ages, however, was a fixing of the number of syllables. For Norberg, reading played a fundamental role in the genesis of rhythmical structures: after the dying out of the pronunciation system which supported them, classical models were read and then imitated according to the properties observed in that reading.

These three different theories of the way verse was read all accredit music with an important role in the formation of new verse forms. For Meyer, the strophic form of rhythmical verse was the direct result of its descent from the refrain songs sung in church. Further, in the new rhythmical forms it was music which was crucial in the definition of structure; in the absence of any set expectations as to form it was music, in conjunction with verbal sense, which indicated the units of half-line, line and strophe. Indeed, music could be the only sure means of defining strophic construction, as in *Dulces modos* (c. 850), the structure of which only became clear to Meyer on examination of a notated source. Finally, according to Meyer, it was music which proved the motivation for new rhythmical forms after the poverty of invention displayed in Carolingian metrical imitations.

---

60 ‘Hier steckt die geistig kräftige Dichtung der Karolingerzeit in der jämmerlichen Zwangsjacke der wenigen Formen, welche sie den bewunderten lateinischen Schriftstellern der alten Zeit nachzumachen wagt... Aber vor uns steht eine Fülle der verscheidenartigsten neuen Zeilen wie Zehnsilber, Alexandriner, Vagantenzeile... Und diese ganze Fülle von Dichtungsformen wird gesungen, nicht gesprochen’, Meyer, ‘Über Ursprung’, p. 34.
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For Norberg, music was a critical influence at all stages of the development of the new rhythmical poetry. The first stage was the rejection of rhetorical device in the simple metrical hymns of Ambrose. The reason for this stylistic change was probably due not to Christian content, but rather to the requirements of song. Similarly, the liberation from verse quantity first signalled by Augustine’s psalm against the Donatists, for which no classical model can be found, was also probably due to its setting to a melody. The second stage was the creation of syllable counting forms, which Norberg saw as a practical method of singing melodies to verse. Finally, it was melody which inspired poetic forms with no relation to classical models in their number of syllables per line and in formal structure. For Norberg, music was a force for change, either acting as a link between different styles – to a given quantitative form a melody is sung, which in turn may become the basis for a syllable-counting form – or a rupture between them – wholly new forms with no classical imitation.

Within the theory of ictus-substitution the role of music is less clearly defined. For Klopsch, music glossed over the exceptional early examples where verse ictus and word accent did not coincide. In other words, musical performance allowed an even greater extent of deviation from a strict ictus-accent alignment than that accounted for by the concept of ‘schwebende Betonung’.

Although conclusions differ, it can be observed that the use of ‘music’ in philology is similar to the use of poetic terminology in musicology. The point at which an appeal to the other discipline is made is the point at which evidence internal to the discipline is lacking. In this case, the unknown territory is the reason for stylistic change and poetic irregularity. Due to the absence of information relating to

---

61 For a summary of Norberg’s view of the stages of poetic development and the role of music in that development, see Norberg, Introduction, pp. 184-7.

early musical settings, this unknown territory, unlike its counterpart in musicological studies, has remained untheorised. As observed by Norberg: ‘Dans bien des cas, nous y verrions plus clair si nous connaissons mieux les mélodies et si nous savions comment on les chantaient dans les différents pays et à différentes époques’. 63

iii Combined Models

Several writers have attempted to place information from poetic structures alongside that from musical structures. Spanke, followed by Chailley, undertook formal accounts of strophic structures in both media as contained in the most extensive source of notated verse in this period, Pa lat. 1154. 64 Both scholars identified patterns of neume repetition and labelled these as self-contained units: A A¹ B C etc. 65 These formal accounts of musical patterning showed several points of departure from one another, indicating the virtual impossibility of classifying degrees of difference with only three terms: same, variation and different. Given these restrictions, it is perhaps unsurprising that Chailley concluded that three broad principles of text setting could be identified in Pa lat. 1154: through-setting (which was rare), repetition and variation. For Chailley, these techniques provided evidence of an anterior stage to sequence composition and the ‘St Martial’ school in general. In similar fashion, Spanke divided poetic composition into two narrow categories, isometric forms and refrain songs, and concluded that the strophic forms were limited in comparison to those in the conductus and troubadour repertories. This was taken as evidence that the new principles of composition being pursued in the sequence did not spread to strophic poetry.

These studies are not so much interdisciplinary, as bi-disciplinary: no correlations between poetic and musical structures were found, and no attempts were

---

63 Norberg, Introduction, p. 186.
65 Chailley, L’École musicale, pp. 123-78 for the musical patterning; and, for poetic structure, Chailley, ‘Essai sur la formation’, pp. 49-80.
66 For the full details of the patterns observed by Spanke and Chailley in Pa lat. 1154, see below, p. 175.
made to discuss areas of mutual definition. Conclusions about the material remained within specialist domains, and the interpretative scheme, rather than engaging with the synchronicity of the music and poetry, was unitary and diachronic: for Spanke, the Romance philologist, limited formal schemes were evidence of a repertory of 'folk' music, primitive, amateur, unofficial, possibly for dancing, even a form of 'Gebrauchsmusik'; for Chailley, the medieval musicologist, these same formal schemes were simple forerunners of the religious poetry and music of a major monastic institution.

More recent studies have sought to re-address the question of word and music relations in early medieval verse. Stevens has described the relation as a two-tiered structure: a 'double melody' and a 'single numerical Idea'. The term 'double melody' referred to a 'non-relationship' between music and words: 'In plain language, the musician did not set the words of the poem to music; he set its pattern. It was this pattern, a purely numerical structure of stanzas, lines and syllables, which preceded both the melody and the poem'. To create verse was thus to dispose number according to principles of balance, proportion and armonia: number was the single metaphysical Idea from which melody and poem were independently fashioned.

Attractive as such Platonic reasoning is, it must represent a possible philosophical basis for an aesthetic of medieval song rather than a tool for analytical use. In drawing upon medieval theory, it retraces patterns of thought that are by nature speculative. When the direction of this theorising is reversed, from the general to the particular, the model is less satisfactory.

Although number is clearly of importance to the structural definition of rhythmical poetry, it is hard to demonstrate the realisation of number in musical patterning. Stevens offers an explicit account of numbered design in only two respects: a simple arithmetical correspondence in so far as the number of neumes

67 Chailley, L'École musicale, pp. 158-9 and 178.
68 Stevens, Words and Music, pp. 496-9.
69 Stevens, Words and Music, p. 499.
corresponds to the number of syllables, and a musical articulation of verbal lines (defined by numerical count) through cadences or semi-cadences. Beyond this, the identification of traces of *armonia* amounts to little more than a realisation that music is formally organised: ‘It is again not easy to put this kind of analysis into words...In the last resort, we have to feel it as music. It is a flowing pattern in which various kinds of ‘numbers’ are musically realized – in actual numbers of notes and note-groups, and in proportions, balances, echoes; it is, to repeat, *armonia*.' Given the lack of demonstrable evidence, Stevens’ own counter-examples of elaborate melismas, extreme gestures at rhetorical climaxes, serve to undermine the thesis of numerical non-relation.

Treitler has similarly criticised Stevens’ approach, dismissing it as both a priori and universalist. As regards theoretical content, Treitler has regarded as historical anachronism the tacit premise that only expressive relations between words constitute a ‘direct referential relationship’, a premise he sees as founded on the Renaissance separation of poetry and music into autonomous entities. For Treitler, following Bielitz and Powers, a more appropriate relation between words and music is that formulated by early medieval theorists who introduced an analogy between the hierarchic organisation of language and the structure of melody.

---

70 Stevens, *Words and Music*, pp. 32-45 (ch. I, § IV ‘Number: the Melodies’).
71 This is intended as a response to Van der Werf’s opinion that composers of troubadour and trouvère song paid little attention to the form of the melody and demonstrated a ‘lack of interest’ in ‘correspondence between form and melody’. For full references, see Stevens, *Words and Music*, p. 40.
72 ‘To sum up, these introductory melismas...are evidently not integral to the song. They lie outside the “numbered” pattern and cannot possibly be incorporated into it’, Stevens, *Words and Music*, p. 73.
73 ‘The effect is “demonstrative”, certainly, and meets one of the central injunctions of the *ars rhetorica* – to persuade...But this remains conjecture. The true explanation of this striking and ‘un-numerical’ effect may be simpler – and deeper – as a natural feature of human song in all ages’, Stevens, *Words and Music*, p. 78.
76 This analogy had been earlier signalled by Powers: ‘It would not be hyperbole to claim that the very idea that performable music might be susceptible to rational analysis was originally a consequence of
this analogy was syntax: just as language consisted of phonemes, syllables, words, phrases and sentences, so music consisted of neumes, phrases and songs. Grammatical principles thus became the model for correct melodic expression, principles which were realised through ‘modal coherence and contrast (ranges, intervals, formulas) and melodic syntax (phrase sequences and associations, cadence hierarchies, properties of formula placement)’. According to Treitler, such syntactic construction inevitably extended melodic influence into the realm of semantic content to the extent that melody was capable of ‘elucidating the relationships among word order, syntax, and phrasing, and through those relationships, of elucidating meaning’. This dual notion of ‘reading’, as both articulation and elucidation, was held to operate in a manner similar to punctuation.

Treitler’s model remains the most sophisticated for word-music relations before the Renaissance. Nevertheless, it contains certain blind spots. First, Treitler has elaborated his model in a series of articles and principally in a mode of critical discourse. He has, therefore, only applied the theory to a handful of pieces, close examination of a substantial body of material has not yet been achieved. A second area which requires qualification is the extent to which the analogy between music and language can be applied. Treitler’s dominant model for word-music relations is making the analogy between language and music’, H. S. Powers, ‘Language Models and Musical Analysis’, Ethnomusicology XXIV (1980), p. 48.


79 The model for this dual role of punctuation is Cassiodorus: Istae siquidem positurae seu puncta quasi quaedam viae sunt sensuum et lumina dictiomm, quae sic lectores dociles faciunt tamquam si clarissimis expiatoribus imbuantur, Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum I. xv. 12, R. A. B. Mynors (ed.), Cassiodori senatoris Institutiones, Oxford, 1937, pp. 48-9. ‘These marks or points of punctuation are, as it were, paths for thoughts and beacon lights for words, and render the readers as easily taught as they would be if they were being instructed by the most intelligible interpreters’, L. W. Jones (trans.), An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings, New York, 1946, p. 110.
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drawn from a passage in Johannes’ *De musica* (c. 1100) where ‘the author frames the analogy between prose and chant with respect to their hierarchical segmentation’.

...Just as in prose three kinds of *distinctiones* are recognized, which can also be called ‘pauses’ – namely, the colon, that is, member; the comma or *incisio*; and the period, *clausula* or *circuitus* – so also it is in chant. In prose, where one makes a pause in reading aloud, this is called a colon; when the sentence is brought to an end, it is a period...

Likewise, when a chant makes a pause by dwelling on the fourth or fifth note above the final, there is a colon; when in mid-course it returns to the final, there is a comma; when it arrives at the final at the end, there is a period.\(^8^2\)

*De musica*

In this passage, Treitler has understood *cola*, *commata* and *periodus* to refer to textual units akin to those marked by punctuation. Strictly speaking, however, the terms refer to rhetorical units and pauses, rather than a syntactic division of the sentence as practised in modern punctuation.\(^8^3\) This distinction has great import when considering verse, for the *cola* and *periodus* of verse frequently do not coincide with boundaries of sense.\(^8^4\) In considering the hexameter trope *Discipulis flammis*, for

---

\(^8^1\) Jacobsson and Treitler, ‘Medieval Music’, p. 8. The same passage had earlier been claimed as a fundamental text in the formation of a medieval musical grammar: see Powers, ‘Language models’, p. 49.


\(^8^3\) *Rhetorical analysis has been concerned with the ways in which punctuation reflects the periodic structure of a discourse and indicates the periodus and its parts (commata or incisa, cola or membr). With its emphasis on pauses for breath this mode of analysis has been preoccupied with bringing out correspondences between the written medium and the spoken word. A rhetorician’s periodus should not be confused with a grammarian’s sententia (the length of the periodus was a matter of opinion), and cola and commata should not be confused with such grammatical units as clauses*, M. B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect. An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*, Aldershot, 1992, p. 4.

\(^8^4\) Although these terms [colon and period] are the same as those applied to rhetorical structures in prose, the components of verse to which they refer are analogous but not identical. The grammarians
example, Treitler was led to the conclusion: ‘Only those aspects of text-structure that relate to the sense of the text were constraints on the melodies’. Yet in this trope it is the *caesurae* and line endings that received the main melodic articulation: the protracted explanation as to why two words which are not syntactically associated are melodically articulated, and the unconvincing assertion that a *caesura* is a function of word content, are avoided if this primarily rhetorical, rather than syntactic, function of *cola* and *commata* is admitted.

A cautious interpretation of Treitler’s theory has recently been applied by Haug and Björkvall principally in the domain of liturgical verse. Although the

---


86 The two words in question are the final two in the hexameter line *Discipulis flammas infundens caelitus almas*. Rather than turning to semantics for an explanation, it may be noted that *caelitus almas* is rhetorically articulated by a secondary *caesura* after *infundens*. This is also the case for the following hexameter line: *Discipulis flammas | infudit | pectore blandas*. The resultant five-syllable line ending with a paroxytone stress (or 5p) is discussed below as the most commonly articulated structural unit in both metrical and rhythmical verse.

87 ‘The one feature of the trope verses that has no influence whatever on the melodic structure is their metrical structure. (This assertion is not contradicted by the reflection of the *caesurae* in the melodies, for *caesura* is a function of both meter and word-content and it is the word-content that is consistently projected by the melody.‘), Treitler and Jacobsson, ‘Medieval Music’, p. 21.

concept of melody ‘reading’ text is retained, a series of distinctions about the activities within which the music-word relation was situated are made; that is, writing, reading, singing and, most crucially, understanding. Reading, in the sense of both recitation and interpretation, was dependent not on textual content, but an understanding of textual form. This understanding itself changed according to varying historical and technical circumstances. Singing, or a sung understanding, could distinguish itself from textual and even melodic strategies, thwarting these through performance interruptions and continuities. Notation recorded aspects of verse form which could be realised in singing, aspects which were not necessarily those observed in reading: the decisive affect of verse form, its duration and pauses, could be not at all, or only ambiguously, treated in this recording. Further, in so far as melody was a sounding manifestation of verse form, it was able in its own right to become a model for formulating further texts. Thus the phenomenon of verse-setting was itself a factor in the history of verse.

The results of the investigations of Björkvall and Haug remain preliminary to further research. Nevertheless, even at this early stage certain conventions have been identified as operative within narrowly defined areas. From an examination of six versified items in Stephen of Liège’s Trinity Office, composed in the early tenth century, it was concluded: ‘Nothing indicates that the melodies render the quantities of the syllables in any way; but by consistently marking the end of the verse lines as well as the main caesura, the setting makes characteristic features of the hexameter structure clearly perceptible to singer and listener’. While the first half of this statement is in agreement with Treitler’s theory, the second extends beyond Treitler’s notion of semantic demarcation. For Björkvall and Haug, music may articulate verse structure even when this structure does not project meaning. This is to suggest a tension between form and content in the principles of melodic setting, a tension which

des Mittelalters’, in Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter. Überlieferung – Ästhetik – Ausstrahlung (Monumenta monodica medii aevi. Subsidia VI) (eds. A. Haug, C. März, F. Reckow and L. Welker) Kassel, 2000 (forthcoming). I would like to thank Gunilla Björkvall and Andreas Haug for allowing me to read these articles prior to publication.

The following is based on the conclusions drawn in Björkvall and Haug, ‘Verstechnische und versgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen’.

created 'an ambivalent attitude towards verse in liturgical chant' and meant that 'a compromise had to be found by the composer in every particular case'.

iv Notation and Text

It is evident from the foregoing summary of previous approaches to verse and music in the ninth and tenth centuries that much reliance has been placed upon general theories imposed from without. This application of external models has largely arisen through a lack of information concerning the relation of music to verse in the ninth and tenth centuries. In order to rectify this state of affairs, it is necessary to return to the manuscripts to seek answers to such basic questions as: What kinds of verse were notated? How much verse was notated? and What was the relation between these notations?

In returning to a close examination of manuscripts, what is attempted is more than simply an identification and collection all surviving evidence relating to the music of early medieval verse. In so far as music and poetry are considered as cultural practices whose precise definition and relation depended upon the activities and thought-structures within which they were situated, manuscripts are to be considered as vital witnesses to a historical 'composition' of music and poetry. Such an approach reverses conventional approaches in so far as it considers the written record not as a reflection of practice, but as a primary source of information relating to the contemporary understanding of music and poetry. In other words, notation and text are to be considered as valuable witnesses to the manner in which music and poetry were conceived both individually and in relation to each other. Such contemporary witnesses are to be preferred as a starting point for analysis both to general concepts derived from theorists and to speculative recreations of musical and poetical performances.

3 Notational Analysis

Three different areas have been identified as susceptible to comparative analysis: i) neumes for concordant texts (both strophic and stichic); ii) neumes for strophic texts; and iii) neumes for stichic texts. In undertaking the first analysis it is hoped to examine melodic identity in relation to specific texts and in particular to establish the extent to which the melodies notated enjoyed wide dissemination or were the products of local invention. In undertaking the second and third analyses it is hoped to examine melodic identity in relation to specific verse forms and thereby identify general conventions that were observed in the fashioning of melodies for given verbal structures. These three analyses will be undertaken in turn.

i Notations for Concordant Texts

Sixteen of the verses notated in the poetic collections under consideration occur with notation in other sources. In seeking to avoid inappropriate categorisation at this stage, the following table is ordered in the first place according to the chronological order in which the poetic collections were written, and in the second place by the order within the individual source. The numbers in the table correspond to those for notations for concordant texts in Volume II.
### Table 10  
**Notated textual concordances for ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Author/Date</th>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i  O mortalis homo</td>
<td>Eugenius of Toledo (Bishop, 646-58)</td>
<td>Pa lat. 8093, Be 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii Sum noctis socia</td>
<td>Eugenius of Toledo</td>
<td>Ma 10029, Be 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii Ihesu redemptor omnium</td>
<td>s. vi ?</td>
<td>Be 455, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv Nocte surgentes</td>
<td>s. ix ?</td>
<td>Be 455, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Qui signati estis Christo</td>
<td>s. vii/ix</td>
<td>Be 455, Pa lat. 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi Ad caeli clara</td>
<td>Paulinus of Aquileia (d. 802)</td>
<td>Be 455, Pa lat. 1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii Anima nimis misera</td>
<td>s. viii ?</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Pa lat. 2373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii Si vis celsi</td>
<td>Boethius (d. 524)</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Or 270, Na IV. G. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix Fuit Domini / Tercio in flore</td>
<td>Paulinus of Aquileia / <em>idem</em></td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154/ Na IV. G. 68, Pa lat. 1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 1 Mecum Timavi</td>
<td>Paulinus of Aquileia</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Be 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 2 Mecum Timavi / Felix per omnes</td>
<td>Paulinus of Aquileia / <em>idem</em></td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Be 394/ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi O stelliferi</td>
<td>Boethius</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Vat lat. 3363, Na IV. G. 68, Be 455, Lo Harley 2685, Mu clm 18765, Pa n. a. lat. 1478, Ge lat. 175, Ox Auct. F. I. 15, Tr 1093, Cdg Gg. V. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii Bella bis quinis</td>
<td>Boethius</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Na IV. G. 68, El 149, Ox Auct. F. I. 15, El E. II. 1, Mu clm 15825, Tr 1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii Iudicii signum</td>
<td>s. iv/v</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, Pa lat. 2832 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv Gloriam Deo</td>
<td>Paulinus of Aquileia</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, RoA 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv Ut quid iubes</td>
<td>Gottschalk of Orbais (c. 806/8-866/70)</td>
<td>Pa lat. 1154, MoH 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi Solve lingua / Hierez runeta</td>
<td>s. x/xxi</td>
<td>Br 8860-8867, Ox Douce 222/Br 8860-8867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicates a similar melody for two separate texts.

indicates an overlap with the hymn repertory as transmitted in liturgical sources. For the fullest list of melodic concordances, see B. Stäblein, *Monumenta monodica mediæ aevi I Hymnen*, Basel, 1956.

