
In the romanization of the liturgy in Gaul during the Carolingian Renaissance, two new literary genres were born, the sequence and the trope. They have been described as an expression of the «German» tendency to a more emotive, enthusiastic and theologically explicit liturgy than the conservative and strictly biblical chants of the Roman mass could offer. The tropes have been the subject of scholarly

1. I shall use the terms *tropo* and *prosula* in accordance with the definitions given in Corpus troporum (= CT) I, pp. 11 f., note 3: «Les Tropes sont les chants (texte et mélodie) qui constituent une introduction, une intercalation ou une addition insérée soit dans un chant liturgique de la messe romaine (texte liturgique de base), soit dans un chant de l'office. *Tropo* est donc employé ici comme un terme générique, indépendant de la technique musicale... On peut distinguer, comme un genre à part, les *prosules* qui sont le résultat d'une technique spéciale ajoutant des mots à une mélodie préexistante ("Textierung, Prosulierung ").

2. A succinct account of the history of troping is given by Bruno Stäblein under the entry *Tropus* in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 13, cols. 798-826.
research since the nineteenth century, although there is no complete consensus concerning their genesis and development and how they were performed musically. Most of the material is still unpublished; volumes XLVII and XLIX of the *Analecta hymnica* contain a selection of metrical tropes which does not aim at completeness, as regards either the existing repertory or the manuscripts available. A number of modern editions present the tropes mainly from the musicological point of view, admittedly not the least important aspect in dealing with works which were always intended for singing. The *Corpus troporum Stockholmiense* is conceived as a complete collection of trope texts from manuscripts written up to c. 1100.

The editing of liturgical texts entails other and no less intricate problems than that of a literary text composed by a single author. Liturgical songs not taken from the Bible and consequently not regarded as inspired were subject to constant revision, re-arrangement and/or adaptation, according to circumstances (it may be sufficient to point to the variant *sorocule* of the MS. *Ka 15* to the trope *Gaudeamus laetantes fraterculi* in CT I, p. 97; cf. the two tropes beginning *Gaudendum est nobis* on the following page). The tropes were therefore never «canonized» apart from some rare exceptions and it is in general impossible to make categorical statements on the precise origin of a single trope and the direction of its diffusion. It is *a fortiori* impossible to arrange the MSS. as a whole on stemmatic principles. The editor who wants to make an inventory as complete as possible is bound to chop the trope arrangements into their smallest indivisible parts and present these parts as separate entities. In CT, such constituents are called *elements*.

There is a further difficulty in connection with the transmission of the texts. In many cases they were apparently taken down from memory by scribes who were either ignorant or had extremely modest requirements as regarded meaning. Otherwise, it is hard to explain variants such as *cluens : cludens : cruens : proles and candet : scandet : scandens : candens : cantent in the trope *Et diadema cluens capitis in vertice candet* (CT I, p. 88) or *mo gubernator irero instead of simul (or summo ?) gubernatore rerum* (CT II, pp. 71 f), and variants like *Nominabitur* instead of

---


Dominabitur or Signum replacing Dignum (CT I, p. 81 and p. 80, respectively) do not seem to have been caused by misreading.

In most cases of variance, however, it is quite possible to decide whether a variant represents an error (= not intended) or a redactional interference (= intended) in the text, even though, in the latter case, it is hard to tell which of the readings can claim to be the « original » one. It is, in other words, quite worth while to venture on textual criticism. In spite of the overwhelming mass of nonsensical readings, it must be assumed that the original author (or compiler) and the subsequent redactors at every stage in the conscious formation of tropes had one specific meaning in mind and did not only take pleasure in heaping up syllables corresponding to a given melody. In general, even the most degenerate variants pay respect to the number of syllables of the presumably original reading as well as to the approximate value of its vowels (cf. the examples given above).

Since the Corpus troporum constitutes a professedly philological contribution to the study of the monastic culture of the « dark centuries », no effort should be spared to make philology do its utmost for the benefit of non-philologists (musicologists, theologians, etc.) engaged in the same field of research. The following remarks, which are restricted to the philological aspects, should be regarded as suggestions to that end on behalf of all those who look forward to the completion of this ambitious work.