Twenty-one further notated examples of *Judicii signum* from before the seventeenth century, including six before the twelfth century, are listed in H. Anglès, *La música a Catalunya fins al segle XIII*, Barcelona, 1935, pp. 288-302. Gómez has since signalled twenty-eight versions of Spanish provenance alone (including seventeen unnoted by Anglès), as well as ten vulgar Latin and Occitan versions: see M. Gómez, ‘El Canto de la Sibila: origenes y fuentes’, paper given at the *Colloqui Internacionals Fonts musicals a la Península Ibèrica (c. 1250-1550)*, Lleida, 1-3 April, 1996 (forthcoming).

The neumes of the textual concordances listed above will now be considered in turn. In the absence of precise indications of pitch, the correspondences between notations noted below are not proposed as exact equivalences but as indications of a similarity in melodic contour and gesture that equates to a similar strategy for realising music for a given poetic form. Even if melodic pitches were not precisely co-ordinated, such similarities in strategy would remain. It could be argued that in so far as neumatic notation represented contemporary conceptions of music the assumption that equivalence in pitch constituted identity is itself anachronistic. It might be proposed instead that it was only the information sufficiently indicated by notation that constituted the essential component of melodic identity. A more differentiated position, and the one adopted here, is that identity could reside both in pitch content and in strategy, and that the question of concordance encompasses not simply relation or non-relation, but a spectrum of possible relations effective in several different domains.

\[ i \quad O \ mortalis \ homo \ (Vol. \ II \ no. \ i) \]

Eugений of Toledo’s *O mortalis homo* comprises fourteen hexameter lines which are regularly articulated by a penthemimeral *caesura*. Prose accent and *ictus* do not routinely coincide except in the last five syllables of each line where a fixed accentual pattern is formed in conjunction with the fixed dactylic cadence: ‘~~’ ~. The
syntactical structure is also regular: each *sententia* extends over two verse lines and each line of verse comprises a separate clause.

The extent of the notation added to Pa lat. 8093 (II: 1) and Be 455 (II: 18) differs: in the former only the first two hexameters are notated, whereas in latter the text is notated throughout. The melody indicated by the neumes in Pa lat. 8093 is predominantly syllabic with *pedes* and *clives* occasionally interspersed. Some similarity between the neumes for the two lines may be observed: it is evident from a cursory examination, for example, that in both lines the notation indicates a melodic contour that rises at the two syllables before the *caesura* and descends at the two syllables that close the line. Further examination reveals correspondences between the second halves of each line.

**Example 1  O mortalis homo in Pa lat. 8093**

```
i   O mor-ta-lis ho-mo · mor-tis re-mi-nis-re ca-sus ·
   Nil pe-cu-de dis-tas · si tan-tum pros-pe-ra cap-tas ·
```

The first four signs after the *caesura* in line 1 (*virga, tractulus, virga, punctum* – two long and two short syllables) correspond in profile to the metrically equivalent three signs after the *caesura* in line 2 (*clivis, tractulus, clivis* – three long syllables). If the second halves of the fourth feet are understood to be equivalent (the *virga-punctum* of the two short syllables corresponding to the disjunct *clivis* over the single long syllable in the second line), the only difference remains in the second half of the third foot, where the *virga* of line 1 corresponds to a *clivis* in line 2. A possible motivation for this disparity may be found by extending the comparison to the previous two syllables. If these two previous syllables are taken into account in both lines the sequence of signs is equivalent in overall gesture; that is, *tractulus-pes-virga,*
tractulus-virga-clivis with a diastematic contour in the neumes that supports an equivalence of three rising notes and one lower note. Furthermore, the following three syllables in each line are matched in gesture if not in melodic content: the pes, virga, punctum written with a descending contour in line 1, and the clivis, liquecent punctum, tractulus written with the same contour in line 2.

The formal implications of the notation added in Pa lat. 8093 are unclear. The similarity in melodic strategy at the points of greatest metrical similarity might indicate a stichic pattern that is to be modified for the remaining lines according to the scansion. However, the substitution of a clivis for a pes five syllables before the close of line 2 suggests a similarity of principle for each line whose contour was adjusted to create a two-line unit of melodic return.

The unit of melodic return is more clearly signalled in Be 455, which also transmits a recitational scheme with fixed points of articulation. The neumes indicate a melodic pattern that, with the exception of the second pair (lines 3 and 4), repeats with a certain amount of variation every two lines. The stable elements of this pattern are the caesurae (a pes that is on occasion extended on the ultima in both odd and even lines), the cadence of odd lines (pes subbipunctis followed by clivis) and the intonation of even lines (a pes or liquecent pes). Three types of variation in the remainder of the lines may be observed:

i) In the second and fourth feet of even lines a clivis on the second long is subdivided into two puncta where a long is replaced by two short syllables.

ii) In the second feet of odd lines and the sixth feet of even lines, a clivis or a pes (i.e. a two-note gesture) is placed on the initial syllable, followed by the requisite number of puncta to complete the foot.

iii) After the caesura in odd lines the melodic sequence is either clivis-punctum or punctum-clivis.

92 For a shorter account of the Bern setting of O mortalis homo whose conclusions do not differ from the following presentation, see Björkvall and Haug, 'Musik und lateinischer Vers', pp. 237-8.
In the first case adaptation is prompted by metrical variation in the number of syllables. In the second and third cases no prosodic motive for melodic variation can be detected.

In line 3 some of the patterns usually used for even lines are observed: an opening *pes* intonation followed by a sequence of *puncta*, and a final cadence of two notes followed by a single note. The use of a *clivis* in the first syllable of the fourth line retains the pattern of odd lines; the absence of any expanded melodic gesture to mark the *caesura* is unique. It is possible that the melodic echo of procedures usually used in even lines was motivated by the exceptional verbal echoes between the third and fourth lines:

iii Omnia quae cernis vanarum gaudia rerum
iv Umbra velut tenuis veloci fine recedunt

A direct comparison of the notations of Pa lat. 8093 and Be 455 reveals a degree of correspondence. In line 1, a *pes* was placed at the *caesura* and the beginning of the fifth foot in both manuscripts. Besides such identity, there is a similar articulation of certain structural points. In the first lines of both Pa lat. 8093 and Be 455 the final five syllables are marked with compound neumes on the two last accented syllables (*reminisci cere casus*). Both notations also indicate a rising melodic contour at the *caesura* of the second line but show no correspondence at the cadence of the same line.

In sum, the two manuscripts do not transmit concordant melodies for *Octavis homi*. Nevertheless, the notations indicate similar ways of realising music for hexameter lines: rising gestures at *caesurae*, falling gestures at the ends of lines, an apparent interchangeability of *pedes* and *clives*, a dissolving of compound neumes into simple neumes to accommodate metrical flexibility and evidence of a two-line unit of return. The two notations thus bear witness to some common strategies of performance.
The two surviving notations for the elegiac distich *Sum noctis socia* differ in context. The version in Be 36 is at the head of a series of nightingale poems by Eugenius of Toledo in which a series of distinct poems are presented as one continuous whole. The neumes in Be 36 continue across the separate poems. The version in Ma 10029 (II: 8), although it appears in the same sequence of poems, presents *Sum noctis* as a distinct distich.

The distich *Sum noctis socia* features a penthemimeral *caesura* in both lines. Accent and *ictus* correspond in the second halves of the verses. In both lines there is also a single-syllable rhyme between the *caesura* and the end of the line.

In Ma 10029 the *caesurae* are preceded by the same sequence of neumes: *clivis-punctum-punctum-torculus*. In this sequence the two compound neumes are placed on syllables that accord with the *ictus*. In the second halves of the verses higher pitches, as indicated by the relative diastematy of the signs, correspond with the *ictus* or word accent (excepting the first *ictus* after the *caesura* in the first line). The openings of the two lines show no signs of correspondence with each other or with properties of the verse structure.

In Be 36 compound neumes are placed at points of structural articulation: the *caesura* of line 1, the two final syllables of line 1, and the intonation of line 2. A further *pes* is placed over the third syllable or second *ictus* of line 1. There is no absolute correspondence between *ictus* or word accent and the height of the neume signs in the remainder of the notation. However, if the compound neumes are considered alongside high tones, then the *ictus* is marked by some means in all cases except immediately after the *caesura* in both lines.

There are few points of correspondence between the two notations for *Sum noctis socia*. In both cases important structural points of the elegiac distich have been

---

93 *Sum noctis socia* is followed by the distich *In somnem filomela*, the quatrain *Dic filomela* and the extended poem *Vox filomela*. A four-line benediction is also added at the end of *Vox filomela*.
marked with compound neumes, yet the two melodies mark largely different points: in Ma 10029 the two caesurae are marked out by the two torculi; in Be 36, the first-line caesura, the final two syllables of the first line and the beginning of the second line are marked with compound neumes. The only other point of contact between the two notations is that the second membri of the distichs are syllabic.

There is a more notable similarity of setting between O mortalis homo in Be 455 and Sum noctis socia in Be 36 than between the Bern and Madrid notations for Sum noctis socia. The former pair, one a hexameter couplet the other an elegiac distich, mark the first-line caesura, the final two syllables of the dactylic cadence and the opening of the second line by similar means: giving the forms in strict order, by a pes in both, by a pessubbipunctis and clivis in Be 455 and a climacus followed by clivis in Be 36, and by a pes in both. This degree of similarity between different texts and structures suggests that strategies for setting verse forms may have been more stable than melodic contents associated with specific texts.

iii Jhesu redemptor omnium (II: iii)

Notation has been added to the opening four strophes of Jhesu redemptor omnium in Be 455 (II: 13). Each strophe consists of four lines of iambic dimeter and where notated displays the same sequence of neumes.

The notation in Be 455 shows clear similarities to several hymn melodies transcribed by Stäblein. Of the nine melodies cross-referenced by Stäblein, two share the same text as this, two are set to Christe redemptor omnium and the remaining five are individual texts. Comparison with these melodies demonstrates that the diagonal stroke leaning to the right in the Be 455 notation is equivalent to a pes and that no consistent diastematic principle is used for the disposition of neumes.

The particular version of the hymn melody indicated by the Bern notation is closest in individual signs to that copied in Ver CIX (102). Where there are

---

departures from the pattern indicated in the Veronese manuscript, the alternative gestures are commonly found in the other versions of the melody; for example, on the fifth syllable of the second line the Bern notation has a *punctum*, but the Veronese notation indicates a *clivis* figure – both possibilities are found in the remaining melodies, the *punctum* in Vat Reg. lat. 205, Worc F. 160 and RoC 1574, the *clivis* figure in both Pa n. a. lat. 1235 melodies, Klo 1000 and Ei 366.

Despite differences in melodic content, all versions of the hymn melody show the same formal pattern, which in its most reductive form may be expressed as: a b c a'. All melodies also show a marked tendency to place two-note forms on the *ictus* – of the twelve two-note figures indicated in Be 455, only one does not occur on the *ictus* (on the sixth syllable in line 2). Thus whilst the melodic content indicated by the notation in Be 455 is not identical to any of the hymn melodies aligned below, the notation does demonstrate a fixed formal pattern (a b c a'), strategy (melodic emphasis of the *ictus*) and melodic contour.

### iv Nocte surgentes (II: iv)

The notation for *Nocte surgentes* may also be identified with a set of hymn melodies transcribed by Stäblein. In this case, none of the melodic concordances has the same text as in Be 455 (II: 14): the melodies are set to *Ecce iam noctis* (twice), *Quod chorus vatum* (twice), *Iste confessor, Christe sanctorum* and *Martyris Christi*.

Notation has been added only to the first nine syllables of *Nocte surgentes*, which is organised in sapphic strophes. The correspondence of the opening *torculus* and third-syllable *pes* in the Bern notation to the other melodies establishes a degree of similarity that is reinforced by the similarities in melodic contour indicated by the relative diastematy. A melodic gesture that finds no correspondence in the other melodies is the *clivis* over the sixth syllable. The melodic content indicated by the Bern notation is thus not identical to any of the melodies as transcribed by Stäblein, although the shape is clearly similar.

---

Two notations for *Qui signati estis* survive. The text comprises strophes with four lines of eight syllables constructed in the same manner as the first *membrum* of a rhythmical trochaic septenarius (8p). The refrain is also 8p.\(^6\)

Little information can be recovered from the notation in Be 455 (II: 19). In the absence of clear diastematy, and given the prevalence of single note neumes, the only secure statement that can be made is that, whilst the notation for the strophe indicates a syllabic melodic realisation, the refrain is set apart by an increase in melismatic gestures.

The later notation in Pa lat. 1928 indicates a particular articulation of the verse form. This articulation is evident in the notation for the second and fourth lines: in both, the first four syllables are set syllabically with first a rising and then two falling intervals; the notation for the next four syllables then differ in contour. A motivation for this patterning can be seen in the verse text which subdivides the 8p line in both cases into 4p + 4p: (line 2) *mementote* | *re promissi*, and (line 4) *in futuro* | *vobis dixit*. Further indications of half-line patterning can be seen through comparing the neumes for the openings of lines 1 and 3. Excepting the opening *pes*, which may be taken as a feature to mark the opening of the strophe, the contour and gesture of the first four neumes is again similar, whereas the next four neumes in each line show no such similarities. Again, the half-line division can be seen in the verse text: (line 1) *Qui signati* | *Christo estis*, and (line 3) *Quod daturum* | *se in caelis*. It is also of note that the pattern of neumes used at the opening of line 3 is repeated in the last four syllables of line 4 (i.e. the neumes for *Quod daturum* and *vobis dixit*), and the neumes over the last four syllables of line 2 are repeated over the last four syllables of line 3 (i.e. the neumes for *re promissi* and *se in caelis*). A simple shorthand for the strophe, in which the letters used are understood to refer not necessarily to precise pitch content but (as seen in the hymn melodies) to an identity of strategy and shape, would therefore be: ab, cd, a’d, ca’.

As in Be 455, the refrain in Pa lat. 1928 is set apart through a more melismatic sequence of neumes. Unlike Be 455, however, a half-line articulation is indicated: the sequence of single-note – rising gesture – and two single notes is used for both the first and second half of the line. To complete the shorthand used above, the design for both strophe and refrain would therefore read: ab, cd, a’d, ca’, ee’.

In sum, the only similarity that can be established through a comparison of the Be 455 and Pa lat. 1928 notations for *Qui signati estis Christo* is one of formal principle whereby the refrain has been set apart through the use of more expanded melodic gestures.

vi  Ad caeli clara (II: vi)

Paulinus of Aquileia’s *Ad caeli clara* is notated in two manuscripts: Be 455 (II: 20) and Pa lat. 1154 (II: 21). The poetic form is a rhythmical imitation of three iambic trimeters and an adonic; that is, 3 x (5p + 7pp), 5p.97 The strophic construction echoes that of sapphic verse whose fixed syllable count was rendered rhythmically as 3 x (5p + 6p), 5p. A further organising principle in the text is the abecedary form with a final doxology.

An examination of the neumes added to Pa lat. 1154 reveals a complex articulation of verse structure. The most striking feature is the repetition of the pattern of neumes between *membra* or distinct sections of the verse structure: the second *membra* (syllables 6 to 12) of lines 1 and 2 share the same pattern, and the first *membra* (syllables 1 to 5) of lines 2 and 3 share similar patterns. Adopting the shorthand used above, the pattern that is realised in the neumes may be described as: ab, cb, cd, e.

---

The notation for the remaining membras of the verse indicates further layers of melodic articulation. The neumes of the opening membrum of line 1 indicate a melody that is similar in profile, even if more elaborate in gesture, to that of the following lines – there is thus a degree of similarity between the a and c sections indicated above. The neumes for the two final membras (syllables 6 to 12 of line 3, and syllables 1-5 of line 4) have little in common with those preceding, although the increased melismatic nature of the gestures forms a parallel to the opening elaboration. In sum, an examination of the neumes alone reveals layers of repetition, similarity in profile and elaboration that articulate the verse structure at the level of half-line, line and strophe.

In the notation for Ad caeli clara in Be 455 a certain degree of melodic repetition within the strophe is also apparent: lines 1 and 2 share the same pattern of neumes with the exception of the final syllable. There is also some recognition of the importance of the half-line as a unit of articulation: the caesura after the fifth syllable is marked in lines 1 and 2 with a conjunct pes placed over the paroxytone accent of the fourth syllable (also in line 4), and a disjunct pes over the fifth syllable. The notation for the third line indicates a melodic pattern that stands apart from the opening lines whilst retaining basic similarities: the pes intonation over the first syllable is extended with a clavis, and the final syllable as in line 1 receives a disjunct pes. The most significant difference in the third line lies in the pedes of the second membrum: while the other departures from syllabic recitation may be understood to mark formal properties of the verse (intonation, medial accent, and cadence), the placement of these pedes appears to establish a degree of melodic tension with the verse structure.

Although the two notations for Ad caeli clara do not indicate identical melodic content, there are some similarities in melodic technique. Both feature rising intonations that are subject to elaboration but abandoned for the final line, and in both there follow after the opening gestures a predominantly syllabic recitation and descending cadences. In addition, patterning is a feature of both melodies: both articulate the half-line, and both articulate the closing of the strophe through departure from established patterns in the second membrum of the third line. Yet the melodic
strategies transmitted by the two notations also differ, for in the Paris manuscript the pattering that may be recovered from the neumes operates by half-line, whereas in the Bern notation the melodic pattering operates by line. To draw these observations together, it would seem that the two notations for *Ad caeli clara* indicate melodic material that is distinct in both strategy and content, whilst sharing certain basic similarities in shape.

vii  

*Anima nimis misera* (II: vii)

Two notations survive for *Anima nimis misera*, one in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 23), the other in Pa lat. 2373. The verse text is a rhythmical imitation of a four-line iambic dimeter with a prose refrain (4 x 8pp, R prose). The strophes are organised according to an abecedary format.

Notation has been added to the first strophe and refrain in Pa lat. 1154. No absolute repetition or systematic marking of prosodic features can be observed, but the neumes indicate a melodic strategy that is realised differently in each line. All lines of the strophe begin with a rising gesture over the first three syllables: in the first line, a *scandicus* followed by two *puncta* (*Anima*); in the second line the rising three-note pattern is distributed differently with the *pes* corresponding to the second-syllable accent on *Infelix*; in the third line the *pes* is transferred to the third syllable within the rising sequence; and in the fourth line the three rising notes are distributed evenly over *Tormenta*. In the remaining portions of these lines, the first three follow a basic sequence of *clivis-pes-clivis* that is distributed differently whereas the fourth line follows an independent contour.

No prosodic motives for the different realisations can be identified, although the placement of the rising gesture over the first syllable in line 1 and the different cadence in line 4 might be understood to mark the strophe. Within the refrain there appears to be a melodic division into separate units, as after the first seven syllables an enclosed group of seven syllables is established through the continued use of a fixed pattern (*pes-clivis* with *oriscus*). The figures in the notation thus indicate a division of the prose refrain into 7p + 7p, 5pp – a division which finds a certain
parallel in the text as the rhyming final syllable \( a \) of the first strophe also appears at the end of the seven-syllable units (quia and torquenda).

In Pa lat. 2373, notation has been added to the opening two strophes and to the first syllable of the third strophe.\(^{98} \) This distribution of notation accords with the verse layout, in which the two opening strophes are copied continuously, but from the third strophe new strophes are placed on a separate line. The motivation for this separation out of the first two strophes would appear to be the structure of the verse: the refrain alternates in a two-strophe cycle, with odd-numbered strophes followed by Lugenda nimis, quia aeternis es torquenda cruciatibus; and even-numbered strophes followed by Succurre Christe, quia benignus es, et da misericordiam.

The melodies indicated for the two strophes in Pa lat. 2373 are virtually identical and show strong similarities to that indicated for the first strophe of Anima nimis misera in Pa lat. 1154. Here only the notations for the first strophes in Pa lat. 1154 and Pa lat. 2373 will be compared. Such is the proximity between the melodies for the first strophes of the two Paris manuscripts that it is simpler to note points of divergence: the penultimate syllable in the first two lines (clives in Pa lat. 1154, pes–virga in the first strophe of Pa lat. 2373), the last syllable in line 3 (a punctum in Pa lat. 1154, a clivis in Pa lat. 2373), and the third, sixth and seventh syllables in line 4 (all puncta in Pa lat. 1154, pes-puncta-pes in Pa lat. 2373). In the refrain greater divergence is evident, although a heightened melismatic melody is realised in both notations. The most marked divergence in the melodic gestures indicated for es torquenda: in Pa lat. 1154, climacus and a pes are employed; in Pa lat. 2373, scandicus and a clivis are used. The indicated melodic contents are thus at this point equivalent, but reversed in direction.

In sum, the two surviving notations for Anima nimis misera show melodies similar in melodic contour and principle. Although they are not identical, it is clear that the two recorded melodies are strongly related.

\(^{98} \) I am indebted to Pascale Bourgain for bringing this notation to my attention and to Francesco Stella for generously providing a reproduction.
There are three surviving notations for the Boethian *metrum Si vis celsi*: Pa lat. 1154 (II: 24), Or 270 and Na IV. G. 68. In each case the notation indicates a division of the stichic acatalectic anapaestic dimeter into three-line strophes. This division allows for a performance of the whole 48 lines, although in Pa lat. 1154 only the first three lines are copied as a later addition to the manuscript.

Little information concerning melodic design can be recovered from the notation in Pa lat. 1154. The melodic pattern indicated by the neumes is syllabic with the exception of the first syllable of the first line. Although the notation shows some information concerning diastematy, no parallels between the melodic contours of the three lines can be discerned.

The notation added to the first six lines in Na IV. G. 68 provides more information concerning melodic patterning. Within the first three lines, the same pattern of neumes is used up to the caesura: three single notes in the relation higher-lower-higher followed by a tractulus as the neume before the caesura. In line three an extra neume was added between the second and third elements of this pattern to account for the extra syllable. In the second halves of the lines a more differentiated pattern can be observed: the second and third lines share the same sequence of neumes (*virga-tractulus-pes-virga-virga*). A shorthand for this patterning would be: ab, ac, a’c. In lines 4-6 the same pattern of neumes can be observed with the exception that in the sixth line a pes is introduced over the second syllable. There is no apparent prosodic motive for this deviation, which indicates that within strophic return an element of variety was introduced.

The neumes added to the first three lines in Or 270 indicate the most elaborate melodic gestures. A degree of repetition can be seen in the neumes between lines 1 and 2: the *pes-clivis* combination over the first syllable in line 1 is spread over the first two syllables of line 2, the *torculus* of line 1 then equates to the third syllable pes of line 2, and the two lower single-note neumes of the third and fourth syllables in line 1 appear to be condensed into the *clivis* over the fourth syllable in line 2. In the second
halves of the lines a similar process of condensation and expansion can be seen: the *torculus-clivis* combination in line 1 resolves into a *pes-virga-punctum* in line 2, and the *pes-virga-virga* combination over the last word of line 1 is matched by the *pes-virga* combination over the last word in line 2. Identity in melodic gesture thus pivots around the caesura with a further correspondence between word boundaries and melodic gesture. In other words, melodic material retains its integrity within the half-line, and contractions and expansions are determined by the variation in the number of syllables per word (thus the gesture on *Si* in line 1 accords with that on *Pura* in line 2, and in the second halves of the lines the gestures on *iura/cernere* and *tonantis/mentis* correspond). No such process of adaptation can be discerned in line 3 – it is possible that the basic rising-falling-rising idea of lines 1 and 2 is decorated at the opening of the second half of the line, but perhaps more significant here is a level of elaboration previously encountered only at the opening of the strophe that serves to demarcate the strophe.

A comparison of the three notations reveals no significant similarity of melodic gesture. There is also a difference in the level of patterning: in Na IV. G. 68 patterning operates by half-line; in Or 270, although the half-line is retained as an integral melodic unit, repetition occurs on the level of the line; while in Pa lat. 1154 no internal repetition can be discerned. The only similarity is one of basic strategy; that is, the decision to set three lines as a melodic unit. In isolation this decision is not surprising as the first three lines form a complete *sententia*. After this point the main syntactical units do not occur every three lines, although it is striking how many do accord with such a pattern. In short, there is no necessary connection between the melodic designs indicated by the three notations and the three-line setting may have been motivated by independent assessments of the unit most suited to melodic return in relation to syntax.
The strophic design of Paulinus of Aquileia’s *Fuit Domini* is striking in so far as each strophe comprises four lines of imitated trochaic tetrameter (or 4 x 8p + 7pp) rather than the standard three-line imitation (or 3 x 8p + 7pp). The extent to which the 4 x 8p + 7pp design was unorthodox is betrayed by the unusual scribal practices in the only notated version of this verse. In *Pa lat. 1154* the text scribe routinely marked new strophes by enlarged and coloured capitals, but omitted to do so for this one poem. The difficulty this engendered for readers is indicated by the subsequent action of the notator, who marked the strophes by adding neumes to the first lines of each stanza (with the omission only of the thirteenth strophe) – again the only case in the manuscript where this was done. A second index of the unorthodox nature of this strophic design is the presence of only one later hymn with this design in the hymnals edited by Stäblein.\(^99\)

An examination of the notation added to *Pa lat. 1154* (II: 26) indicates a clear sequence of repetition: the neumes for lines 2, 3 and 4 are virtually identical in both gesture and diastematy. The only significant departure in patterning within these three lines occurs over the last three syllables of line 4 where the elaboration may be understood to mark the close of the strophe. A further distinctive feature of these three lines is the elaborate *pes subhispunctis* that occurs on the third syllable amid neumes indicating one- and two-note figures.

The distinctive strophic design of *Fuit Domini* was used for another composition by Paulinus of Aquileia, *Tercio in flore*. Besides authorship, and distinctive strophic design, *Fuit Domini* and *Tercio in flore* also share the same accentual pattern within the individual lines.\(^100\)

---

\(^99\) *Ad homonem regis* is the only example of a 4 x 8p + 7pp structure in Stäblein’s edition: see Stäblein, *Hymnen*, no. 167.

\(^100\) On the presence of a secondary accent in rhythmical verse, as indicated in the following example, see principally Norberg, *L’accentuation des mots*, pp. 29-39.
Example 2  **Accentual patterns in Fuit Domini and Tercio in flore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fuit domini di-lec-tus</th>
<th>lán-guens à be-thá-ni-à</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Tér-ci-ô in fló-re mún-dus</td>
<td>âd-huc ô-lim pù-be-scé-ret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Lã-za-rûs be-á-tus sác-ris</td>
<td>ô-lim cúm so-ró-ri-bûs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Ín de-cô-re û-ven-tû-tis</td>
<td>sé-cu-lûm pul-crès-ce-rêt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Quâs hié-sus ae-tér-nus á-mor</td>
<td>di-li-gé-bat plû-ri-mûm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Àt-que pró-lis sú-per óm-nes</td>
<td>lá-tos cé-li cár-di-nès</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Már-tham si-mul êt ma-ri-am</td>
<td>fë-li-cès per sé-cu-lâ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the notation for Tercio in flore as transmitted in Na IV. G. 68 with the notation for Fuit Domini in Pa lat. 1154 also reveals several correspondences. In terms of patterning, the two notations indicate the same design; that is, an opening line followed by three lines with almost identical patterns of neumes. As regards melodic profile, the diastematy, where indicated in the Naples notation, is almost identical to that in the Paris notation. There remain differences in the indicated melodic content between the two notations – most notably from the second line onwards the Naples notation indicates a more melismatic melody than that represented by the Paris notation. Nevertheless, a similarity in gesture is always retained so that the expansive figure on the third syllable of lines 2 to 4 is present in both notations, even if the details of its melodic contour differ.

To draw these observations together, the close correspondence between the texts of Fuit Domini and Tercio in flore in terms of strophic design and internal pattern is mirrored in the correspondence in pattern and melodic profile in the two surviving notations for these poems. Yet just as the two texts display differences in verbal content, so there is a difference in melodic content between two realisations of the same melodic strategy.
x. 1  **Mecum Timavi** (II: x. 1)

*Mecum Timavi* by Paulinus of Aquileia is a lament for Eric, Duke of Friuli, who died in 799. The structure of this verse is once more a rhythmical imitation of an iambic trimeter, but in this case a more common five-line imitation, or in the shorthand of Norberg, 5 x 5p + 7pp.\textsuperscript{101} Notations for this poem survive in two manuscripts: Pa lat. 1154 (II: 28) and Be 394.

Alignment of the two surviving notations reveals two closely related melodies. In terms of strategy, the half-line patterning previously seen in *Ad caeli clara* can be observed: in both notations, the neume patterns for the second *membra* of lines 1 and 4, as well as the second *membra* of lines 3 and 5, are repeated. The melodic profile indicated by the two notations is virtually identical. The section of greatest dissimilarity is the second *membrum* of the second line, but any doubts about the melodic relation at this point are allayed by the distinctive final melisma in both notations. A further notable feature of both notations is the neume pattern in the second *membrum* of the fourth line. It would appear from the disposition of the neumes that in the mind of both scribes seven distinct melodic gestures were imagined for this *membrum*, as in the first line, from which the melodic pattern is copied, despite the presence of only six syllables of text.

x. 2  **Mecum Timavi / Felix per omnes** (II: x. 2)

An explanation for the anomalous disposition of neumes in the second *membrum* of the fourth line in the two surviving notations for *Mecum Timavi* is provided by the identification of a related melody for *Mecum Timavi* that was transmitted alongside a text with a full complement of seven syllables at this point. The text in question is another composition by Paulinus of Aquileia, *Felix per omnes*. Melodies for *Felix per omnes* are transmitted in numerous hymnaries from the Moissac hymnal onwards. I have copied in first place those versions of *Felix per omnes* included in Stäblein’s edition of hymn melodies which are closest in content; that is, a version in a

\textsuperscript{101} This poetic structure was previously used by poets such as Theofrid of Corbie and Master Stephen of Pavia, as well as in several Irish hymns: see Norberg, *Introduction*, pp. 111-2.
thirteenth-century Southern Italian source (Bari s. n.) and one in the Moissac hymnal (Vat Rossi 205). The Moissac version shows a close similarity in profile for only three out of the ten *membra*: the second *membrum* of line 1 and the whole of the second line. In themselves, these similarities would not be enough to support the assertion of a connection between these two melodies. The thirteenth-century version of the melody, however, demonstrates a closer resemblance.

The correspondence in profile between the notated versions of *Mecum Timavi* and the Italian melody is by no means absolute. Nevertheless, to a degree unmatched by any of the other melodies for *Felix per omnes*, the overall direction of the melodies is the same. Most striking, however, is the similarity in organisation that accompanies this similarity in profile. In both *Mecum Timavi* and the Italian melody the second *membra* of lines 1 and 3 display repetition in lines 4 and 5. Perhaps more importantly, the extended melismas at the close of the second line and the first *membra* of line 5 correspond in position and profile.

Viewed in isolation, such similarities might be dismissed as the outcome of similar strategies of performance for similar verse forms. However, if the level of correspondence between these four notated melodies is compared with Stäblein’s sample of melodies for *Felix omnes*, then the level of similarity between the Moissac melody and the versions of *Mecum Timavi* appears typical, whilst the similarities to the Italian melody appear exceptional. Indeed, besides the placement of melismas, only the Italian melody has an almost identical melodic organisation: a b, c d, e f, a’ b, x f, where x marks the only departure from the organisation in *Mecum Timavi* as it corresponds to either a or e in the Italian source with no clear relation discernible in the neumes for *Mecum Timavi*. In sum, what we appear to have here is a relation between melodies for different texts by the same author that lies somewhere between a shared performance strategy and a stable tune.

---

102 In Stäblein’s edition, the concordant melodies for *Felix per omnes* are nos. 33, 105, 106, 739, 759 and 775. For the full references to these melodies, see Stäblein, *Hymnen*, pp. 680-5.
O stelliferi, the fifth metrum from the first book of the *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius, consists of 48 lines of acatalectic anapaestic dimeter. No regular formal or syntactical division is apparent within these 48 lines. Notations for *O stelliferi* survive in eleven manuscripts from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. In only three of these manuscripts are notated versions of *O stelliferi* presented outside the context of the complete work; that is, Pa lat. 1154, Be 455 and Cdg Gg. V. 35.\(^\text{103}\)

The following table demonstrates the differing extent of the notation added to *O stelliferi* in the surviving manuscripts:

**Table 11**  
Lines of notation added to *O stelliferi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>No. of lines noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Na IV. G. 68</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu 18765</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr 1093</td>
<td>2 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Harley 2685</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa n. a. lat. 1478</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>1 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox Auct. F. I .15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge lat. 175</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cdg Gg. V. 35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat lat. 3363</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>4 +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
+ indicates the presence of occasional further notation

\(^{103}\) An early precedent for excerpting the *metra* from the *De consolatione philosophiae* is provided by a late ninth-century manuscript copied at Corbie, Pa lat. 13026 (fols. 84v-92v): on this manuscript, see D. Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*, Sigmaringen, 1990, p. 157.
The number of lines notated cannot be taken as an automatic indication of the unit of strophic return. Within the thorough notation of the Naples manuscript a basic three-line unit of return can be observed that encompasses both adjustment to accommodate the flexible number of syllables in the line and half-line, and a variation in the indicated melodic substance per strophe. In three other manuscripts there is also the possibility of strophic return within the number of lines notated: in Vat lat. 3363 the third notated line is similar to the first with modifications only in the fourth, fifth and sixth syllables; in Ge lat. 175, there is a substantial repetition of the material of the opening two lines in the third and fourth lines; and in Cdg Gg. V. 35 a pattern similar to that of Ge lat. 175 although less precise in its correspondences. In all cases, the difficulty lies in making an absolute distinction between strophic return with variation (either for reasons of syllable alteration or for no apparent prosodic reason) and the use of similar material per line or half-line within a strophic structure. Rather than insist on one or other designation, it is most useful at this preliminary stage to articulate the ambiguity in the notation of a restricted number of lines: the notation may indicate a strophic unit, or a strophic unit with initial and paradigmatic departures from strict melodic return, or a number of possible ways of performing individual lines.

Further detailed examination allows distinctions to be made between the particular strategies adopted for a musical realisation of this *metrum* and the relation of these individual strategies to general practice. For the purposes of this study, I shall attempt a close reading only of the version in Pa lat. 1154 and seek to relate comments about general practice to this one realisation.

The disposition of notation in Pa lat. 1154 points to a strophic unit of four lines. This unit of return can be established since sporadic notation added beyond the first four lines indicates material from the opening lines adapted to the varying syllable count. It is also apparent from this later notation that melodic gestures were altered in subsequent strophes for non-prosodic reasons. To give an example, neumes were added to the first *membrum* of the second strophe, which contains four syllables, in contrast to the five syllables of the first strophe, whereas the second *membrum* of
the second strophe, which contains the same number of syllables as the first strophe, was not notated. Such a disposition of notation initially suggests alteration for the purposes of adaptation. Yet in the second strophe, whilst retaining and condensing the contour of the melody for the first membrum, the scribe has also indicated a change of melodic substance in so far as the melodic elaboration of the first strophe is replaced by a syllabic setting.

The simpler version of the opening membrum indicated for the second strophe provides a clue both as to patterning within the strophe of Pa lat. 1154 and the relation of the melodic design indicated in Pa lat. 1154 to other notations. With regard to internal design, the three-note rising figure followed by single notes on the same level that is now understood to underlie the opening membrum can also be seen for the first membrum of line 3. An elaboration of this figure can also be seen in the first membrum of line 1, which is identical in profile with the addition of an upper note on the first syllable – this upper note elaboration can also be seen in the first membrum of line 1. A related case of patterning within the strophe can be seen in the first membras of lines 2 and 4, which share an identical profile with the addition of a quilisma in the fourth line – these two membras share the same opening profile as the first membrum of line 3 and the additional quilisma can itself be equated with the quilisma in the elaborated first membrum of line 1. Finally, the pattern of the first membras of lines 2 and 4 can be seen with an additional upper note in the second membrum of line 2.

A shorthand for this internal patterning would be: a b, c c’, a’ d, c a’. This shorthand, however, obscures the strong similarity between c and a. A more accurate shorthand would be: a b, a a’, a’ d, a a’. The potential confusion between a, a’ (a modified version of a) and a (a pattern initially based on a) is too great, however, for practical purposes – the first shorthand will be retained along with a recognition of its inadequacies.

A comparison between the neumes for the first strophe of Pa lat. 1154 and the ten other surviving notations reveals no consistent correspondence. However, the simplified pattern from the first membrum of the second strophe establishes an
equivalence with the opening of Vat lat. 3363 whose Aquitanian notation shares the same signs and diastematy.

The Vatican notation displays its own internal patterning: the rising three note figure returns at the opening of the third line, and the second membrum of line 1 is repeated with opening elaboration in the second membrum of line 3. Viewed in isolation this patterning in the neumes could be described as: a b, c d, a’ b’, or A B A’. In itself this pattern establishes little correspondence between the two notations, but it is remarkable in the light of the absence of any such internal patterning in the remaining nine notations. Stronger points of contact can be observed by comparing individual membri. As observed above, the opening membrum of the Vatican notation follows the contour and gesture of the simplified opening of the second strophe in Pa lat. 1154. The one point of departure, the final clivis in the Vatican notation, finds an equivalent in the final clivis in the first membrum of the first line of the Paris notation. A similar mix of gestures is found in the first membrum of the third line in the Vatican notation – the three-note rising figure is, as in Pa lat. 1154, the first membrum of line 3, the following pes in the Vatican notation is found in the elaborated continuation as in the first membrum of lines 2 and 4 in Pa lat. 1154. A further case where the second strophe notation in Pa lat. 1154 provides a link occurs in the first membrum of the second line in both notations. A comparison of the first strophe version in Pa lat. 1154 with Vat lat. 3363 shows a correspondence for all but the second syllable, where a pes in Vat lat. 3363 contrasts with a punctum on Pa lat. 1154. The pes in this position is, however, to be found in the second strophe notation of Pa lat. 1154.

In sum, the notations for Pa lat. 1154 and Vat lat. 3363, although divergent in the number of lines notated, appear to be related in general principle (internal patterning) and in melodic gesture (at least for opening membri). That correspondence should be found between these two notations is not surprising in the light of correspondences that can be observed between some of the other notations. Notations that are particularly strongly related are those in Lo Harley 2685, Ge lat. 175 and Tr 1093, in which there is a virtual identity of melodic gesture in the notated lines. To this group might also be added Mu clm 18765 on the basis of the near
identity of melodic gesture in its second line. What is striking about these four manuscripts is their witness to Eastern practices as opposed to the Aquitanian practices of Pa lat. 1154 and Vat lat. 3363: Lo Harley 2685, Tr 1093 and Mu clm 18765 are Germanic in origin, whereas Ge lat. 175 was copied at Canterbury. Two other closely related notations are those found in Pa lat. n. a. 1478 and Ox Auct. F. I. 15 – the former a late tenth-century manuscript of Cluny provenance, the latter copied at Canterbury then transferred to Exeter.

A full account of the above-mentioned notations falls beyond the scope of this study. It suffices to note here that the similarities between Pa lat. 1154 and Vat lat. 3363 may well have been due to regional proximity (i.e. Aquitaine). Indeed separate German and French traditions, both having links to England, appear to have operated in the transmission of this Boethius melody.\textsuperscript{104}

\textit{xii} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Bella bis quinis} (II: xii)

\textit{Bella bis quinis} is the seventh \textit{metrum} from the seventh book of the \textit{De consolatione philosophiae} of Boethius. The text comprises 34 sapphic lines and a final adonic. Neumatic notation for this \textit{metrum} survives in seven manuscripts from the ninth to eleventh centuries; in addition, there is letter notation for \textit{Bella bis quinis} in the Pseudo-Odo treatise.\textsuperscript{105}

The extent of notation added to \textit{Bella bis quinis} has been the subject of two studies. Besides the Pseudo-Odo notation, Page has discussed a single notated witness, Ox Auct. F. I. 15, in which only 3 out of 35 lines received notation.\textsuperscript{106} In the

\textsuperscript{104} Of the remaining manuscripts, CdG Gg. V. 35 shows several points of overlap with Pa lat. 1154 and Vat lat. 3363. Na IV. G. 68 shows no clear relation to any of the identified groups. The notation in Be 455 similarly shows no evidence of relation and as the only one not to encompass two separate lines and thereby indicate some level of strophic return might be understood as different in type from all others.