CTI

The first volume of the Stockholm corpus contains the tropes of the proper of the mass during the Christmas cycle: the first and third Sundays in Advent, the three masses of Christmas, St. Stephen’s Day, St. John the Evangelist’s Day, the Innocents’ Day, and the Epiphany. To the edition of the texts, several tables are added, showing the distribution of the single elements in every MS. cited, a list of previous editions of every element, and a special study on the music of certain introit tropes for Christmas by the French musicologist Nicole Sevestre. A few representative examples of MSS. are reproduced in 31 plates, and in the section of tropi selecti the reader can make his own judgement on the more outstanding specimens of tropes as literary units in their full context.

In the edition (in the strict sense), the trope elements are presented in alphabetical order, according to incipits, a most unfortunate solution from the reader's point of view. In order to find out which elements occur in which order in a certain MS. or group of MSS., the reader is obliged to resort to the tableaux showing the repertory of every single
MS. by means of code numbers referring to a decoding list of incipits of elements that are to be sought in the main part of the book, a most demanding procedure, especially since the different elements are often syntactically intertwined with each other and sometimes also with the basic liturgical texts that are printed in full only in yet another section of the volume. I cannot make out why the elements are not printed in connection with the respective texte de base (the latter preferably printed in full in bold type), in the same order as in the decoding list. Such an arrangement, supplemented, of course, by an alphabetical index of elements, would have saved both valuable space and the reader’s patience. The inconveniences mentioned here may easily be confirmed by taking a rapid look at a number of elements beginning with Qu-.

It would seem that the editors have not described the principal editorial problems in a sufficient manner. It is stated that « l’éditeur commettrait une bévue s’il corrigeait le texte d’un trope en vue de restituer un archétype antérieur au texte dont il dispose effectivement » (p. 38; the editor’s italics). This applies to cases in which an original hexameter may have been altered, with the result that the standard rules of prosody have been violated. What is intended by « archétype » is clearly not the archetype of the given MSS. — it is always the task of textual criticism to try to establish the reading of the archetype or, better still, the original — but a source that was quoted by the author or compiler of tropes. In fact, some corrupt readings of original hexameters really can be emended if due regard is paid to the prosody. An instance of this is the element Salve vera dei proles aethere missus (according to Pa 887), where there is absolutely no need to posit the otherwise unheard-of adverb aethereee (probably thought of as a synonym of caelitus), since the metre is restored by the conjecture <ex> aethere (cf. Aeneis 4,574 deus aethere missus ab alto) and considering also that proles could now and then be spelt prolex 5. There is no reason to suppose any greater ignorance on the part of liturgical authors or compilers of prosodical matters than the manuscript evidence actually makes necessary 6.


6. In fact, not a single one of the 13 « hexameters » qualified as « douteux » (pp. 40 and 224 ff.) has sufficient characteristics to be called a hexameter. On the contrary, as Dr. E. Tidner shows in his paper In tropos liturgicos studia I, in Eranos 75 (1977), pp. 57-69, based on the material of the Stockholm corpus, a restored meaning in genuine but corrupt hexameters also means a restored metre.
The editors recognize the principle that conjectural emendations should avoid, as far as possible, altering the number of syllables (pp. 35 and 265), but they print *Iratus Herodes iussit omnes pueros occidi a bimatu <et> infra in Bethle<hem> civitatem Iude<ae>*, where the only necessary correction seems to be *Bethle<hm> civitate[m]* (cf. I Par 27,23 *noluit autem David numerare eos a viginti annis inferius « those less than twenty years of age »*). *Bethlem* is a disyllable, e.g., in Juvenecus and Prudentius, and even in the tropes, judging from *Laudibus alternis*, where one of the hexameters runs *o quam felix est Iudae Bethlemitica tellus* 7.

The spelling has been normalized in accordance with the standards of Lewis & Short (except, for some reason, *amigdalum, archana, coro, ethiopes, sinagogae, tempnere*) and orthographical peculiarities, such as *aecclesia, spetialis, homnes, fatie, capud*, etc. are not accounted for. This is regrettable, less in view of our knowledge of Latin pronunciation in the 10th and 11th centuries (CT I, p. 35) than in the interests of textual criticism: the corrupt passage *O admirabile clementiae plene sunt Mariae*, printed within crosses, would perhaps be less obscure if the reader were in a position to check the scribe’s graphical habits in the MS. (*Pst 121*).