\textsuperscript{105} For the letter notation in the treatise of Pseudo-Odo, see M. Gerbert (ed.), \textit{Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica sacra} I, St Blasien, 1784, pp. 265-6.

light of this uneven ratio, and given the absence of notation from the shorter final adonic, Page considered it likely that the singer was never intended to deliver the whole text. More recently, Wälli has shown that the addition of three lines of notation was a normal practice for this text; besides Ox Auct. F. I. 15, three lines of notation are to be found in Na IV. G. 68, Ei 149, Tr 1093 and Pa lat. 1154 (II: 30). Exceptions to this practice are found only in El E. II. 1 and Mu clm 15285, both of which are through notated — the former of which shows a division into four-line units, the latter into two-line units. In view of the fact that only exceptional designs were through notated, Wälli presumes contra Page that silent conventions governed the elaboration of the three-line notated pattern into a design for the whole verse text.

Whichever argument is followed it is clear that the three-line notation of Pa lat. 1154 was a shared convention. Further similarities between the notation in Pa lat. 1154 and the other surviving notations are few; indeed, no significant correspondences can be detected. The only parallel that can be made is with the notation in El E. II. 1, whose indication of a similarly melismatic melody forms a contrast to the syllabic melodic gestures indicated by the remaining notations. Even similarities in patterning cannot be identified since no repetition can be discerned in the neumes added to Pa lat. 1154.

The individuality of the Paris notation is not in itself striking within the overall transmission. The notation for *Bella bis quinis* in Pa lat. 1154 stands as one of five notations for which no concordance survives. The remaining three notations — the Pseudo-Odo notation and the notations in Ei 149 and Tr 1093 — bear witness to a stable melodic shape whose frame varies slightly in separate realisations: Ei 149 departs from the contour of the Pseudo-Odo notation principally at the cadences of the second and third lines, whereas Tr 1093 demonstrates differences in shape principally

---

107 In the event, *Bella bis quinis* does not quite work, for it has 35 lines and only three lines are set. Furthermore the very last line of the poem...lacks music, suggesting that the singer was never intended to deliver the whole text’, Page, ‘The Boethian Metrum’, p. 308.

at the opening of the three lines. In sum, the tradition of notation for Bella bis quinis demonstrates both a stable melodic contour and a number of apparently independent notations including the one in Pa lat. 1154.

Numerous notations for Iudicii signum survive from throughout the Middle Ages and beyond. These notations have been collected together in two major studies. In his monumental La música a Catalunya fins al segle XIII Anglès aligned twenty-three versions of Iudicii signum in sources before the seventeenth century, including eight copied before the twelfth century. More recently, Gómez has signalled twenty-eight versions of Spanish provenance alone (including seventeen unknown to Anglès) and identified a further ten vulgar Latin and Occitan versions. For the purposes of this study, the notation for Iudicii signum in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 32) will be examined against the earliest transcribable version in Pa lat. 2832, with reference to the table of Anglès for generally agreed strategies of performance.

As is clear from the table of Anglès, all settings of Iudicii signum use the same basic melodic shape and all use the first line as refrain and group the subsequent hexameter lines into pairs. This arrangement contradicts the sense of the poem, which often makes use of enjambment across these two-line groups (e.g. lines 11 to 12, 13 to 14, 23 to 24). When laid out in the manuscript in its strophic form, as in Pa lat. 1154, the acrostic is also interrupted by the refrain. One division which is indicated in all the notations is the caesura, which is either penthemimeral, heptemimeral or trochaic according to the division of sense within the line. Within the line the basic model is

one of psalmic adaptation with recitational *puncta* being added or omitted for lines of varying length.\textsuperscript{111}

Turning to individual melodic realisations the striking aspect of the notation in Pa lat. 1154 is that it contains not one, but two intertwined notations written in different coloured inks and featuring distinct neume types.\textsuperscript{112} The two notations indicate similar principles in adapting the melodic design to the metrical structure: both feature elaborate gestures at the intonation and the accented syllable before the *caesura*. The final cadence of the hexameter line is nevertheless articulated differently: in the lighter notation a *clivis* is placed on the fifth syllable before the *pes* in both lines; in the heavier notation, the second line of the couplet is distinguished by a *torculus* with *oriscus* four syllables before the end of the line. In Pa lat. 2832 the first line of the couplet has a *torculus* two syllables before the end of the line, whereas the second line has a *pes* invariably three syllables before the end of the line.

Thus there is a certain amount of freedom in the way the basic recitational model is manipulated in Pa lat. 1154 and Pa lat. 2832. This freedom is most clear at the points at which there are deviations from the respective set schemes. In Pa lat. 1154, final cadences in the heavier notation are occasionally disrupted by condensing the cadential figure into the last four syllables (as in lines 9, 16, 19 and 25). In these lines the accent does not coincide with the *ictus* on the fifth from last syllable of the line. This application, however, is not systematic; there are two lines in which the displaced accent does not result in a displaced cadential figure (lines 8 and 22). A second point of deviation occurs at the opening of line 17 in the heavier notation. This unit repeats the cadence figure of the preceding line, a modification which appears to be motivated by the fact that this line, unlike any other, features a 5p rhythm before the *caesura*; that is, the same rhythmical unit as the dactylic cadence. Moreover, this is a similarity in rhythm alone: the metrical scheme of the opening of this line is five longs rather than the dactylic rhythm of the hexameter cadence.

\textsuperscript{111} This basic recitational model was observed and described in detail for Pa lat. 1139 and Pa lat. 2832 by Jammers: see Jammers, *Aufzeichnungsweisen*, pp. 27-8.

\textsuperscript{112} The identification of these two notations was first made in Barrett, 'Music and Writing', pp. 85-93.
The poetic structure of Paulinus of Aquileia's *Gloriam Deo* is the same as that seen above for the same author's *Ad caeli clara*; that is, the pseudo-sapphic strophe of 3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p. The text comprises forty-two strophes that retell in poetic form the nativity of Christ from the Annunciation through to the Slaughter of the Infants.

There survive two notations for *Gloriam Deo* – one in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 33), the other in the eleventh-century Italian troper RoA 123. What is striking about the notation in Pa lat. 1154 is that it shares the same patterning as that observed in Pa lat. 1154 for *Ad caeli clara*; that is, a repetition of neume patterns between the second *membra* of lines 1 and 2, and between the first *membra* of lines 2 and 3 – or, in shorthand, ab, cb, cd, e. The same pattern is also to be found in RoA 123, where there is once more a repetition of neume patterns between the second *membra* of lines 1 and 2, and between the first *membra* of lines 2 and 3.

Closer examination reveals a certain correspondence in melodic shape for the two notations of *Gloriam Deo*. In particular, the profiles indicated by the neumes for the first *membra* of lines 2 and 3 demonstrate close parallels: the clives on syllables two and three correspond, and on the fifth syllable both notations indicate an extended descending gesture. For the remainder of the notations, correspondences are less precise. Nevertheless there are many similarities in the principles of melodic articulation; for example, the extended descending figures at the *caesura* in line 1 and the more elaborate melodic gestures immediately after the *caesura* in line 3 that serve to distinguish the opening of this *membrum* from all others in the strophe. Yet despite such correspondences, there is a certain difference in melodic organisation between the two notations: the opening *membra* of lines 1 and 4 in RoA 123 are almost identical in profile and show strong similarities to the opening *membra* of lines 2 and 3, whereas in the Pa lat. 1154 no such correspondences can be established. Even though the two notations share a degree of common patterning and profile, and may well be related in some way, in terms of formal strategy the Paris notation stands closer to *Ad caeli clara*, in which no relation between the first *membra* of lines 1 and 4 can be observed.
This proximity between *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo* may be taken further by examining the two texts and notations in direct relation to each other. As with *Fuit Domini* and *Tercio in flore*, a consideration of accentual pattern reveals a striking correlation:

**Example 3  Accentual patterns in Paulinus of Aquileia’s *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>iii</th>
<th>iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gló-ri-am dé-o</td>
<td>Cae-lés-tis prí-mum</td>
<td>Pàx an-ge-ló-rum</td>
<td>Pár-ce re-démp-tor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nón sum dig-nus si-de-ra</td>
<td>in ex-cél-sis hó-di-e</td>
<td>pèc-ca-tó-rum pón-de-re</td>
<td>ét in tér-ra vó-ci-bus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only difference in these accentual schemes occurs at the very first syllable, itself a common position for an exchange in prosodic patterning. Unlike the case of *Fuit Domini* and *Tercio in flore* little correlation in melodic content appears to accompany the similarity in both neumatic and textual strategy and patterning. The only case of proximity, however, again concerns the final *membrum*, where there is a close correspondence in profile and content between the Paris notations for *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo*.

**Ut quid iubes (Ii: xv)**

The poetic structure of *Ut quid iubes* by Gottschalk of Orbais differs in status from the rhythmical poems so far discussed in so far as no direct metrical model for its structure can be identified. The strophic structure is most simply represented as 4 x 8p, 4p, R 7pp. The four 8p lines may be understood as imitations of the first *membrum* of a trochaic septenarius in the same manner as *Qui signati estis Christo* discussed above. Understood in this way, the 8p lines may be further subdivided
according to accent and word boundaries. An examination of the first strophe reveals a regular accent and subdivision of the 8p line into 4p + 4p:

**Example 4**  The internal poetic structure of *Ut quid iubes*

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Út quid iū-bes</td>
<td>pū-si-ō-le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Quā-re mān-das</td>
<td>fl-li-ō-le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Cār-men dūl-ce</td>
<td>mē can-tā-re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Cūm sīm lōn-ge</td>
<td>ēx-ul vál-de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Īn-tra má-re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>O cur iūbes</td>
<td>ca-nē-re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more differentiated shorthand for the poetic structure of the first strophe would thus read: 4 x (4p + 4p), 4p, R (4p + 3p).

There survive two notations for *Ut quid iubes*, one in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 34) and one in MoH 219. The Paris notation which extends over the first strophe also shows clear signs of internal patterning. Expressed according to the first shorthand of 4 x 8p, 4p, R 7pp, the repetition in the neumes that can be observed would be summarised as A A B C, D, E; that is, a single repetition of neumes between the first and second 8p lines. By directing attention to the articulation of 4p units a more complex reading of the neumes in Pa lat. 1154 can be recovered. Within the strophe, the diastematy of the Aquitanian notation points to a melodic break after each 4p: the neumes on *Ut quid iubes*, *Quare mandas*, *Carmen dulce*, *exul valde* and *Intra mare* form closed arch shapes; in contrast, the neumes for *pusiole*, *filiole*, *me cantare* form a jagged shape. It is of particular note that this division in shapes corresponds to word boundaries within the 4p unit – the arch shape, with its clear rise followed by fall, is found over units that may be further divided into 2p + 2p. A more differentiated expression of the patterning within the strophe might therefore read: ab, ab, a' b', ca'', a'''. Besides such half-line structuring, a degree of strophic patterning is apparent in the increased melismatic nature of the final two *membra*. Subdivision is also visible within the

---

113 On the subdivision of the first *membrum* in rhythmical imitations of the trochaic septenarius, see Norberg, *Introduction*, pp. 114-6 and *idem*, *Les vers latins*, pp. 96-125.
refrain: *canere* is set to the cadential formula used for *pusiole* and *filiole*, whilst the neumes for *O cur iubes* are bracketed together and subdivided by the repetition of a falling-rising gesture.

Subdivision is also a feature of the melodic shape as indicated by the notation in MoH 219. Within the first 8p unit, *Ut quid iubes* and *pusiole* are both separated and associated by the repetition of a rising contour. Within the second and third 8p units subdivision is marked by a change of register and direction: the four similarly heightened signs at the beginning of these lines are broken by a leap and a shift to either an ascending (second line) or descending (third line) contour. In the fourth line a subdivision is harder to identify from the neumes alone, but the repetition of the *virga-tractulus-virga-punctum* pattern over *exul valde* for *O cur iubes* suggests a consideration of this unit as a self-enclosed entity.

While it is apparent from a cursory inspection of the neumes that there is little in common between the pitches, or even the patterning, of the melodies indicated by the notations in Pa lat. 1154 and MoH 219, there is nevertheless a shared understanding of the poetic structure and a similar strategy based on melodic contour for realising this understanding.

*Solve lingua / Hierez runeta* (II: xvi)

*Solve lingua*, a strophic poem of praise and supplication addressed to St Peter consisting of 12 strophes of 3 x 6p, is transmitted in two contexts. In Br 8860-8867 (II: 38) and Vat Reg. lat. 215 the poem appears as an independent composition in marginal additions. In the eleventh-century Novalesa troper Ox Douce 222 the poem appears as an Offertory trope for St Peter.

Among these three records of the text, two notations survive for *Solve lingua* – one in Br 8860-8867, the other in Ox Douce 222. With the exception of occasional extra notes and liquescences, these two surviving notations indicate an identical melodic substance. No systematic relation between prosodic features and melodic design can be recovered from these notations. With respect to internal patterning, the
only evident feature is a similarity between the intonations of the first and third lines of each strophe.

The association of Solve lingua with the Old High German poem Hierez runeta is suggested in the first place by their alignment as marginal additions in Br 8860-8867. The precise textual relation between Solve lingua and Hierez runeta is unclear; however, the musical relation between the two texts is transparent – allowing for differences in syllable count the notation for Hierez runeta is identical to that for Solve lingua. \(^\text{114}\) An examination of the process of melodic adaptation evident in the notation provides valuable information about how the nine Old High German words of Hierez runeta were understood to relate to the poetic structure of Solve lingua. The division indicated by the notation is as follows:

**Example 5  Alignment through notation of Hierez runeta and Solve lingua**

```
  i  Hie-rez ru- ne-ta
  i  Sol-ve lin-gua mo-ros
  ii  hin-tun in daz o- ra
  ii  Et be- a- to lau-des
  iii  vil-du noh hin-ta
  iii  Re-fert pe-tro ca-nens
```

As is evident from this alignment, the Old High German words were thought to fall into the same threefold division as Solve lingua, thereby echoing with their final a rhyme the final es rhyme in Solve lingua. The correlation between five syllable lines in the Old High German and six lines in the Latin verse was achieved simply by omitting (as in line 1) or condensing (as in line 3) puncta.

\(^{114}\) The correlation between the two sets of neumes was first noted in K. Müllenhoff and W. Scher er, *Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa aus dem VIII.-XI. Jahrhundert II Anmerkungen*, Berlin, 1892 (3rd ed., ed. E. Steinmeyer), p. 57.
Summary

Despite the absence of precise information relating to pitch and rhythm in many neumatic notations, a highly differentiated account of the relations between notations for the same texts, as well as occasional *contrafacta*, has proved possible. Examination of the surviving notations has revealed a spectrum of different relations. This spectrum is most easily summarised through a grouping according to authorship and type.

Of the sixteen notations for concordant texts examined, the highest proportion of poems were composed by Paulinus of Aquileia. Analysis of the notations for these demonstrates four different modes of melodic relation: melodies sharing only basic strategies (*Ad caeli clara*), similar patterns for similar verse structures (*Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo*), closely related melodies for the same text (*Mecum Timavi*), and melodic *contrafacta* for different texts (*Mecum Timavi* and *Felix per omnes*, and *Fuit Domini* and *Tercio in flore*). For these Pauline poems there was thus a range of melodic behaviour extending from realisations satisfying basic melodic literacy (such as *Ad caeli clara* in Be 455), through common modes of performance (such as *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo* in Pa lat. 1154), to relatively fixed tunes (such as for *Mecum Timavi* and *Fuit Domini*).

A similar spectrum of melodic behaviours has been shown for the three notated Boethian poems. For *O stelliferi* an Aquitanian melodic tradition can be identified in contrast to both a German and a French tradition. For *Bella bis quinis*, whilst three notations showed similar melodic realisations, five further notations were apparently entirely unrelated except in their three-line unit of return. For *Si vis celsi*, besides a similar agreement on a three-line unit of return no relations can be traced between surviving notations.

The most uniform melodic traditions can be traced in notations for Office hymns and for *Iudicium signum*. For *Ihesu redemptor omnium* and *Nocte surgentes* a stable melodic pattern and contour could be traced. Later pitched versions also served to reinforce the premise that melodic identity did not reside solely in pitch since no
two melodies in different manuscripts were identical but incorporated variations in
starting degree, the size of intervals and the detail of melodic formulations. Any clear
distinction between a set melody and its variants is clearly inappropriate even for
these most closely related of musical realisations. A similar stability in strategy,
pattern and contour was witnessed for *Judicii signum*, but again differences in the
complexity with which melodies were realised could be identified.

Of the remaining notations, the surviving melodies for *Anima nimis* indicate
points of close contact, especially in the strophes. In contrast, the notations for poems
by Eugenius of Toledo and Gottschalk as well as *Qui signati estis christo* show few
points of contact. Only basic decisions concerning the way in which the verse
structure is to be articulated by the melody are shared between these latter notations.

Perhaps the most striking feature of this plurality of melodic behaviours is that
relatively stable melodic traditions can be traced both for verses associated with Mass
and Office and for those with no apparent connection. The stability observed for
Office hymns and *Solve lingua*, which appears elsewhere as an Offertory trope,\textsuperscript{115} is
unsurprising. Equally, the stability of the melodic tradition for *Judicii signum* has
been long known. However, the elements of melodic stability seen in the Pauline
verses, the Boethian verses and for *Anima nimis misera* are notable given prevailing
assumptions that most verses outside the Mass and Office did not enjoy stable
melodic traditions.\textsuperscript{116} Rather than a strict divide between a stable liturgical tradition
and an unstable non-liturgical tradition, what have been traced here are multi-faceted
relations that existed between individual verses. Further, these relations extended
between verses used in Mass and Office and those not destined for such use, as seen
in the case of melodic interchange between *Mecum Timavi* and the Office hymn *Felix
per omnes*.

\textsuperscript{115} For details, see above, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{116} According to Jammers, ‘Gelegenheitsdichtungen’, which included verses such as those considered
here, had no consistent melodic tradition: see Jammers, *Aufzeichnungsweisen*, p. 2.
For purposes of investigation, two broad distinctions may be made between strophic and stichic verse. The first is that strophic verse tended to be fixed in syllable count, whereas stichic verse was almost always variable in the number of syllables per line. This reflected a wider difference between poetry embodying rhythmical principles of construction and poetry drawing on metrical principles. Inevitably, there are certain exceptions: metrical forms with fixed syllable count could be used as strophic forms (most notably, the sapphic strophe), while strophic forms on occasion encompassed alteration in syllable count and accentual regularisation often occurred in stichic forms. Nevertheless, in the overwhelming majority of cases, strophic forms were both fixed in syllable count and embodied rhythmical principles of construction.

The second distinction is that stichic verse consisted of a maximum of two lines before repetition, whereas strophic forms featured more than two lines per strophe. It could be argued that where *caesurae* are heavily marked a two-line stichic form takes on the effect of a four-line strophic form. However, the half lines of stichic forms do not stand as independent units: the point of return which serves to define the line is not at the *caesura* since it is dependent on the continuation of the line for its structural definition. To give an example, a 4 x 8p form is distinct from a hexameter divided into four by its *caesurae* by virtue of the fact that after 8p a return is made to the same unit, whereas after the hexameter *caesura* there is simply a continuation of the main defining unit.

These two definitions open out onto a further stylistic possibility: patterned repetition may occur within strophic structures, but only between stichic lines. It is the conventions which governed this patterning within strophic form that are the main focus of the following section.

**ii (a) Neumatic Patterning Within the Strophe**

To examine the use of musical repetition in settings of strophic verse, it is most useful to begin with the notations found in Pa lat. 1154. Not only is this the largest
collection of notated *versus* from the ninth and tenth centuries, but also all the forms contained therein are strophic in organisation. The phenomenon of repeating neume patterns in this collection has been previously noted. Both Spanke and Chailley examined each *versus* for its textual and, where appropriate, melodic form.\(^{117}\) The results of these two investigations were similarly expressed through assigning letters to formal units:

**Table 12  Neumatic patterns in Pa lat. 1154**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Spanke</th>
<th>Chailley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad caeli clara</td>
<td>A A(^1)A(^2)B</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad te Deus</td>
<td>A B C D R</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anima nimir misera</td>
<td>A B C D R</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tocius mundi</td>
<td>ab ab(^1)cb(^3)d</td>
<td>ab ac de(^1)d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuit Domini</td>
<td>ab cd ce cf'</td>
<td>ab cd c'd(^1)c'e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christus rex vita</td>
<td>ab ab a'c de fg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecum Timavi</td>
<td>ab cd ef gb hf</td>
<td>ab a'(^b)(^1)a'(^b)(^2)a'(^b)(^3) cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quique de morte</td>
<td>A B C D E F</td>
<td>A A(^1)A(^2)B C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 2 A A B C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicii signum</td>
<td>R ab R ab ...</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloriam Deo</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut quid iubes</td>
<td>A A B C A(^1) (=R)</td>
<td>A A B C D R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A solis ortu</td>
<td>A A B C R</td>
<td>ab a'(^b)(^1)a'(^b)(^2)a'(^b)(^3) R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 2 de de fg hi R')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hug dulce nomen</td>
<td>ab cb a'd e</td>
<td>ab a'(^b) cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora cum primo</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the purposes of this table the denotation systems of Spanke and Chailley have been regularised. Capital letters indicate textual lines, whereas lower case letters indicate half lines. Superscript numbers indicate variations and R indicates a refrain.

\(^{117}\)Spanke compiled an inventory of the *versus* of Pa lat. 1154, including a formal account of neume patterns: Spanke, "Rhythmen", pp. 286-320. Chailley included a formal account of all the neume patterns in Pa lat. 1154: Chailley, *L’École musicale*, pp. 123-78.
Clearly there are differences in the understanding of the neume patterns, including disagreement as to the unit of return. In part, these differences are due to the inflexibility of formal modes of description as described above. In part, however, the differences between the accounts of Spanke and Chailley stem from their lack of an ultimate arbiter as to the significance of any pattern that may be recovered from the neumes. In accordance with the method employed for examining concordances, what shall be done here is to assess neumatic patterns alongside a consideration of poetic structure.

Viewed as a whole, the poetic structures represented in Pa lat. 1154 fall into two main categories: sapphic and iambic trimeter imitations, and trochaic tetrameter imitations. According to Norberg, the proximity between the sapphic (3 x 5p + 6p, 5p) and the iambic trimeter forms (5p + 7pp) stemmed from the genesis of a new form in the poetry of Paulinus of Aquileia, the pseudo-sapphic strophe: 3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p. 118 What is striking in the Paris manuscript is that these forms share certain similarities in their repetition of neumatic material.

118 See Norberg, La poésie latine, p. 96.
Table 13  Neumatic patterns in sapphic and iambic trimeters in Pa lat. 1154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic structure</th>
<th>Neumatic structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tocius mundi</td>
<td>Sapphic metre</td>
<td>ab ac dc' d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad caeli clara</td>
<td>3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloriam Deo</td>
<td>3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hug dulce nomen</td>
<td>3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p</td>
<td>ab cb a’d e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christus rex vita</td>
<td>5 x 5p + 7pp</td>
<td>ab ab a’c de fg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecum Timavi</td>
<td>5 x 5p + 7pp</td>
<td>ab cd ef gb hf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A solis ortu</td>
<td>4 x 5p +7pp, 7pp</td>
<td>i) ab a’b cd c’d e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) A A B C D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the detail of these descriptions may be refined, it is unequivocal that in these forms patterning operates by half-line. This is not so for the imitations of trochaic tetramer.

Table 14  Neumatic patterns in trochaic tetrameters in Pa lat. 1154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad te Deus</td>
<td>2 x 8p + 7pp, R 10pp</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuit Domini</td>
<td>4 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td>A B B B'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora cum primo</td>
<td>3 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this limited information, it appears that the trochaic forms do not use half-line repetition. Turning to the other notated forms in the Paris manuscript, it can be seen that lines opening with five-syllable *membra* use half-line repetition, whilst those which begin with more syllables in their first *membrum* repeat material by the full line.

Table 15  Neumatic patterns for remaining forms in Pa lat. 1154

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si vis celsi</td>
<td>3 x Anapaestic dimer acatalectic (or 3 x 5p (4-6) + 5p (4-6))</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O stelliferi</td>
<td>4 x Anapaestic dimer acatalectic (or 4 x 5p (4-6) + 5p (4-6))</td>
<td>ab c’c a’d a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella bis</td>
<td>3 x Sapphic lines (or 3 x 5p + 6p)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anima nimis misera</td>
<td>4 x 8pp, R prose</td>
<td>A A' A&quot; A’’’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quique de morte</td>
<td>6 x 8-10p</td>
<td>v. 1 - ; v. 2 A A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut quid iubes</td>
<td>4 x 8p, 4p, R 7pp</td>
<td>A A B C, D, E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It seems then that poetic forms opening with five-line *membra* featured patterning by half-line and other forms featured patterning by line. The evidence, however, remains slim, especially given the inherent difficulties of classification in using letters to represent repetitions of material. To explore the strength of the distinction noted above, it is thus necessary to expand the field of enquiry beyond Pa lat. 1154 to include all the notated verse under consideration.
Table 16 Neumatic and poetic structures for notated strophic forms in ninth- and tenth-century poetic collections

A Five-syllable openings

1 Sapphics (3 x 5p + 6p, 5p)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Neumatic structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Tocius mundi (II: 25)</td>
<td>ab ac dc’ d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 8093</td>
<td>Dura quae gignit (II: 5)</td>
<td>A B B c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>Nocte surgentes (II: 14)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Pseudo-sapphics (3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Ad caeli clara (II: 21)</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloriam Deo (II: 33)</td>
<td>ab cb cd e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hug dulce nomen (II: 36)</td>
<td>ab cb a’d e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 394</td>
<td>Ad caeli clara (II: vi)</td>
<td>A A B c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Iambic trimeter (5p + 7pp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Christus rex vita (II: 27)</td>
<td>5 x 5p + 7pp</td>
<td>ab ab a’c de fg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mecum Timavi (II: 28)</td>
<td>5 x 5p + 7pp</td>
<td>ab cd ef gh hf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A solis ortu usque (II: 35)</td>
<td>4 x 5p + 7pp, 7pp</td>
<td>ab a’b cd c’d e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) A A B C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 394</td>
<td>Mecum Timavi (II: x)</td>
<td>5 x 5p + 7pp</td>
<td>A B B’ A’ B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Other 5p lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Si vis celsi (II: 24)</td>
<td>3 x Anapaestic dimeter acatalectic (or 3 x 5p (4-6) + 5p (4-6))</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O stelliferi (II: 29)</td>
<td>4 x anapaestic dimeter acatalectic (or 4 x 5p (4-6) + 5p (4-6))</td>
<td>ab c’c a’d a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bella bis (II: 30)</td>
<td>3 x Sapphic lines (or 3 x 5p + 6p)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>Avis haec magna (II: 15)</td>
<td>6 x 5p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eight-syllable openings

1. Standard trochaic tetrameter (3 x 8p + 7pp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Aurora cum primo (II: 37)</td>
<td>3 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>Sume plectrum (II: 16)</td>
<td>3 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td>A A' B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br 8860-8867</td>
<td>Avarus maximam cupiditatem (II: 39)</td>
<td>3 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma 10029</td>
<td>Inclite parentis (II: 10)</td>
<td>3 x Trochaic tetrameter catalectic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Other trochaic tetrameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Ad te Deus (II: 22)</td>
<td>2 x 8p + 7pp, R 10pp</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuit Domini (II: 26)</td>
<td>4 x 8p + 7pp</td>
<td>A B B'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Trochaic dimeters (8p)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma 10029</td>
<td>Deus miserere mei (II: 9)</td>
<td>4 x Trochaic dimeter</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>Qui signati estis Christo (II: 19)</td>
<td>4 x 8p, 8p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Ambrosian iambic dimeter (4 x 8pp, or 8p)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be 455</td>
<td>Ihesu redemptor omnium (II: 13)</td>
<td>4 x Iambic dimeter</td>
<td>A B C A'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 1154</td>
<td>Anima nimis misera (II: 23)</td>
<td>4 x 8pp, R prose</td>
<td>A A' A'' A'''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ut quid iubes (II: 34)</td>
<td>4 x 8p, 4p, R 7pp</td>
<td>A A B C, D; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quique de morte (II: 31)</td>
<td>6 x 8-10p</td>
<td>i) A A B C D E ii) A A B C D E iii) A A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa lat. 2832</td>
<td>Iohannis Paulique (II: 7)</td>
<td>4 x 6-8p (free iambic dimeter catalectic)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Remaining Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript sigla</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Poetic Structure</th>
<th>Neumatic Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Br 8860-8867</td>
<td>Solve lingua (II: 38)</td>
<td>3 x 6p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What can be seen from this overview is that for lines opening with five syllables, both half-line and full-line units of repetition could be used, while for all other forms only full-line units of repetition were employed. The difference in approach is clear, but the reasons for it are not immediately apparent. Before suggesting explanations, it is necessary to consider the distribution of this phenomenon. It appears from the table that the half-line repetition of five-syllable openings was practised exclusively in Pa lat. 1154. Moreover, there are no full-line repetitions for forms with 5p openings in this manuscript. The possibility that this represents exceptional usage is tempered by an examination of the melodies for 5p and other forms in the Moissac hymnal (1064-1080), which is the hymnal nearest to Pa lat. 1154 in both chronological and geographical terms. In this hymnal (Vat Rossi 205), both half-line and full-line repetitions are used for forms with 5p openings, while only full-line repetitions are used for other forms.\(^{119}\)

The implications of this distribution are at this stage unclear. The possibility that half-line articulation in forms with 5p openings was a localised trait is ruled out by the appearance of this phenomenon in collections such as the Einsiedeln hymnal (Ei 336).\(^{120}\) On a more positive note, the existence and the dissemination of this practice point to two conclusions that can be drawn from an analysis of notations according to verse form. First, in so far as the practice in Pa lat. 1154 differs from that observed in the other five poetic collections under consideration, it appears that conventions for realising music for given verse forms were dependent upon particular circumstances. Whether the key feature in moulding these conventions was regional, chronological or dependent upon individual competence cannot be determined on the basis of the evidence assembled here. Second, in so far as a distinction was drawn in the notations in Pa lat. 1154 between forms opening with five syllables and all others, a distinction was made on a numerical basis without regard for differences in metrical or accentual structure. This would suggest that, at least in certain quarters, the

---

\(^{119}\) For half-line repetitions in forms with five syllable openings in the Moissac hymnal, see Stäblein, *Hymnen*, nos. 105-7 and 109.

\(^{120}\) Half-line patterning is evident in both sapphic hymn *Nocte surgentes* and the iambic trimeter hymn *Aurea luce*. See Stäblein, *Hymnen*, nos. 532\(^2\) and 152\(^4\).
numerical pattern of a poem was of more importance in the fashioning of a musical realisation than its means of construction.

ii (b) Neumatic Patterning Beyond the Strophe

A strict strophic return of melody in the ninth- and tenth-century verse under consideration cannot be presumed a priori. Occasions where notation has been added beyond the first strophe of a poem reveal a more varied relation between the notated melody of the first strophe and melodic return. Of the twenty-two surviving instances of extra notation in strophic forms, only two indicate identical repetition of the melody beyond the first strophe.\(^{121}\) The majority of continued notations, whether in the same or a different hand, indicate at least minor alterations for following strophes. In general, no textual motivation can be discovered for these alterations; only on one occasion does the alteration correspond to a change in syllable count.\(^{122}\) Of the remaining examples, there are two cases of wholly new melodies being added by different scribes,\(^{123}\) and one where neumes have been added after a first strophe notated in letters.\(^{124}\)

Where new melodies are added over later strophes it is probable that these are not intended as distinct settings for individual strophes, but represent further possibilities for singing these verses. Viewed in this light, the two surviving examples of recognisably different melodies for later strophes (\textit{A solis ortu usque} and \textit{Quique de morte}) present further evidence for multiple settings of the same texts.

\(^{121}\) \textit{Ihesu redemptor} in Be 455, and \textit{Ad Dominum clamaveram} in Na IV. G. 68.

\(^{122}\) The Boethian setting of \textit{O stelliferi} in Pa lat. 1154 is forced to take account of the metrical variation in syllable count. An alternative setting for the reduction from five to four syllables in the first half of the line is notated in the second ‘strophe’.

\(^{123}\) \textit{A solis ortu usque} and \textit{Quique de morte} in Pa lat. 1154. The latter is a poem with a varying number of syllables per line (8-10) which is notated throughout. The second verse appears to have a different setting from that of verse one, being notated by a different scribe. Of subsequent verses, the third, seventh and eighth are notated by the first scribe with minor alterations in setting; the fourth and fifth are again by the first scribe, but revert to the setting of the first verse; the sixth verse is notated by a third scribe, although with a similar setting to the first verse.

\(^{124}\) \textit{Audi tellus} in Pa lat. 1928.
There is one instance where the written medium itself appears to motivate the appearance of extra notation. The neumes added to Fuit Domini in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 26) extend over the first strophe and subsequently an exact repetition of the neumes of the first line of each strophe. The motivation for this practice is clear from a consideration of the layout which exceptionally in this manuscript does not mark the beginning of a new strophe with an enlarged capital, perhaps because the unusual 4 x 8p + 7pp structure caused some confusion for the text scribe. It would thus appear that notation was added to the first lines of the new strophes in order to clarify the strophic structure for the reader.

The assumption that alteration is an exception and where there is no additional notation all melodies are to be exactly repeated seems plausible. However, given the existence of examples where notations for opening lines cannot be maintained for the remaining strophes, such an assumption cannot be universally applied.125 Also, there are several examples where different verses notated by the same hand feature both strict repetition and alteration. Such examples strongly suggest that altered, rather than literal, strophic return was routinely used.

iii Stichic Verse

iii (a) Units of Return

The two stichic forms in use in the ninth and tenth centuries were the hexameter and the elegiac couplet. In setting hexameters, since the verse lines were not already arranged strophically, a decision had to be made as to whether to set lines individually or to group them into larger units. Of the six surviving notated hexameters that have been identified in this study, two have notation over the first two lines only: O mortalis homo (Pa lat. 8093, II: 1) and Hac locuples (Pa lat. 2832, II: 6). The notation for three further hexameters – Sume miser (Pa lat. 8093, II: 4), O mortalis homo (Be 455, II: 18) and ludicium signum (Pa lat. 1154, II: 32) – demonstrates a grouping of

125 In the setting of O stellifer in Pa lat. 1154, for example, although the variation for a four-syllable opening is noted, there is no indication as to the alterations necessary for the later six-syllable openings, or the variations of four- and six-syllable second membra.
hexameters into pairs for the purposes of musical delivery. Only the notation for *lam dudum Saulus* (Ma 10029, II: 12) suggests a basic pattern that is arranged differently per line. While a certain amount of caution is therefore necessary, from the evidence of more extensively notated hexameters it appears that there existed a convention of arranging the musical settings of hexameters in repeating two-line units.  

A similar situation pertains for elegiacs whose couplet provided a ready unit of structural return. Of the five notated examples in this study, two lines only were notated for *Iohannis Paulique* (Pa lat. 2832, II: 7), *Sum noctis socia* (Ma 10029, where the whole poem consists of one distich, II: 8) and *Qui cupis esse bonus qui* (Be 455, II: 17). In the two remaining cases – *O mors omnivorax* (Pa lat. 8093, II: 3) and *Vae mihi, vae misero* (Pa lat. 8093, II: 2) – notation added beyond the initial distich indicates that the elegiac couplet still functioned as the unit of musical return. From these examples, it would thus appear that there existed a generally accepted convention to take the distich as the unit of return in realising music for elegiacs. An exceptional case that proves the rule is *Imperat omnipotens* (Ma 10029, II: 11), in which two elegiac couplets are combined to form a strophe which is followed by a refrain in the form of a dactylic pentameter. The unit of melodic return, however, remains the couplet, with the refrain following the pattern of the elegiac pentameter.

As has been shown, a two-line unit of melodic return, standing somewhere between a strophe and formulaic repetition of material, was normal for hexameters and elegiacs. This two-line melodic unit, however, required modification in subsequent lines where the syllable count was different. To examine the criteria which governed such alterations, it is necessary to turn to the seven cases where notation was added beyond the unit of melodic return.

\[
\begin{align*}
O \text{ mors omnivorax} & (II: 3) \\
& \quad i
\end{align*}
\]

The elegiac couplets of *O mors omnivorax* represent an extract from a longer poem by Eugenius of Toledo which uses three distinct metres: elegiac distichs, lines 1-16 and

---

126 Norberg notes a tendency to group hexameters after the manner of the distich from the end of antiquity onwards: see Norberg, *Introduction*, pp. 68-9.
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37-80, five-line strophes of iambic senarius, lines 17-36, and sapphics, lines 81-100. Only the dramatic part, lines 37-80, is notated in Pa lat. 8093. Notation was added over all of these lines, but not continuously. It is sometimes badly faded and sometimes omitted; in all cases this fading or omission occurs in the middle rather than at the end of the lines.

The hexameter lines are divided by a fixed penthemimeral caesura. The second half of the line is almost always eight syllables in length. The melodic pattern consists of puncta and virgae, with the cadence marked by a torculus two syllables before the end and a final pes. For nine-syllable lines (lines 1 and 5) an extra punctum or pes respectively is inserted at the appropriate point. In the first half of the hexameter line more distinction is made between settings of lines with different numbers of syllables. Seven-syllable half-lines consist of an intonation of what appears to be a clivis followed by a scandicus and three clivis figures; the final two syllables are generally left unnotated. Six-syllable half-lines are distinguished by substituting a clivis for the scandicus and notating the final two syllables with virgae. Two lines (lines 11 and 39) consist of five syllables only. For line 11 the first half setting of the hexameter is unique: a scandicus, followed by a clivis, pes, a virga, and an unnotated final syllable. Line 39 is a more routine contraction of the seven-syllable half-line: a clivis, followed by a scandicus, then two clives; the final syllable is unnotated.

In pentameter lines, the notation suggests a fixed setting for the fixed syllable second half. Only the fifth syllable from the end of the line and the final three are clearly and consistently notated: a torculus, two virgae and a punctum. In the first half of the line there is a flexibility of setting which is independent of syllable count: after two pedes, the next three syllables are set either with a pes or clivis. This variety pertains for six-syllable lines as for seven. The process of adaptation between seven-and six-syllable lines cannot be easily observed on this occasion since the omitted syllable is usually the second last before the caesura which remains, along with the last before the caesura, unnotated in all lines. The one exception to this is in line 22, where the syllable omitted is in the first foot: in this instance, the fourth element is set
as a *torculus* which appears to function as a contraction of a *pes* and a *clivis* into one syllable.

From this account it appears that the internal *caesurae* are not marked out in the musical setting. The intonations of each line are made distinct, although by varying means: in the hexameter line by more elaborate and varied gestures for the first two syllables, in the pentameter line by a fixity which contrasts with the variety possible in the remainder of the first half of the line. The cadences are marked, but without any clear correlation to the poetic cadences: in the hexameter line cadential elaboration begins only on the last three syllables in contrast to the poetic cadence, which extends over the last five syllables; in the pentameter line, the cadential elaboration is continuous from the third last syllable of the line. Again, the principle of setting appears to be a recitation model which is easily adapted to a varying number of syllables in the line.

The only dramatic exception to this recitation principle is the setting of the five-syllable opening of line 11. It is possible that this deviation is motivated by recognition of the 5p rhythm. However, this is not to account for the second five-syllable line (line 39), which is more uniformly set. Although this seems to diminish the suggestion that the 5p line inspired the exceptional setting, it remains the case that it is only five-syllable lines which receive different settings on each appearance.

\[ ii \quad Vae \ mihi, \ vae \ misero \ (II: \ 2) \]

Neumes were added to the first five elegiac distichs of *Vae mihi, vae misero* in Pa lat. 8093. In none of these ten lines was a full complement of notation added, rather notation was added at main points of structural articulation. In almost all lines the first syllable is marked with a *virga*, the *caesura* with either a *virga* (in hexameters) or *pes* (in pentameters), and the final two syllables of the hexameter cadence with *virgae*. The other points in the line that regularly received notation were long syllables, which were marked either with a *virga* or with a *pes* (when in the middle of the second *membrum*). Smaller signs resembling *puncta* were occasionally added on short syllables.
The disposition of notation for Vae mihi, vae misero suggests some kind of recitational scheme in so far as signs are added most frequently to intonation, caesura, a secondary break and cadence. The further marking of long syllables within the line points to a concern for pointing the metre of the verse. In this case the melodic shape of the prosodic recitation is assumed; notation marks points of articulation (i.e. where to place certain gestures), rather indicating a fully elaborated melodic shape and the detail of its subsequent adaptation.

iii Sume miser (II: 4)

For Sume miser (Pa lat. 8093) notation was likewise not added to all the syllables of any verse line. The first two hexameter lines are the most fully notated with signs omitted for the two syllables after the caesura in both lines and for other occasional syllables. Beyond the opening hexameter pair, notation was added only to the third and fourth lines. The notation for both lines shows no departure from the pattern established in the opening couplet and points of metrical adaptation from the pattern in the opening couplet (the second foot of the third line and the fourth foot of the fourth line) receive no notation.