To a large extent, the tropes consist of quotations or paraphrases of the Bible, the liturgy and the works of the Fathers of the Church. Unfortunately, the editors have refrained from making « time-consuming efforts with no certain advantages » to locate every potential source (p. 38). It would, e.g., have been worth while to identify two of the prologues to the Gospel of St. John 8, which constantly recur, more or less conspicuously, in the elements *Audite fratres, Christi virgo, De sacro, Dilectus iste, Eius arcanum, Eructat puro, Florebit iustus, Hausit, Hic est discipulus, Iusto pectoris, Pectoris, Qui eum, Qui fluenta, Quo*

---


8. The prologue *Hic est Iohannes*, printed, e.g., by Wordsworth and White (*Novum Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Latine*), I, pp. 485 f.: *cui virginitatis in hoc duplex testimonium in evangelio datur, quod et prae ceteris dilectus a deo dicitur, et huiic matrem suam iens ad crucem commendavit deus ut virginem virgo seruaret; and Praefatio incerti auctoris, printed, e.g., in *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, 36, p. xiv: hic autem paуча de temporalibus eius gestis edisserens, sed diuinitas potentiam sublimius contemplans, cum domino ad caelum uolat. Qui enim supra pectus domini in cena recubuit, caelestis haustum sapientiae ceteris excellentius de ipso dominici pectoris fonte potauit... Iste siquidem est Iohannes, quem dominus de fluctuaga nuptiarum tempestate uocauit et cui matrem virginem urginem commendauit.*
ceteris, Revelans, Sacro fonte pectoris, Sacro fonte potavit and Virginitatis. (Such a reference would also shed light on the commentary on the last of these elements.) Further references could be made to the following elements: Amplificare, cf. Ps 117,24; Caelestium, cf. Phil 2,10; Christus in alvum, Corpus antiphonalium officii (CAO), no. 6858; Ecce dominus, CAO, no. 6586; Fare age, cf. Prudentius, Apotheosis, 129; Hodie lux, cf. CAO, no. 6859; Hodie parvulorum, cf. Prudentius, Cathemerinon XII, 100 and 136; Hodie pectore, cf. Venite populi, P. Evans, The Trope Repertory, p. 162; In praesepio, cf. Quodvultdeus, sermo 2 de symbolo, PL 40, 655; Laudibus alternis, cf. Phil 2,13; Lux de luce, cf. CAO, no. 3649; Novo puerolo, cf. Walpole, Early Latin Hymns, 63,5; Olim quem, cf. Walpole, 23,21; Pro qua, Act 6,9 ff.; Qui pater, Io 5,22; Ut possimus, cf. G. Manz, Ausdrucksformen der lateinischen Liturgiesprache, no. 1052 (note the misprint contraire on p. 30). 9.

The following are some remarks on the commentary (pp. 256 ff.). Christum cernentis patitur dum verba minantis in vice (var.: en vice) nos Stephani dominum pulsando canamus agite ETENIM SEDERUNT is translated « Chantons alternativement, avec des coups rythmiques, le maître d'Etienne, qui, voyant le Christ, endure les de celui qui menace », etc. It is highly questionable whether in vice really means « alternativement », as if invicem was intended, and whether it is not to be read en vice, vice being taken as dependent on Stephani (« on behalf of, after the manner of, in the person of, in the name of St. Stephen ») with subsequent adjustment of the translation. Cf. the following parallels: Eia conlevitae in protomartyris Stephani natalicio ex persona ipsius cum psalmista ovantes concinamus ETENIM SEDERUNT; Hodie Stephanus martyr caelos ascendit quem prophetam dudum intuens eius voce dicebat ETENIM SEDERUNT; a similar example applied to Christ is Exultate ... et deo patri canoris vocibus vice filli persona DOMINUS DIXIT <AD ME: FILIUS MEUS ES TU>. The element discussed here is not likely to have a different meaning from the exact parallel in primus init ... En vice nos Stephani dominum pulsando canamus agite ETENIM SEDERUNT.

Constituere dapes mentis dare corporis escas « Ils [the apostles] instituaient qu'il [St. Stephen] donnerait les vivres de l'âme (et) la nourriture du corps ». The editors take this to be an asyndeton ; this assumption is not necessary if one interprets corporis escas as the eucharistic species and dapes mentis as a complement: « He was ordained (a deacon) to...