Where there is no adaptation signalled by notation added beyond the unit of melodic return the question of the function of such notation may be raised. In the case of Sume miser the added notation appears to be a means of indicating the hexameter couplet to be the unit of melodic return. The relatively fully notated third line refers unambiguously back to the first line; the two signs in the fourth line are sufficient to refer the reader back to the pattern of the second line. In other words, the scribe appears to have added notation up to the point at which the melodic design could be extrapolated for the whole text – to indicate the detail of metrical adaptation was evidently not a concern in this instance.
Notation was added to all lines of *Imperat omnipotens* in Ma 10029. As signalled above, despite the unusual grouping of two elegiac distichs followed by a refrain consisting of three minor ioces, the pattern indicated in the notation operates by couplet.

A closer examination of the notation for *Imperat omnipotens* reveals a limited range of signs that render the prosodic articulation in a schematic fashion. In the second membra of both hexameter and pentameter lines (with the exception of the final syllable) virgae are placed over the ictus, which also corresponds with the word accent. In the first membra of pentameter lines virgae correspond with the word accent; no fixed pattern can be recovered for the first membra of hexameter lines. In sum, the notation, as for *Vae mihi*, indicates not so much a fixed melodic shape and its adaptation, as basic prosodic information.

Notation was also added to all lines of *Iam dudum Saulus* in Ma 10029. Again, a restricted range of signs was employed and in part their disposition suggests a rendering of the prosodic design in a schematic fashion. Where added, notation for the second halves of the hexameter lines indicates for the most part a virga, pes or clivis on the ictus with puncta in between. The first halves of the hexameter lines demonstrate a more flexible working out of a basic melodic shape of rise and fall: pedes appear in the first two feet, except where a long syllable in the first foot dissolves into two short syllables (as in lines 4 and 9); clives appear over any of the last three syllables before the caesura – no consistent principle for their application can be deduced.

The notation for *Iam dudum Saulus* thus indicates both a schematic marking of prosodic articulation (in the second half of the lines) and a fixed melodic shape that is adapted in a non-schematic manner to a varying metrical pattern.
The notation beyond the initial hexameter couplet for *O mortalis homo* in Be 455 has already been discussed above. Here, only a summary will be presented.

The neumes in Be 455 transmit a relatively elaborate recitational scheme with fixed points of articulation. With the exception of the second couplet, the recitational scheme repeats with a certain amount of variation every two lines. The *caesurae*, the cadence of odd lines, and the intonation of even lines are marked by invariable melodic gestures. Within the remainder of the lines, three types of variation can be observed: one was prompted by metrical variation in the number of syllables, but for the other two no prosodic motive can be established.

The principles of adaptation to accommodate metrical variation in the two notations for *Judicii signum* in Pa 1154 have also been discussed above. Again, only a summary is provided here.

A basic psalmodic model of recitation is used to project the text of *Judicii signum* in both notations. Both feature elaborate gestures at the intonation and the accented syllable before the *caesura* with recitational *puncta* placed in between. The cadence of the line is articulated differently with melodic elaborations placed four and five syllables before the end of the line. Departures from this schematic recitation can be seen in the heavier notation (B), in which on occasion, and possibly motivated by a shift in word accent, the cadential elaboration is condensed into the last four syllables. One further point of departure occurs where the opening of one line repeats the cadential formula of the line preceding; this repetition appears to have been motivated by the recurrence of the cadential 5p pattern in the text.
iii (b) Structural Principles within Stichic Verse

In discussion of concordances for stichic verses and cases where notation has been added beyond the strophe, a number of different articulations within stichic verse have been exposed. These articulations may be divided into three related areas: i) the marking of caesurae, cadences and intonations; ii) the marking of accent and ictus; and iii) fixed patterns within lines. Table 17 summarises information that may be recovered from notation concerning these areas:

Table 17 Structural articulation indicated by notations added to stichic verse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Points of melodic elaboration</th>
<th>Accent/ Ictus</th>
<th>Fixed patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O mortalis homo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High notes on final two ictus corresponding to word accent in second half of both lines</td>
<td>Line 1 pattern adapted for line 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa lat. 8093, II: 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sume miser</td>
<td>Both intonations and cadences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Line 1 pattern adapted for line 2. Fixed syllable intonation, intonation after the caesura, and cadence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa lat. 8093, II: 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hac locuples</td>
<td>Intonation in line 1 and intonation after line 2 caesura.</td>
<td>High notes on ictus in second half of line 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa lat. 2832, II: 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iam dudum Saulus</td>
<td>Even-line caesurae when not penthemimeral.</td>
<td>ictus marked in second half of lines by high notes or elaboration.</td>
<td>Rise-fall pattern adapted within opening halves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ma 10029, II: 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O mortalis homo</td>
<td>Both intonations, caesurae and cadences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fixed syllable cadences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Be 455, II: 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicii signum</td>
<td>Cadences in both lines. Intonation and caesura in even lines.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fixed syllable cadences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa lat. 1154 x 2, II: 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is clear from these tables is that no single principle was followed in realising music for stichic verse forms. Instead, a set of possibilities existed from which different selections were made in each case. Certain structures were observed more frequently than others; in particular, the *ictus* was regularly marked in the second half of lines, and fixed syllable cadences (where a set melodic pattern was employed a fixed number of syllables from the end of the line) were routinely observed. The combination of these two features points to a general principle in the realisation of music for stichic verse, namely that the openings of lines or half-lines were treated flexibly and the ends were accorded fixed patterns.
Principles of Composition

Having undertaken a close reading of individual examples it remains to return to general questions concerning the relation between words and music set out at the beginning of this chapter. The following discussion deals separately with rhythmical and metrical verse.

i Rhythmical Verse

Most philologists have insisted that rhythmical verse was destined to be sung, rather than read. Yet, although the premise that rhythmical verse was intended to be sung has been widely accepted, the role that melody played in the genesis of rhythmical verse has received less attention. Dag Norberg entertained two possibilities: that words were composed first and music afterwards, or that following a syllabic principle words were composed to a pre-existent melody. Although both scenarios are certainly possible, neither serves to explain how melodies were fashioned. The material assembled here provides a clue to solving this problem.

One of the few cases where sufficient information survives to reconstruct the processes involved in the composition of both music and text for rhythmical verse is provided by Paulinus of Aquileia’s Ad caeli clara and Gloriam Deo. For Norberg, the innovative pseudo-sapphic structure of the text of Ad caeli clara was the product of a direct imitation of a hymn by Eugenius of Toledo. This hymn, which now survives only in a fragmentary state, consists of three iambic trimeters followed by an adonic refrain Parce redemptor. Paulinus echoed Eugenius’ hymn and simultaneously created a novel form by constructing a rhythmical equivalent of the first three lines followed by parce redemptor as a final 5p element in the first strophe. The rhythmical structure of $3 \times 5p + 7pp$, 5p therefore originated with Ad caeli clara and was subsequently used by Paulinus for Gloriam Deo.

---

Example 6  Structural imitation in rhythmical verse

i)  Eugenius of Toledo

Salvator alme qui creasti saecula,
ignosce, prosper solve culpae vincula,
ne puniamur tanta propter crimina.
Parce redemptor.\(^{128}\)

ii)  Paulinus of Aquileia

Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sydera
levare meos infelices oculos,
gravi depressus peccatorum pondere.
Parce, redemptor!\(^{129}\)

iii)  Paulinus of Aquileia

Gloriam deo in excelsis hodie
caelestis primum cecinit exercitus,
pax angelorum et in terra vocibus
vera descendit.\(^{130}\)

Having established a series of textual imitations, the question remains as to the role of music in this process of imitation. For Norberg, music can only have been secondary to the imitation of verbal structure for Paulinus of Aquileia is supposed to have read the hymn by Eugenius that acted as his model.\(^{131}\) Yet given prevailing conditions for the transmission of poetry, the more likely scenario is that Paulinus heard the Eugenius hymn in a performance that included music. Unfortunately, the melody, along with most of the text, of the Eugenius hymn no longer survives and thus the extent to which Paulinus’ textual imitation also took cognisance of music cannot be determined. Nevertheless, the melodies for the texts involved in the secondary imitation of *Ad caeli* by *Gloriam Deo* do survive. If we are to assume with Norberg that rhythmical verse was destined to be sung rather than read, then the structural imitation of *Ad caeli* by *Gloriam Deo* would most probably have been of an

\(^{128}\) MGH AA XIV, p. 247.


\(^{130}\) Norberg, *L’oeuvre poétique*, p. 131.

\(^{131}\) Norberg, *Introduction*, p. 154. Also ‘Nous avons formulé le résultat de nos recherches de la manière suivante: on lisait les anciens vers quantitatifs en respectant les accents ordinaires comme s’ils avaient été de la prose et en prenant garde aux coupes et à la répartition des mots dans les vers, puis on
object that was heard in a performance that included music, or at the very least of a text that was known in association with a melody.

For the two verses by Paulinus of Aquileia — *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo* — notations survive in Pa lat. 1154 (II: 21 and 25). The two notations are identical in pattern, if not in melodic contour. But do the later notations represent earlier melodies sung to these poems? The precise content of any earlier melodies for Paulinus’s poems cannot be definitively established due to the later introduction of musical notation, but certain observations may be made on the basis of later transmission. Surviving notations added to Paulinus’s poems reveal a stability that was effective over both time and place. The notations in Pa lat. 1154 are Aquitanian in style and appear to date from the tenth century. The notation for *Gloriam Deo* in the Bolognese troper RoA 123, however, dates from the eleventh century (II: xiv). Concordant notations for *Mecum Timavi* and *Fuit Domini* (II: ix and x) have both been dated to the earlier tenth century on the basis of their textual script. In addition, the notation for *Mecum Timavi* in Be 394 was added by a West-Frankish

---

132 On the date and provenance of RoA 123, see J. Froger (ed.), *Le codex 123 de la Bibliothèque Angelica de Rome (XIIe siècle): Graduel et tropaire de Bologne* (Paléographie musicale XVIII), Bern, 1969, pp. 31-5.

133 The melody for *Mecum Timavi* was recorded on a flyleaf that is now fol. 0 of Be 394. Both text and melody were added by the same unsteady hand that is now barely visible in places. What may be observed, however, is that the text originally continued onto fol. 1 of Be 394 before a later hand erased the poem to form the title page of the manuscript. This later hand that copied over the erased verses of *Mecum Timavi* on the title page of Be 394 was dated by Bernhard Bischoff to 1014 (see Bischoff, *KFH*, no. 590); 1014 thus becomes a *terminus post quem non* for the hand that copied *Mecum Timavi*. The melody for *Tercio in flore* recorded in Na IV. G. 68 may also be dated to no later than the first quarter of the tenth century, for, as Rankin has observed, both notation and text were added by the same St Gall hand of 10th: see S. Rankin, ‘The Song School of St Gall in the Later Ninth Century’, *Sangallensia in Washington. The Arts and Letters in Medieval and Baroque St Gall viewed from the Late Twentieth Century* (ed. J. J. King), New York, 1993, p. 195 (n. 11).
hand, probably at Fleury, while that for *Tercio in flore* in Na IV. G. 68 was added by a St Gall hand.

This correlation between melodies recorded from the early tenth century through to the eleventh century, and stretching from West to East Francia and down to Italy, indicates that under certain conditions there was a relatively stable transmission of melodies. If the same conditions were present in the ninth century, then it is likely that a relatively stable melodic transmission operated at this earlier date also. An exceptional insight into earlier conditions of melodic transmission for Paulinus’s poems is provided by Walahfrid Strabo in his *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis* of c. 840, who records: ‘For indeed they say that Paulinus, the patriarch of Friuli, quite often used hymns he and others had composed particularly in private Masses around the offering of the sacraments’. Which of his poetic compositions Paulinus sang in this way is not made clear, yet certain observations may be made on the basis of content and transmission. Of the verses considered here, only *Mecum Timavi*, as a lament for a close friend, can be categorically ruled out on the grounds of content.

---

134 See *KFH*, no. 590.
135 See Rankin, ‘The Song School of St Gall’, p. 195 (n. 11).
136 Walahfrid Strabo, *De exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*, ch. XXV: Porro ymmi metrici ac rhythmici in Ambrosianis officiis dicuntur, quos etiam aliqui in missarum sollemnis propter compunctionis gratiam, quae ex dulcedine concinna augeretur, interdum assumere consuerunt. Traditur siquidem Paulinum Foroiulensem patriarcham saepius et maxime in privatis missis circa immolationem sacramentorum ymnos vel ab aliis vel a se compositos celebrasse. Ego vero crediderim tantum tantaque scientiae virum hoc nec sine auctoritate nec sine rationis ponderatione fecisse. ‘Moreover, metrical and rhythmical hymns are sung in the Ambrosian offices which some people are accustomed to introduce in the Mass from time to time because the grace of compunction is magnified by the beautiful melody. For indeed they say that Paulinus, the patriarch of Friuli, quite often used hymns he and others had composed particularly in private Masses around the offering of the sacraments. I would certainly have believed that such a great and knowledgeable man would not have done this without authority or without the weight of reason’. Latin text and translation from A. L. Harting-Correa (ed. and trans.), *Walahfrid Strabo’s Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum. A Translation and Liturgical Commentary (Mittellateinische Studien und Texte XIX)*, Leiden, 1996, pp. 160-1.
137 Of the other Paulinus verse identified by Norberg, the following are suitable for liturgical performance as a hymn: *Congregavit nos, Hic est dies* (Easter), *Insigne sanctum (ymnus), Refulget omnis luce* (Easter), *Iam nunc (ymnus, St Mark), Refulgent clara* (Dedication).
Verses for which a positive case can be made on the basis of transmission in liturgical manuscripts include *Gloriam Deo* \(^{138}\) and *Fuit Domini*. \(^{139}\) Cases may also be made for *Tercio in flore*, which as an exposition of the robbing of Joseph by his brothers, could, according to Wilmart, have been sung within the Easter cycle, \(^{140}\) and *Ad caeli clara*, which is signalled in one manuscript as a *Ymnus omnibus horis canendus*. \(^{141}\) Since the melodies for *Ad caeli clara*, *Mecum Timavi*, *Gloriam Deo* and *Fuit Domini* are all concordant to some degree with melodies for texts later appearing as hymns, it would seem that Strabo’s witness to Paulinus’ performance of his own hymns during the Mass, the hymnic associations of some of Paulinus’ texts in Paris 1154, and the later stability of the Pauline concordances, can be added up as evidence for a melodic tradition associated with liturgical performance that effectively regulated practice.

If, as suggested here, a fairly stable melodic tradition is presumed for the verses of Paulinus, then it would appear on the basis of the similarities between the surviving notations that just as the verbal structure of *Ad caeli clara* was taken as a model for *Gloriam Deo*, so the musical structure of the former was imitated in the melody of the latter. In other words, it was not just a verbal text that was imitated in fashioning rhythmical verse, but a musical and poetic complex, *or carmen*.

This hypothesis of concomitant imitation finds some measure of justification in the melodies indicated for other texts composed by Paulinus. *Tercio in Flore* and *Fuit Domini*, both composed by Paulinus, also show an identity of patterning in both text and music. It might be objected at this point that a simpler explanation for these similarities is that an individual scribe, in seeking to realise a melody for a given text,

---

\(^{138}\) In RoA 123 *Gloriam Deo* is transmitted as a hymn for use before the Epistle in the Mass on Christmas day.


\(^{141}\) Mu clm 27305, p. 233.
recognised the verse form and authorship and simply transferred a known melody or melodic strategy. In other words, the melodies of *Gloriam Deo* and *Fuit Domini* may have been prompted by the recollection of melodies for related hymnic texts.

This objection may be met by considering two further cases of textual and musical imitation. According to Norberg, textual imitation could either be full, in which account was taken of word boundaries and accents, or partial, in which only the number of syllables, *caesurae* and cadences might be fixed.\(^{142}\) The cases of *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo*, and of *Fuit Domini* and *Tercio in flore*, provide examples of full imitation. Partial imitation can be traced in *Mecum Timavi* and *Felix per omnes* (II: x), and in *Hug dulce nomen* (II: 36).

In adopting the 3 x 5p + 7pp, 5p form, the anonymous author of *Hug dulce nomen* must have been aware of the verses by Paulinus. The accentuation of the text of *Hug dulce*, however, cannot be matched to either *Ad caeli clara*, *Gloriam Deo*, or even a third verse in the same form possibly by Paulinus, *Ad flendos tuos*. The rhythmical imitation must thus be categorised as partial;\(^ {143}\) all that was retained was the number of syllables and cadential accentuation. The patterning indicated by the notation in *Psalterium* 1154 for *Hug dulce nomen* is also not identical to that for *Ad caeli clara* and *Gloriam Deo*. The basic principle of patterning has nevertheless been retained for *Hug dulce nomen*: there is only one point of difference between the two patterns ab, cb, cd, e for the two Paulinus verses, and ab cb c’d e for *Hug dulce nomen*.

A similar process may be traced in two further texts in the same form by Paulinus of Aquileia: *Mecum Timavi* and *Felix per omnes*. Unlike the cases noted above where the poetic forms were rare and thus a direct sequence of imitation could be reconstructed, the 5 x 5p + 7pp poetic form used for these poems was common. A direct imitation between the two texts, whether full or partial, cannot thus be


\(^{143}\) Even if the imitation in *Hug dulce nomen* was a full imitation of a now lost pseudo-sapphic verse, the fact that differences in accentuation and melodic design were introduced at an earlier stage would still point to the existence of partial imitation at some stage in the history of this form.
demonstrated. Nevertheless, in relation to each other, the two texts share the mimimal characteristics of a partial imitation; that is, a fixed number of syllables, fixed \textit{caesurae} and cadences. This partial similarity is echoed in the similarities of musical settings – the melismas in fixed positions and a similarity although not identity in melodic organisation.

With these further examples in mind, the question of the mechanics of imitation may be re-opened. The objection raised to a concomitant verbal and musical imitation was that melodic similarities might be the result of an entirely independent association. Yet how likely is it that two scribes would independently make the same association? For that is what would have to be imagined to explain the concordance between the two surviving notations for \textit{Mecum Timavi}, whose 5 x 5p + 7pp form was by no means uncommon. Furthermore, the melody for \textit{Mecum Timavi} in Pa lat. 1154 shows greater similarities to that transmitted for Paulinus’s hymn \textit{Felix per omnes} in a thirteenth-century manuscript (Bari s. n.) than it does to the melody for \textit{Christe rex} in the same manuscript, in the same form and notated by the same scribe (II: 27). Finally, the proximity between the two notated melodies for \textit{Mecum Timavi} and the Italian melody for \textit{Felix per omnes} is far greater than between any two hymn melodies for \textit{Felix per omnes} (II: x), thereby further diminishing the likelihood of any independent process of melodic association. A second factor that speaks against the suggestion of entirely independent association is the full imitation for both the text and music of \textit{Ad caeli clara} and \textit{Gloriam Deo}, as against the partial imitation for both the text and music of \textit{Hug dulce nomen}. On the basis of the evidence assembled here, it is therefore suggested that music was neither preliminary, nor secondary, to verbal composition, but could to some degree be involved in the genesis of a sung complex.

The pragmatics of this suggestion are open to further investigation. Are we to imagine Paulinus as an early medieval poet-musician fashioning melodies in conjunction with his verbal composition?\textsuperscript{144} Or should a two-stage process be

\textsuperscript{144} As might be expected, there survives no unambiguous reference to Paulinus of Aquileia as a composer of music, although Alcuin’s reference to Paulino..., \textit{mellifluous nostras musis qui impleverat aures} could be interpreted as a reference to musical qualities of his poetry: see Alcuin, \textit{carmen XVIII}, \textit{MGH PAC I}, p. 239.
imagined in which a sung *carmen* was taken as an object for verbal imitation, and the new text was then sung by contemporary performers according to available models, which would mean in effect an imitation of the melody of the initial *carmen*? Whichever scenario is imagined, the key feature remains a melodic imitation that was bound up with verbal imitation. Textual evidence for such a process of imitation can be traced back to the early Carolingian era. By contrast, the surviving melodic evidence dates only from the tenth century. However, in the light both of the evidence for a later relatively stable transmission, and patterns of melodic imitation analogous to those observed in the textual composition, it is suggested here that at least the notations for poems by Paulinus of Aquileia in Pa lat. 1154 can be read as a witness to a specific case of musical and textual imitation in the genesis of rhythmical verse.

The extent to which these close relations observed among the music and texts for the rhythmical verse of Paulinus of Aquileia can be extended to other rhythmical verses is open to question. In part, the Paulinus verses are unique in so far as few other examples of direct imitation in the formation of rhythmical verse have been traced. In part, however, it is not to be expected that all notations will display imitation on the level of patterning. Just as the minimal characteristics of syllable count and cadence may be taken for verbal imitation, so only the basic strategies indicated by notation might be imitated. A musical equivalent to such minimal imitation would be exactly the kind of behaviour observed in Pa lat. 1154; that is, melodies for similar verse types observing the same basic principles of patterning (disjunct half-line repetitions for 5p forms, full-line repetitions for 8p forms), without reproducing exactly the same design throughout the strophe.

A specific example of such an imitation of basic strategy without reproducing any extended patterning is provided by the text and melody for Gottschalk’s *Ut quid iubes* (II: xvi). No direct model for its 4 x 8p, 8p, R 7pp rhythmical form survives, although as indicated above the four 8p lines may be understood as imitations of the first *membrum* of a trochaic septenarius. As shown above, the 8p lines of *Ut quid iubes* can be further subdivided into 4p + 4p units according to accent and

---

word division. Not only was this practice common in the texts for trochaic septenarii, but it has also been shown by Björkvall and Haug that such divisions can be traced in hymn melodies using this text form. In other words, basic strategies for realising both the text and melody of the first membra of trochaic septenarii seem to have formed indirect models for the text and melody of Ut quid iubes. Further, this basic strategy of sub-division is observed in both surviving notations without any associated identity of patterning.

Just as a spectrum of modes of verbal imitation is to be reckoned with in considering rhythmical verse, so a parallel spectrum of modes of musical imitation is therefore suggested. Where full, partial and indirect verbal models are assumed, so distinct layers of musical imitation may be distinguished, namely melodic contour, melodic patterning and melodic strategy. Most importantly, where a series of textual imitations, or a series of textual structures associated with a particular author, can be identified and notations for these texts survive, analogous degrees of structural imitation can be traced.

ii Metrical Verse

As outlined in the first part of this chapter, philologists have recently been interested in the way in which hexameters and distichs were read in the early middle ages. In particular, questions have been raised concerning whether metrical forms were read with prose accent or by stressing the ictus. In undertaking a close reading of surviving notations, I hoped at the outset to uncover clues to the manner in which such verse was read. The evidence provided by the notations for metrical verse considered in the second part of this chapter, however, did little to clarify the issue as no single principle was observed in these notations. Instead, ictus and word accent were enhanced at varying points during the metrical line. In other places a fixed number of syllables from the cadence or an autonomous concern for musical variety was seen to be the governing principle of melodic organisation.

146 See Björkvall and Haug, ‘Verstechnische und versgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen’ (forthcoming).
Rather than a set of principles specific to metrical verse, what a close examination of notation revealed was several points of articulation shared with notations for rhythmical verse. In both metrical and rhythmical verse a two-part linear structure with flexible openings and fixed cadences was clearly marked. Furthermore, in both metrical and rhythmical verse individual lines were grouped into larger units of return. Such shared features of articulation in the notation for metrical and rhythmical verse suggests a relative indifference towards specifically metrical or rhythmical features in musical performance. Indeed, the only feature that was specific to metrical verse was the systematic observance of prosodic features in notations whose restricted repertory of signs and occasional disposition suggest analytical rather than specifically melodic features. In these notations the ictus is regularly marked, suggesting that at least for analytical purposes the ictus could be emphasised.

This proximity between the sounding structures of metrical and rhythmical verse was not solely a feature of musical pattern – a similar tendency can be traced in the sounding patterns of the text. In the two late antique verses under consideration here (Iam dudum Saulus and Iudicii signum) the number of line endings where ictus and word accent coincide is notable: a ' ~ ~ ' rhythm corresponding with the fixed hexameter cadence of ~ ~ ~ x occurs in twenty-one out of twenty-seven lines in Iudicii signum and in all twenty-five lines in Iam dudum Saulus. In the Eugenian verses under consideration there is a tendency to fix the position of the caesura: in O mors omnivorax, Sume miser, Sum noctis socia and O mortalis homo the caesura is always penthemimeral, whilst in Vae michi, vae miser only two out of ten caesurae are not penthemimeral. In addition to this fixing of the caesura in Eugenian verse, accentual patterns immediately preceding the cadences were fixed: all hexameter lines match the routine hexameter cadence with the accentual cadence ' ~ ~ ' ~ , and in all pentameter lines an accent coincides with the penultimate ictus in the fixed metrical pattern of the second membra, thereby creating the closing accentual pattern ' ~ ' ~ .

With the exception of the irregularly constructed Imperat omnipotens, in notated post-

\footnote{As, for example, the notations for Vae mihi, vae miser (Pa lat. 8093) and Imperat omnipotens (Ma 10029).}

\footnote{One result of this fixing of the caesura is the establishment of a parallel between the opening membra of hexameter and pentameter lines (in which the penthemimeral caesura is fixed).}
Eugenian verse the same features can be observed; that is, a penthemimeral caesura, a ' ~ ~ ' ~ closing pattern in hexameters and a ' ~ ' ~ cadence in pentameters.

The wider phenomenon of such internal patterns within metrical verse from late antiquity onwards has been described by Norberg.\textsuperscript{149} A pronounced use of assonance, rhyme, alliteration, acrostics, abecedary organisation, and tmesis (or word separation) all served to distance this poetry from classical predecessors. The poetry of Eugenius of Toledo in particular embodies the tendency to divide the metrical line into smaller, independent patterns. A particularly striking instance of small-scale pattern within the line is provided by the final two couplets of \textit{O mors omnivorax}:\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{verbatim}
Parce, precor, animae pulsanti, parce petenti
Quae flammam metuit, dum sua facta gemit.
Gaudia tu sanctis, tu reddis praemia iustis
Eugenii miseris sit rogo poena levis.
\end{verbatim}

A wider tendency to fix the caesura and to place more emphasis on the caesura as a point of structural divide was also observed by Norberg.\textsuperscript{151} Further subdivision in metrical forms was also common (especially in the trochaic septonarius) and was reproduced in rhythmical imitations. A further significant technical development within metrical verse was a tendency to avoid elision, thereby according the syllable more importance as a unit of structure.

Besides placing the limited material examined in this study in a wider context, the importance of Norberg’s observations to this study is twofold. First, it is apparent that a tendency towards fixed patterns was a feature that was shared by both poetry and music; that is, there was a preference for sounding patterns organised into shorter, modular units. Second, it appears that the organisational principles of notated metrical and rhythmical verse shared certain strategies: both featured a clearly

\textsuperscript{149} See Norberg, \textit{Introduction}, pp. 7-87.
\textsuperscript{150} \textit{MGH AA XIV}, p. 245.
\textsuperscript{151} ‘Un fait, cependant, est sûr, c’est que l’importance de la coupe comme limite métrique était plus grande au Moyen Age qu’elle ne l’avait été auparavant’, Norberg, \textit{Introduction}, p. 68.
articulated two-part linear structure with flexible openings and fixed cadences, and both organised individual lines into larger units of return. In pointing to these similarities it is not intended to suggest an identity between either poetic and musical patterning (which was often disjunct), or metrical and rhythmical verse, but to suggest that similar principles of modular construction or small-scale closed patterns in sound guided their varying realisations.
5 Summary

The implications of this study for an understanding of the relation between the sounding structures of early medieval music and poetry lie in two directions. Philologists have assumed to varying degrees that music was responsible for deviations in poetic principle – as formulated by Meyer, 'Singen kann man alles';\(^{152}\) according to Norberg, the variation in the number of syllables in rhythmical verse 's’agit d’un phénomène qui ne peut s’expliquer que si on voit ses rapports avec la musique';\(^{153}\) for Klopsch, ‘ein gesungener Text gegen Tonbeugungen wesentlich unempfindlicher ist als ein gesprochener’.\(^{154}\) The evidence assembled here, however, speaks against such claims that music was responsible for weakening the integrity of poetic design. Surviving notations indicate that musical performance realised a sophisticated articulation of verse structure, able to articulate a series of relations between strophe, line, half-line and even smaller units. Rather than systematically observing or obscuring aspects of verbal structure, musical realisation allowed a number of conflicting principles within the text to be articulated; in metrical compositions, for example, ictus or word accent could be followed, or fixed syllable structures could be observed. In short, rather than detracting from verbal structures, it appears that musical realisation could intensify verbal structures and articulate a plurality of different principles within them.

Second, commentators more directly concerned with music have for the most part assumed a unitary relation between words and music: for Stevens, there was a ‘non-relationship’ between music and words, both of which independently realised a numerical pattern; for Treitler, music was capable of elucidating meaning through a ‘reading’ of the text. By viewing music and words as mutual components in the

---


\(^{153}\) Norberg, Introduction, p. 142.

fashioning of verse as sounding pattern, a more differentiated model for word-music relations has been proposed in this study. Rather than singular principles such as number or syntax governing the realisation of music for any set of words, what have been proposed here are individual relations within and between individual *carmina*. Rather than consistent principles being applied from without, existing sounding patterns were imitated to varying degrees and with differing relations between verbal and musical components. It is therefore only through seeking to understand the complex network of relations between words, music and verse in their full particularity that the history of early medieval verse and music can begin to be written.
PART IV

Conclusion
Conclusion

Throughout this study notation has been analysed without reference to performance. This omission might be regarded as the result of a concentration on documentary evidence to the exclusion of imaginative historical reconstruction. Yet, although attention has focused upon surviving documentary evidence, the relation of notation to performance has not been ignored on account of methodological scruples. Instead, the function of notation, and in particular the assumption that neumes acted as an aide-mémoire for singing, has itself been held up for scrutiny.

Two aspects of the aide-mémoire hypothesis may be distinguished: the assumption that notation was used for singing, and the assumption that notation served a mnemonic purpose. As regards the former, several of the notations have been seen to be recorded in a form that renders singing directly from the source practically impossible. A particularly striking case is ludicii signum in Pa lat. 1154, for which there survive two notations within the same notational space; the degree of interweaving between the two notations is such that they can be separated only with great difficulty.¹ Performance directly from the manuscript would thus appear not to have been a concern for the second scribe. Further examples of notations that are unsuited to performance and have been discussed in this study include the copying of marginal additions in a clockwise fashion in Br 8860-8867. Also unsuited to performance would have been notations that presented difficulties to reading.²

² Several notations are now very faint, especially in Pa lat. 8093, but no assessment of legibility can be safely made since it is impossible to state with certainty the extent to which these notations were once legible.
general, the neumes added to these verse manuscripts, which were prepared without musical notation in mind, are so small as to be unsuited to use in any form of recital.  

A further category of notations not recorded for purposes of performance are those that functioned as writing exercises. One case is found in Be 455 where a scribe has copied in the margin not only a portion of the text from the same folio, but also the neumes that accompany that text. Written exercise remains the most likely explanation for certain other cases. The text and neumes for the first strophe of Mecum Timavi in Be 394, for example, are not only copied by an unsteady and erratic hand, but also appear in the context of sundry pen-trials and exercises. Further possible written exercises include notations that extend only over opening words.

The second part of the aide-mémoire hypothesis, that neumatic notation functioned as a reminder, has also been questioned. The hypothesis was developed in conjunction with traditional claims for chant transmission. According to this view, the aim of notation was to remind singers of melodies that had already been stabilised within an oral tradition and were therefore already ‘known’. This historical scenario has since been challenged on two fronts. Most recently, Treitler has argued on the one hand for a flexibility in oral tradition both before and after the advent of notation, and on the other for a separation of the origins of notation from its deployment as a tool for disseminating chant. Levy, meanwhile, has regarded notation as an essential

---

3 The space between ruled text lines ranges from 56 mm. (Pa lat. 2832) to 86 mm. (Pa lat. 1154). Given that text occupies approximately half the space between lines, the remaining space for musical notation is between a quarter and half a centimetre.

4 See above, p. 71.

5 A further clear example is to be found on fol. 2' of Ka Aug. XCI, in which a verse line featuring all the letters of the alphabet is accompanied by neumes. Such verse lines were commonly used to practice the formation of letters: see B. Bischoff, ‘Elementarunterricht und Probationes Pennae in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters’, MAS I, p. 81.

means of stabilising oral tradition.\textsuperscript{7} The effect of both Treitler and Levy’s arguments has been to weaken the \textit{aide-mémoire} hypothesis, for, in so far as notation involved a promotion of certain melodic versions circulating in oral tradition, its function was not \textit{solely} mnemonic. Rather, according to Treitler and Levy, neumatic notation served a complex of possible uses: to fix melodies, to clarify melodic structure, and to co-ordinate melody and text.

A consideration of the oral behaviour of the melodies of the poems examined in this study places the sufficiency of the mnemonic hypothesis further in doubt. As far as can be extrapolated from surviving notations, the melodic tradition for verse was less stable than that for chant. This flexibility in melodic behaviour raises a central problem for the mnemonic hypothesis, for if melodies were themselves in flux, to what extent could notation serve as a reminder of a pre-existent melody? This problem in applying the \textit{aide-mémoire} hypothesis to notated verse in particular was first raised by Treitler. In response to the suggestion of Jammers that sung non-liturgical pieces had no tradition and therefore needed writing down, Treitler observed that for singers to whom the melodies were not traditional the notation would provide little information.\textsuperscript{8} The assertion by Jammers that these melodies had no tradition can be rejected in the light of the close relations between certain notations uncovered in this study. Even so, Treitler’s observation retains its force, for, given the variations indicated by the neumes for even the most closely related melodies, the likelihood that these notations served as an mnemonic for melodic content is diminished. In short, in the absence of uniform oral tradition, the information provided by the neumes would have been insufficient to enable melodic reconstruction.

It remains possible that a more circumscribed mnemonic function was fulfilled by these notations: neumatic notation may have been used to record melodic versions particular to individuals or a locality, and thus a strictly limited mnemonic function

\textsuperscript{7}This position was also developed over the course of several articles: see, in particular, K. Levy, ‘Charlemagne’s Archetype of Gregorian Chant’, \textit{JAMS} XL (1987), pp. 1-30 (repr. in K. Levy, \textit{Gregorian Chant and the Carolingians}, Princeton, pp. 82-108); and \textit{idem}, ‘On the Origin of Neumes’, \textit{EMH} VII (1987), pp. 59-90 (repr. in Levy, \textit{Gregorian Chant}, pp. 109-40).

\textsuperscript{8}Treitler, ‘Reading and Singing’, p. 205.
may have operated. Even within such a restricted context, however, the mnemonic hypothesis cannot be retained as a primary or sufficient explanation for notational function, for in recording particular melodic versions the use of notation to privilege or fix one possible melodic realisation cannot be divorced from a potential mnemonic function.

To draw together the two objections to the aide-mémoire hypothesis: first, the notation of versus was not necessarily intended to make the material ready for performance, as can be deduced both from the exceptional formats of the collections and the minute size of the neumes in general; second, the neumes were not necessarily intended solely as mnemonics, since in the context of oral instability several other functions were fulfilled by notation. The effect of dislodging the aide-mémoire hypothesis from its position as a unitary explanation for the function of notation has been to loosen the relation between notation and performance and to throw open the question of the function of notation to the possibility of multiple explanations.

In rejecting a central hypothesis for notational function, it might seem that reasoning about notation has been accorded unrestricted freedom. However, throughout this study the written context within which notation was added has been used as a basis for interpretation. At its simplest, this has meant distinguishing between the operation and purpose of notation with reference to the particular selection and organisation of material in the individual manuscripts. At its most advanced, what has been promoted is an interpretation of notation as an extension of the writing of verse collections as a whole. These two aspects of the relation of notation to written presentation will be summarised in turn.

With respect to individual manuscripts, a range of possible functions for notation corresponding to the sphere of use of the poetic collections to which they were added has been traced. In Be 455, in which the ordering of texts and the presence of the script of a known master provide a clear indication of didactic intent, notation was understood to function as a ‘written exercise’ in at least three senses: as an exercise in writing neumes, as an exercise in understanding verse structures through the medium of writing, and possibly as an exercise in ‘writing’ (or
‘composing’) melodies. Such a didactic intent was also traced in Pa lat. 8093 and Ma 10029 in which notation was added alongside diacritical signs. In these two collections the potential of notation to clarify verse structure within the written domain in a manner similar to the analytical information imparted by diacritical signs was traced. Particular weight is lent to this suggestion by the fact that the notations in these two collections often indicate little more than a systematic heightening of prosodic features.

In Pa lat. 1154, the presence of a group of poems notated by the same scribe, as well as the strong concordances that survive for the notations by this scribe, indicates that in this one case there was an attempt to record a corpus of known melodies.9 That an aide-mémoire function for many of the notations by this one scribe may be imagined is supported by the presence of material suited to recital elsewhere in the manuscript; that is, the litany and prayers as transmitted in the first two parts of the manuscript. Finally, in Br 8860-8867 and Pa 2832, the novelty and local significance of the notated poems points to a use of notation as a means to preserve ephemeral material in a similar manner to the way in which these two extensive collections of verse manifest a tendency to a form of bibliographic compilation per se.

This proposed correspondence between the sphere of use of the individual manuscript and the function of its notation is not claimed as necessary or absolute. Not only was notation in certain cases added up to a century or more after the copying of the main body of the text, but also all the collections underwent changes of shape and circumstance. The proposed correspondence is instead one among several indices that may be used to provide clues to notational function in the absence of an a priori hypothesis. Given the potential disjunctions in time and space represented by these notations, each example requires separate consideration.

9 Melodic concordances for six of the ten notations by scribe A in Pa lat. 1154 have been identified (Ad caeli clara, Fuit Domini, Mecum Timavi, Bella bis quinis, Judicii signum and Gloriam Deo). Melodic concordances for only four of the remaining thirty-nine notations were identified, three of which were hymns (Ihesu redemptor omnium, Nocte surgentes and Solve lingua) and one of which was a Boethian metrum (O stelliferi).
A second and more precise means of drawing upon immediate written context to make statements about notational function is to consider the individual texts that received notation. In the case of Be 455 and Pa lat. 1154, for example, a strong distinction is apparent between standard hymnic texts, which were almost all left unnotated, and other texts. The simplest explanation for this is that hymns, which would have been widely known, did not require notation. Yet the sufficiency of this explanation is placed in doubt by the mnemonic problem signalled above; that is, if a melody was less well known, then it is doubtful how much aid neumatic notation could afford. It should also be noted that it is in fact far from clear that non-hymnic melodies were less well known. Instead, or at least as well, the selection of non-hymnic pieces for notation appears to have been a matter of the scope that such poems allowed the notator; that is, a freedom to realise a melody particular to the individual scribe or locale. Further refinements in reasoning may be made by reducing the focus to single collection. In Be 455, for example, the reason for notating only two out of twenty-seven hymns, as opposed to eleven out of twenty-six Boethian and Prudentian metra, was most probably related to a reception that was more concerned with demonstrating varieties of poetic construction than melodic contents.

While such reasoning based upon individual collections and texts points to a plurality of notational functions, a consideration of notation as an extension of writing in general suggests a stable framework within which this plurality of functions operated. The extent to which notation was one among several activities involved in representing the attributes of verse on the page is most readily observed in relation to other sign systems that represented sounding properties, namely prosodic signs and punctuation.

Prosodic signs added to poetic collections have on occasion proved difficult to distinguish from musical notation. Of more significance than occasional problems

---

10 In Vae mihi, vae misero (Pa lat. 8093, II: 2), for example, the virgae coincide with either the ictus or final long syllables. The employment of these ascenders thus coincides with the use of the accent sign in the same manuscript, which was also added only to long syllables. In Sum noctis socia (Ma 10029, 212
of formal classification, however, is the functional similarity that obtains between notation and prosodic signs. With respect to metrical verse, it has been seen that musical notations mark structural properties according to a simple recitational model. This pattern of recitation entails an observation of certain features of the verse structure (caesura, accent, ictus, or fixed syllable cadences), but the number and nature of the structural features observed varies, as do the means by which these features are marked (pitch, duration, melodic elaboration or pattern). The notation of melodies for metrical verse, although a more complex and nuanced system, may thus be regarded as an extension of the impulse behind the addition of prosodic accents; that is, a desire to represent sounding properties of verse structure in written form.