9. Note also: p. 67 Eccli 15,3 = Sir 15,3; p. 61 Gal 14,4 = Gal 4,4; p. 89 DN 3,100 = Dn 3,100; p. 100 Jov = Joh; p. 155 exsosi = exosi; p. 164 Evangelista = Evangelistes; p. 171 terrens = terreus; p. 265 vîs = vitel.
distribute the Body (of the Lord) as a banquet for the soul». Such an interpretation is all the more plausible in that this is an offertory chant.

_Iam fulget orien... iam venit dominus illuminare nobis._ Here, it is not a question of the ellipsis of an object to _illuminare_ (such as _vitam, mundum_, etc., suggested by the commentary); the element is a reminiscence of St. Luke, 1,78 f. _Visitatit nos orienex alto inluminare his qui in tenebris... sedent_, the infinitive being final and used as intransitivized._10_.

Cf. _CAO_, no. 3184 _Illuminare, Domine, his qui in tenebris sedent_ (a mediopassive imperative)._11_ Likewise, the parallel _Iam surgens aurora iam veniet_ (var.: _venit et_) _dies iam venit dominus illuminare nobis_ _lumen vitae_ does not yield the meaning «déjà le Seigneur est arrivé pour nous illuminer de la lumière de la vie» but rather «the Lord is coming to shine for us as the Light of Life» (cf. St. John, 8,12), _lumen vitae_ being a predicative attribute.

_CT II_

The prosula writer was constrained by the structure of a pre-existing melody. His task was more demanding, in many cases too demanding, it would seem. The prosulas have often come down to us in a rather abstract and sometimes even meaningless form, due to the limited talents of their makers and the ordinary errors of copyists. It is a matter of course that a prosula seldom exhibits metrical or rhythmical form; on the other hand, the number of syllables ought to be more predictable than in the «logogene» _12_ tropes. The task of an editor is at the same time a more challenging and a more rewarding one.

Dr. Marcusson’s purpose was to include all _alleluia_ prosulas up to c. 1100, except those contained only in MS. 79 at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. It is not stated why the eleventh-century Beneventan prosula _Agebatur maximum hinc silentium_ (cf. Karl-Heinz Schlager’s contribution in _Festschrift Bruno Stäblein zum 70. Geburtstag_, Kassel, etc., 1967, pp. 217 ff.) is omitted, nor is it explained (for instance, by identifying the _texte de base_ as an _alleluia_ verse) what constitutes the status of nos. 3, 14, 15, 16, 20, 28, 35, etc. as _alleluia_ prosulas, since they do not contain the word _alleluia_. The definition given on p. 8 that «melogene» tropes are syllabic is erroneous, if stated

---


_12._ Using the terminology suggested by C. Sachs, “logogene” tropes are those in which the music has been composed to pre-existing words and “melogene” tropes are those in which the music is primary or the text and music have been produced simultaneously (cf. CT II, pp. 7 f.).
categorically. Italics are used, according to the information given on p. 15, to indicate those parts of the texts that constitute a complete entremêlement, i.e. identity of the basic liturgical text and the trope, and this statement is correct so far, but the editor should not have added « et si le texte de base n’est ni orné de mélismes ni marqué d’une autre façon », which is obviously misleading, since many of the italicized words were to be sung melismatically.

The editor nowhere explains his own critical principles and this is certainly embarrassing, considering the fact that the prosulas display a greater variety of distinct redactions (and not only textual variants of single words) than do other types of tropes. There is no reason to yield to the « eclectic » temptation to blur the borderlines between separate redactions in order to restore an acceptably meaningful textual form, the disadvantage of which is that it never existed in reality. Two phenomena should be taken into consideration: the general tendency for the prosula, which was originally closely modelled on the basic text, to be given a more independent and conspicuous structure (e.g. parallel cola) by later redactors (B. Stäblein, op. cit., col. 807; J. Smits van Waesberghe, op. cit., p. 154) and the well-known fact that scribes who do not understand their text are inclined to construct a lectio facilior.

Both of these circumstance ought to have been taken into account, with considerable profit, in prosula no. 4,2 Amauit eum dominus. The printed text does not correspond fully to any of the three MSS., in spite of the facts that Apt 18 is the only one with a complete entremêlement of the basic text (= CAO, nos. 1359 and 6080) and the trope, that Apt 18 is the only version which (after some slight adjustments: flamme = flammen, perpetua = perpetue, a dittography of four words) represents by far the most consistent meaning, and lastly, that the same MS. has the reading strofioque castitatis, clearly a lectio difficilior, against the tropho castitatis of the other two MSS. It is also highly plausible, since Ekkehardt IV, the same man who supplied one of the rare contemporary hints on the early history of trope-writing 13, makes a holy lady admonish a half-naked young man thus: Castitatis, inquit, fili mi, tibi cingulum ... accipe, continentiaeque strophio ab hac deinceps die ... te praecinctum memento (Casus sancti Galli, 57, ed. Meyer von Knonau, p. 214).