Certain correlations between notation and punctuation may also be observed. Units of melodic construction (indicated by cadence or formal patterning) often coincide with textual units indicated by punctuation; in Ma 10029, for example, the caesurae are routinely marked by punctuation signs as well as in the musical design indicated by notation. It is not possible, however, to identify any systematic formal relation between the two media in general and, in the absence of any systematic relation, the more significant correlation is one of formal principle. The function of punctuation was to make explicit prosodic units (period, colon, comma) in the text, whether as an aid to the reading aloud of that text or as a rhetorical analysis directed towards clarifying textual structure on the page. The capacity of melody to project textual syntax in a manner analogous to punctuation has been described and theorised principally by Treitler, for whom neumes, like punctuation, were concerned with the elocution and articulation of language, and hence a useful tool for singing. Here, it may be added that punctuation, and by extension neumes, also served as tools for both clarifying and representing verse structures on the page.

11: 8), the second half of the pentameter line is also marked with virga over the syllables carrying the ictus in a manner similar to the employment of accent signs elsewhere in the manuscript.

11 'The role of punctuation in verse is inextricably bound up with the functions of layout and the graphic manifestation of rhyme in presentation of texts for readers. This complex of graphic features also reflects the different ways in which readers have perceived prosodic structures, and the interaction between these and other rhetorical and logical structures in the text.', M. B. Parkes, Pause and Effect. An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West, Aldershot, 1992, p. 97.

Two other aspects of the representation of verse in written form were layout and script hierarchy. Again, there is a certain relation between the understanding of poetic structure promoted by these techniques and the patterning that may be observed in notation; most notably, in Pa lat. 1154, the layout and *litterae notabiliores* articulate half-lines, rather than lines or strophes, as does the patterning in 5-syllable opening forms. Again, however, the relation is by no means systematic and there are numerous examples of non-correspondence; in Pa lat. 1154, the 8-syllable opening forms are also laid out and given *litterae notabiliores* by half-line or *cola*, but there is no equivalent patterning that can be recovered from the notation. The importance of the parallel between layout and musical notation lies instead in the principle of forming a written representation of verse that projects a certain understanding of its prosodic features – its half-lines, lines and units of repetition.

By associating notation with the written representation of verse structure as expressed through prosodic accents, punctuation, layout and *litterae notabiliores*, what is stressed is the extent to which notation was one among several tools for making verse structure visible. Viewed in this way, notation took its place among several graphic features that were concerned with what Parkes has termed a ‘grammar of legibility’; that is, a complex of graphic features intended to represent textual structures on the page. The development of this ‘grammar of legibility’ was a gradual process whose various strands were first brought together under the Carolingians with the establishment of conventions for the use of punctuation, layout and *litterae notabiliores*. Musical notation as a Carolingian invention stands alongside these achievements of a script culture and represents with them an expansion of the tools of written representation.

The shift in mentality that accompanied this development of a ‘grammar of legibility’ has been traced through statements by grammarians concerning the relation

---

13 See Parkes, *Pause and Effect*, ch. II (‘Changing attitudes to the Written Word: Components in a “Grammar of Legibility”’).
of written language to speech.\textsuperscript{14} In broad terms, there was a shift between Augustine, for whom written words were signs of spoken words,\textsuperscript{15} and Isidore, for whom letters were signs without sounds that ‘have the power to convey to us silently the sayings of those who are absent’.\textsuperscript{16} The development of a ‘grammar of legibility’ was a practical counterpart to this establishment of writing as a medium with independence from speech, but which could nevertheless convey information about it. The importance of this development to the present study is that it places the historical emergence of notation at a time when written symbols were not secondary to sound, but of an independent status. In other words, the rationale of notation resided, at least in part, in its properties as writing and its place within a written context.

In viewing notation within this framework of writing in general, it assumes a place within wider political and cultural developments. The questions that may be framed about notation as an historical activity are various, but centre on the ways in which control was exerted through music writing. Alongside this question runs a second concerned with the corollary of music writing; that is, music reading. Again the issue is not simply the documentary matter of who was reading and under what conditions, but the cultural ends that musical literacy served.

With regard to the cultural role of notation, the conviction presented here has been that writing was a tool not only for transmitting information, but also for self-reflection. As has been seen, the contents of the verse collections are largely moral-didactic in orientation. A confluence between writing such morally sound verse and an autonomous training of character was outlined by Quintilian in his \textit{Institutio oratoria}:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} \textit{Inventae sunt etiam litterae per quas possemus et cum absentibus conloqui; sed ista signa sunt vocum, cum ipsae voces in sermone nostro earum quas cogitamus signa sint rerum}, Augustine, \textit{De Trinitate} XV. x. 19. Latin text reproduced from W. J. Mountain (ed.), \textit{Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Trinitate libri XV} (CCSL L A libri XIII-XV), Turnhout, 1968, p. 486.
\item \textsuperscript{16} \textit{Litterae autem sunt indices rerum, signa verborum, quibus vis est ut nobis dicta absentium sine voce loquantur}, Isidore of Seville, \textit{Etymologiae} I ch. iii (\textit{De litteris communibus}). Latin text reproduced from \textit{PL} LXXXII, cols. 74-5.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
And as we are still discussing minor details, I would urge that the lines, which he [the child] is set to copy, should not express thoughts of no significance, but convey some sound moral lesson. He will remember such aphorisms even when he is an old man, and the impression made upon his unformed mind will contribute to the formation of his character. He may also be entertained by learning the sayings of famous men and above all selections from the poets, poetry being more attractive to children.  

That verse, even non-Christian verse, continued to be used for such purposes in the Carolingian era is demonstrated by the use of the Disticha Catonis both as a basic educational text and as a fund for written exercises. Further evidence for autodidacticism in the act of notating verse can be found in two factors. First, the manuscripts to which notation was added display features indicative of a personal use and exercise: the diminutive size and moralistic contents of Br 8860-8867, the penitential content of Pa lat. 1154, the private ownership of Pa lat. 2832, the interest in technical complexity displayed by the ordering of material in Be 455, and the prosodic marks in Pa lat. 8093 and Ma 10029. Second, the association between notating verse, writing, and a training of the self is one made explicitly in the late ninth-century treatise Musica enchiriadis. The versus Rex caeli, copied with Daseian notation in chapter VII of the theory treatise, is prefaced by the following lines:


\[\text{\emph{17}}\]

\[\text{\emph{18}}\]

On the use of the Disticha Catonis as a text for elementary teaching in the Carolingian era, see G. Glauche, \textit{Schullektüre im Mittelalter. Entstehung und Wandlungen des Lektürekansons bis 1200 nach den Quellen dargestellt} (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung V), Munich, 1970, pp. 30-6 and pp. 52-61. The distich Plus vigila semper (1, 2) was frequently added to manuscripts as pen- or writing-trial, perhaps the earliest example being an addition to a manuscript copied in the first third of the eighth century (Aut 107: see CLA VI, 729).
Soon it will be clear which tone is involved, since practice makes notating or singing tones as easy as writing or reading letters. These things are said to help beginners with their study.\textsuperscript{19}

The context of the notated \textit{versus} in the \textit{Musica enchiriadis} is admittedly of a different order to that found in verse collections. Yet what is striking is the confluence between the explicit formulation sketched in the \textit{Musica enchiriadis} and the rationale for notation that has been drawn out from a contextual reading of the verse collections; that is, notation was a tool by means of which one could train oneself.

The precise situation within which an individual might have read and added notation to one of the collections considered in this study is far from clear. Singular notions of function associated with the terms ‘classbook’ and ‘library book’ have been rejected in this study in favour of a recognition of various interconnected concerns in the reception of the content of these collections. In rejecting a narrow notion of function, it is necessary to turn for further insight to the broader purpose of moral-didactic compilations. Rochais noted that \textit{florilegia} were almost without exception Benedictine products, even if many were prepared for use by members of the laity.\textsuperscript{20} More recently, Leclerq and Carruthers have associated \textit{florilegia} with an identifiably monastic form of \textit{lectio} in which the reader was required to meditate upon extracts rather than embark upon dialectical disputation.\textsuperscript{21}


A more precise context for such lectio and for books for individual use in monastic culture may be grasped by turning to the Benedictine Rule. Chapter 48 of the Rule states that at the beginning of Lent each monk received a biblotheca which he was required to read in its entirety.22 To Benedict, biblotheca would have meant a Bible, but Carolingian commentators re-interpreted the Rule to require the reading of one book during the year.23 According to Lapidge, poetic collections similar to the ones discussed in this study may well have been such a book.24

Admittedly, there is no direct evidence to identify the biblotheca of the Rule with poetic collections, and other books would seem more immediately suited to the stated purpose (such as the Vitae patrum). Nevertheless the form of reading, or lectio, identified in the Rule is one whose features have been detected in these poetic collections. First, and in particular, the books distributed in Lent are given to individuals for private edification. Second, reading in general is presented as an act of self-discipline within the Rule. It constituted an extensive portion of the week, totalling approximately twenty hours, and is detailed under manual labour.25 Moreover, in Lent monks are encouraged to lead a life of particular austerity, devoting themselves ‘to prayer with tears, to reading and to compunction of the heart, and to abstinence’.26

22 In quibus diebus quadragesimae accipient omnes singulos codices de biblotheca, quos per ordinem ex integro legant. ‘In these days of Lent let them all receive single volumes from the library, which they shall read through in order’. Latin text from R. Hanslík (ed.), Benedicti regula (CSEL LXXV), Vienna, 1960, p. 117 (ch. XLVII. 15).
25 Chapter 48 of the Rule (De opera manuum cotidiana) stipulates three hours of lectio per morning in winter, two hours each afternoon in summer, an optional lectio after lunch and provision for lectio nearly all day Sunday: see CSEL LXXV, pp. 114-9.
26 Quod tunc digné fit, si ab omnibus vitís temperamus, orationi cum fletibus, lectioni et compunctioni cordis atque abstinence operam damus, ch. XLIX. 4, CSEL LXXV, p. 119. ‘This will be done worthily, if we refrain from all sin and we give ourselves to prayer with tears, to reading and to compunction of the heart, and to abstinence’.
That monastic *lectio* formed the occasion for the addition of notation to these collections is not proposed in a strict sense: Palat. 2832 was owned by an educated individual before it passed to a monastic library; Palat. 8093 contains the hand of another educated individual, the deacon Florus of Lyons; and the remaining contents of Palat. 1154, a litany, prayers and an extract from Isidore of Seville’s *Synonyma*, indicate a penitential *florilegium* that may have belonged to a lay person. Nevertheless, although the specific occasions for the reading and addition of notation to these collections were most probably many and varied, the form of *lectio* promoted in the Rule accords with the form of reception that has been suggested for these collections; that is, a two-fold reflection aimed at both a grammatically correct understanding and a meditation upon hidden meaning. Such a twofold reflection upon the text has been seen to apply to the act of notating music; that is, in the technical appreciation of verse structure, and in the process of making explicit the rhetorical qualities of the text. Understood within the framework of a twofold *lectio*, the notations in these poetic collections can be considered, despite their ephemeral appearance, part of a wider movement of *reformatio* in which it was sought to regulate society through individual reflection upon the written word.

---

Appendix

1 Pa lat. 8093 (olim Colb. 1512, Reg. 4018) – a composite MS created by a nineteenth-century binder, of which only fols. 1-38 are described here. Fols.1-32 and 37-8 originally bound with Lei Voss. lat. 2° 111 (Tafel). Prov.: s. xvi, Île Barbe, Lyons.

Fols. 1-38: 277 x 200 mm. (230 x 185 mm.), 2 cols., 31-3 lines.

Two main scribes: A fols. 1-32 and 37-8, visigothic minuscule of s. ix\(\frac{1}{4}\), Lyons (Bischoff, MAS), including a circle-dot sign (for \(\bar{o}\)), open \(a\), narrow uncial and a left-leaning half-uncial \(d\), an uncial \(g\) with a long descender, and a \(t\) whose crossbar begins on the left-hand side with a bow ascending from the line; red rubrics and capitals; frequent ligatures (including \(re\), \(rm\), \(ro\), \(rr\) and \(er\), \(te\)); abbreviations include a high-set \(s\) with a \(q\) (\(que\)). B fols. 33r-36v, unsteady Caroline minuscule with visigothic elements of s. ix\(\frac{1}{4}\), Lyons (Bischoff, MAS); minuscule includes an open \(a\) and uncial \(a\), a half-uncial \(d\) and (occasionally) an uncial \(d\), and a half-uncial \(t\); visigothic elements include a \(t\) with an additional bow and a \(g\) with a long descender; infrequent ligatures (\(st\), \(rr\) and \(re\)); abbreviations include \(q\) with a high-set \(s\) (for \(que\)).

\(Dura quae gignit\) (fol. 24r) added by a different hand writing in the same style as A (but changed in ink colour). Florus of Lyons copied two additions in the lower margin of fol. 33\(^r\) (Bischoff, Notes). Pen-trials of s. ix/\(x\) on fol. 36\(^r\) (Bischoff, Notes).

Accent marks over the second half of pentameter lines in elegiac distichs (fols. 14v, 17r-20r, 23r-24v, 30r-31v and 37v). Scansion signs added to fols. 1r-14v

(Sedulius - \textit{Carmen paschale}), 15r, 17r, 23v and 32v.

Musical notation added by five different hands (fols. 17r, 18r, 18v, 24r and 32v). Neumes are predominantly central French in style, but several signs found in Spanish scripts also used.


Prose', *MAS* I, p. 292; *idem*, Unpublished notes in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich.

2 **Pa lat. 2832** (olim Bigotianus 323, Reg. 4345) – Prov.: s. xi, St Oyon (fol. 1r, ‘VOTO BONAE MEMORIAE MANNONIS / LI-BER / AD SEPULCHRUM SANCTI AUGENDI OBLATUS’); s. xvii, Bouhier collection.

135 fols., 215 x 147 mm. (141 x 99 mm.), 1 col., 25 lines.

Single main hand writing a good caroline minuscule of s. ix m-3/4, Lyons (Bischoff); tendency to lean to the left and begin forms (especially b, h, l, m, n and r) with a small left-right tick; n with an initial left-right diagonal ascending from beneath the line; two forms of a (uncial, and a frequently used open half-uncial); rustic capitals with an uncial a for rubrics; few ligatures (only ct regularly); few abbreviations (*nomina sacra*, *per*, *pro*, etc.).

Several hands of the late ninth century on flyleaves. Additional texts copied in the tenth century on fols 71r and 135v.

French neumes added by later scribes to fols. 62r and 68v. Heighted Italian neumes added to fol. 123v.


3 **Ma 10029** (Tolet. 14, 22) – Prov.: s. x, Spain.

159 fols., 245 x 167 mm. (193 x 135 mm.), 1 col., 26-8 lines.

Fols. 1r-139r: several hands writing visigothic minuscule of the late ninth or early tenth century. Fols 139v-159r: mid to late tenth-century visigothic minuscule. Later additions of the twelfth century at the beginning and end of the manuscript.

Diacritical signs, in the form of both accent and scanision signs, added throughout.

Neumes added by five different hands (fols. 55v, 141v, 158r, 158v and 159r) employing a range of neumes used in central French and Spanish notations.


4 Be 455 – Prov.: s. x, Laon (Office of St Anstrude, fol. 44\(^{4v}\)); s. xvi P. Daniel. 44 fols., 214-9 x 165 mm. (130-5 x 100-110 mm.), 1 col., 18 lines.

A single main hand writing a neat Caroline minuscule of s. ix\(^{23}\) (Bischoff, KFH); heads of d, h and l are slightly clubbed, and uncial, half-uncial and double-c a forms used; standard and frequent abbreviations (including all for 'alleluia'); few ligatures (st, ct and re); rustic capitals with no ornamentation.

Tenth-century additions (fols. 25\(^{4v}\), 43\(^{iv}\) and 44\(^{iv}\)). Eleventh-century additions over erasures (fols. 4\(^v\) and 9\(^v\)). Further additions of s. xi-xii on fols. 3\(^{iv}\) and 4\(^i\). (Bischoff, KFH).

Musical notation of the late ninth or tenth century by several hands of a Messine type with occasional French influence. The quality of the neume scripts is variable; none are precisely heightened.

Cat.: H. Hagen, Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana), Bern, 1895, pp. 396-400.


5 Palat. 1154 (olim St Martial 76 and 97, Reg. 4458) – Prov.: s. xii, St Martial of Limoges.

146 fols., 208-210 x 150-4 mm. (138-143 x 43-5 mm.), 2 cols., 16 lines (fols. 66-97: 1 col., 16 lines).

Three main scribal hands of s. ix-x (Bischoff, MAS). Fols. 0\(^i\)-25\(^{iv}\): bold, heavy Caroline minuscule, prob. s. x (Bischoff, Notes), that uses uncial and double c a
forms. Fols. 26r-65v and 98r-143v: smaller, light Caroline miniscule; open, double-c and uncial \( a \) forms; joined and broken \( g \) forms; standard ligatures \((st, nt\) and \(c_t)\), also \( ns\). Fols. 66r-97v: a similar Caroline miniscule to that preceding, but more erect and uniform; no open \( a \) employed. All hands use rustic capitals for headings. Rubrics in red with occasional green highlights; gold and purple also used for the capital \( A \) on fol. 66v.

Other scripts of tenth to twelfth centuries in additions, corrections, glosses and rubrication.

Aquitainian musical notation added by various hands to the text of the third scribal hand.


6 **Br 8860-8867** (*olim* Bibl. de Bourgogne 22, Bibl. Roy. 1351)

76 fols., 150 x 115 mm. (100 x 75 mm.), 1 col., 19 lines.

Several hands in a similar style – differences marked by changes in ink colour, size, and thickness of letters; changes in hand correspond to gatherings (I-II, III, IV, V, VI, VII-IX, X and XI). The overall style is a small, neat Caroline minuscule of mid-late ninth century (s. ix\(^{3/4}\), St Bertin – Bischoff, *KFH*); individual letters regular in formation with almost vertical ascenders and descenders; minim ticks at the beginning and end of most letters; both minuscule and uncial \( a \); few ligatures (mainly \( st, ae\) and \( rr, rt\) and \( r-et)\) with standard abbreviations. Red for rubrics, initials and first letters of internal verses.

Poetic additions with occasional musical notation on i) fols. 15v, 22r-26r, and ii) 74r-76r. Musical notation of a St Gall type. The script of the verse additions is tenth century (Bischoff, *KFH*); notation appears to be contemporary with the textual
forms. Fols. 26r-65v and 98r-143v: smaller, light Caroline miniscule; open, double-c and uncial a forms; joined and broken g forms; standard ligatures (st, nt and cr), also ns. Fols. 66r-97v: a similar Caroline miniscule to that preceding, but more erect and uniform; no open a employed. All hands use rustic capitals for headings. Rubrics in red with occasional green highlights; gold and purple also used for the capital A on fol. 66v.

Other scripts of tenth to twelfth centuries in additions, corrections, glosses and rubrication.

Aquitainian musical notation added by various hands to the text of the third scribal hand.


6 Br 8860-8867 (olim Bibl. de Bourgogne 22, Bibl. Roy. 1351)

76 fols., 150 x 115 mm. (100 x 75 mm.), 1 col., 19 lines.

Several hands in a similar style – differences marked by changes in ink colour, size, and thickness of letters; changes in hand correspond to gatherings (I-II, III, IV, V, VI, VII-IX, X and XI). The overall style is a small, neat Caroline minuscule of mid-late ninth century (s. ix3/4, St Bertin – Bischoff, KFH); individual letters regular in formation with almost vertical ascenders and descenders; minim ticks at the beginning and end of most letters; both minuscule and uncial a; few ligatures (mainly st, ae and rr, rt and r-et) with standard abbreviations. Red for rubrics, initials and first letters of internal verses.

Poetic additions with occasional musical notation on i) fols. 15v, 22v-26v, and ii) 74v-76v. Musical notation of a St Gall type. The script of the verse additions is tenth century (Bischoff, KFH); notation appears to be contemporary with the textual
Other minor corrections, pen-trials and occasional modern additions (esp. fol. 1\textsuperscript{r-v}), as well as marginal ascriptions of author or reference for verses.\footnote{The numbers added in the margin next to certain verses (e.g. fol. 77\textsuperscript{r}) correspond to those in C. U. J. Chevalier (ed.), \textit{Repertorium Hymnologicum}, 6 vols., Brussels and Louvain, 1892-1920.}
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