There is another example of editorial ecleticism in prosula 15,1, Arbiter singulorum, which has come down to us in eight MSS. Marcusson has rightly brought three of these together (= α in the apparatus), because of certain obvious errores conciunctivi, but he nevertheless

---
accepts the variant *scruteris* instead of the clearly superior *trutines* in the context *examinis tui libra ne trutines seruorum acta*. The last four words are written thus in Mü 14843; group α has *neque scruteris seruorum acta*; other variants are *nec trutinans s. a.; nec rutilans s. a.; conrutilans s. a.*; and even *nec uentilem temporum actans*. Apart from the fact that readings like *nec rutilans* can easily be explained as palaeographic errors or mishearings of *ne trutines* followed by unsuccessful scribal emendations, there is a literary source for this expression, St. Ambrose, *Epistola 2,14* (PL 16, 883), *piis mentibus consideranda (est) statera qua singulorum facta trutinantur*; further instances will be found in Blaise and Du Cange, s.v. *trutino*.

This shows that the indefatigable search for support in literary sources is not only a favour to the reader but also and above all the editor's duty for his own sake. Even Bible quotations are only indicated sporadically: out of 86 *textes de base*, 63 are taken from the Scripture or at least inspired by a specific scriptural passage, but only in some cases is this stated. In text no. 1,2, the reader is told that the first line alludes to Ps 44,3, but nothing is said about the fact that the basic text is verse 15 of the same psalm, which is not, of course, pure coincidence. The editor would not have placed 23,4 *Sancti patronis ... de quo David cecinit prophet a dicens* together with the other prosulas of Pentecost had he considered, among other things, that the verse *Dum complerentur* is not a part of the Psalms. In 79,3,2-3 *sanc te spiritus sanctissime spirans ubi uis artifex spiritus*, he would not, of course, have bracketed *ubi* as spurious, had he identified *spirans ubi uis* as a reminiscence of Io 3,8 *spiritus ubi vult spiral*. In 16,1,5-6 *de quo (sc. Iohanne) salvator factus est non mulierum maior natus est*, Marcusson would not have accepted the MS. reading *factus est* if he had analysed the biblical contexts. In 59,13,3-4 *quae (sc. Maria) meruisti portare saeculi uitam speciosum prae filiis hominum formâ*, Marcusson has identified Ps 44,3 but alters *speciosum* without reason to *speciosa*; *speciosum ... forma* is an apposition to *saeculi uitam* and *formâ* is a limitative ablative, here as well as in the Psalm (cf. 1,2,1 f f. *Forma specioso sponso ... Adducentur regi virgines*).

Even non-scriptural sources are exploited abundantly, and the consciousness of this would have saved the editor from several mistakes and helped him considerably in the heavy task of conjectural criticism. Lines 37,9,7 ff. run: *In his quoque delectentur in laetitia quae (so I would read; Marcusson accepts the quem of the single MS.) totus non capit orbis* (here, Marcusson indicates a lacuna) *sed quibus datum est iuste petentibus certantes (certantibus Marcusson) in agone carnis*. Obviously both the author and the scribe(s) must have known the famous distich *Virgo Dei genetrix, quem totus non capit orbis / in tua se clausit viscera*
factus homo (used as an antiphon at Christmas and on September 8; cf. CAO, no. 5448). The whole passage makes sense if one takes quem to be a distortion of quae due to hypercorrect normalization, according to the well-known pattern. This cliché is overlapped by another one, Matthew 19,11 non omnes capiunt verbum istud sed quibus datum est. There is no need to posit a lacuna or to alter certantes; the following translation is possible: « Also those still struggling in the combat against the flesh may rejoice in the (heavenly) things that the whole world cannot grasp, but (only) those to whom it has been given », etc.

The prosulas 4,6a and 4,7 contain conspicuous borrowings from Sulpicius Severus, Dialogus 2,2,1 (cf. Venantius Fortunatus, Vita S. Martini 3,54 f.), and they are therefore (at least originally) designed for the feast of St. Martin of Tours. Likewise, no. 20,1-3 is nothing but a paraphrase of some passages in the Dialogi (PL 66, 126 and 202) of St. Gregory the Great, the popular legend of St. Benedict. It is indicated that 22,3a,1-2, Dulce lignum dulces clauos dulcia ferens pondra quae sola juisti digna sustinere regem caelorum et dominum resembles Venantius’s hymn Pange lingua; it would have been more interesting to have stated their common origin, the legend of the exaltation of the Cross, printed by Migne among the works of Hrabanus Maurus (PL 110, 131-134).

Sometimes, a rather peculiar mode of expression can be explained as a word-for-word borrowing from famous hymns; thus, for instance, nisibus totis in 23,4,2 and 37,8,2 is taken from Ecce iam noctis (Analecta hymnica LI, 31: nisibus totis rogitemus omnes / cunctipotentem) and the abrupt beginning Precamur idem supplices in 25,1,1 is in fact a iambic dimeter, beginning the fourth strophe of Somno refectis artubus (Analecta hymnica LI,27).

All these observations indicate that the trope-makers largely had recourse to pre-existing patterns, and this knowledge can be very helpful when one is faced with some seemingly hopelessly corrupted lines. The editor resigns himself to accepting 59,14,1-2 Mirantur ergo saecula quod <...> tabstulit turre dedit almo germinat. This is clearly an echo of the hymn Quem terra pontus aethera (Analecta hymnica L, 86; MGH, Auct. ant. IV, 1, p. 385), in which one of the stanzas begins Mirantur ergo saecula quod angelus fert semina and, later on, we find the source of the corrupt passage: quod Heva tristis abstulit tu reddis almo germine. The trope compiler thus made a conscious contamination of two separate expressions in the same hymn.

Using the same comparative method on 35,2,7 ff., which is in fact nothing but an adaptation of the sequence Vexilla martyrum sacra (Analecta hymnica VII, 211, 8b-9b), we can easily resolve all the remai-
ning difficulties: *ubi martyrum splendidata* (MS., *splendida* Marcusson) 
turba glorificat trinam essentiam. *O quam beata domata* (dogmata MS., 
Marcusson) sanctorum, *ubi iubilamina sonant* (sonat MS., Marcusson), 
*ubi iam bonitas tua intercessu* (intercessio MS., *intercessione* Marcusson) 
martyrum nos perducat in aeternum. The noun *doma* (*dôma*) is of parti-
cular interest, since it has survived in French and indirectly in the 
English « dome » (Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 
3, s.v. *doma*).

Another « passage obscur » can be elucitated by means of one of the 
most famous of all Latin hymns, the sapphic *Ut queant laxis*, ascribed 
1953, pp. 166 f.), the first stanza of which furnished the solmization 
syllables, *ut*, *re*, *mi*, etc. (W. Apel, *Gregorian Chant*, Bloomington & 
(*organa, miris, fibris, famulis*) of this hymn. A panegyric stanza that 
served as a model for later poems in honour of St. John the Baptist also 
gives a key to the understanding of the last line of the prosula: *<ut>* 
possint post haec ter denis (donis MS., Marcusson) sertis coronari. Why 
ter denis? The original has Matthew 13,23 in view; the prosula is an 
expression of insipid mannerism.

Another aspect not taken into consideration with sufficient consist-
tency is the liturgical situation intended for the singular prosula ele-
ments (cf. *Sancti patronis* dealt with above). It is a well-known fact that 
a liturgical text written for the feast of a certain saint, with or even 
without the necessary adjustments, could be used for any other saint in 
the same category. Line 4,3,2 in one MS. runs (*sollemnitas colitur ...*) 
sancti Rufini cuites sunt acta and in another sancti confessoris tu i 
Siluestri. If it is possible to prove that certain individual features in a 
text fit one saint better than another, it can be assumed that the text was 
originally conceived for the former. Accordingly, prosulas 4,3-5 were 
almost certainly designed to fit a martyr (cf. 4,5,1 ff. *Arma tyrannica ...
non timuit ulla nec minas regum; ... uicit certamina*) like Rufinus rather 
than a confessor, and the readings of the martyr version (of *Vro 107*) 
should be given precedence (which Marcusson also does). Prosula 12,1, 
however, has nothing to do with the Gloria of the Mass but precedes 
the solemn *alleluia* of the Easter Vigil. Texts 73,3-4 call for a commen-

---

15. Cf. the hymn *Iste confessor*, perhaps originally composed in honour of 
St. Martin of Tours, but later, less happily, used indiscriminately in the Common 
of confessors; *Hymni instaurandi Breviarii Romani*, Città del Vaticano, 1968, 
p. 168.
tary on why the words *Laus tibi Christe* seem to play the role of an *alleluia* : these prosulas were intended for the Innocents’ Day (*Laudent lactentes omnes Christum puerum*), when the liturgy refrained from the *alleluia* 16. The verse *Mirabantur omnes* (no. 45) obviously belongs to the Sundays after Epiphany, and this is not without interest to the reader, since prosula 45,2 forms a compendium of the gospels of the Christmas and Epiphany period 17.

Considerations of the liturgical « milieu » are, in fact, the only key to the understanding of seriously corrupt passages like 81,2a, a prosula to the verse *Venite ad me*. It must be made clear, first of all, that these songs were used at the feasts of the Apostles and that the verse (= Matthew 11,28), as well as the adjoined prosula, are hought of as Christ’s apostrophe to his Apostles. The version of the MS. *Wo* 79 is printed as a separate redtion (81,1b-2b). As in prosula 4,2 (discussed above), it can be maintained that the partly seemingly meaningless text 81,2a of MS. *Apt. 18* comes closest to the original:

1 *Venite filii lucis aeterna ad me*  
o *uos omnes qui ponis nubilo*  
3 *transitis limina*  
et *uerba reseratis portans in aethera*  
5 *polorum cernetis agmina*

Varr.: 2 *ponis*] polis *Pa* 776, ponitis *Pa* 1084 3 *transitis] plauditis* *Pa* 1084, *Pa* 776, reclusaditis Marcusson 4 *uerbo* *Pa* 1084, *Pa* 776 reseratis] instauratis *Pa* 776 *portas* *Pa* 1084, *posta* *Pa* 776 5 praeclara sedulius dogmata *Pa* 1084, praeclera sedulans dogmata *Pa* 776.

I suggest the following emendations of the *Apt 18* text: *ponis > bonis* ; *nubilo > nubila* ; *transitis > panditis* ; *uerbo > uerbo* ; *portans > portas* ; cf. *Analecta hymnica* VII, 183,5 Petre qui maxima reseras clausa *verbo caeli limina* ; ibid. 218,7 da ... *ut polorum intret limina* (sc. *caterva*) and ibid. 69,5 (Christus) *excelsa pandit limina* ; *Analecta hymnica* LI, 216 Petre ... *peccati vincula resolve tibi potestate tradita qua cunctis caelum verbo claudis aperis*. The futural *cernetis* goes easily with lines 7 f. *et ego reficiam ... uos : « You will behold the hosts of heaven ... and I will refresh you »* ; concerning *cerno*, cf. prosula 26,2a,6-7 *discurrent* (sc. *iusti*) *in aeternum ... dominum gloriae cernentes*.

Commenting upon prosula 40,9, printed among prosulas to the verse *Iustus ut palma*, Marcusson expresses the suspicion that this text


belongs rather to the mass of St. Andrew, because of the last word suauitatis, which also constitutes the ending of the verse (19) Dilexit Andream dominus in odorem suauitatis. This hypothesis is supported also by lines 40,9,3-4 petamus ... ut eius intercessio sit pro nobis, a rather far-fetched expression for what is prayed for in the collect of St. Andrew’s Day in the following way: exoramus ut ... beatus Andreas ... apud te sit pro nobis perpetuus intercessor (J. Deshusses, Le sacramentaire grégorien, no. 770).

Greater attention should have been paid to readings represented in MS. Apt 18, as a general rule. The reading (17,2a,6-7) regna(t) omnia supra et infera uicit a ligno (sc. dominus), (cf. Ps 95,10 dominus regnavit a ligno, according to the Psalterium Romanum; R. Weber, Le psautier romain, p. 237) is clearly superior to Marcusson’s emendation regnat omnia supera et imperauit a ligno, since the antithesis is lost. Lines 37,2,10-11 should be read interuentu sanctorum (= Apt 18, Ivr 60) piissime quorum festa ueneramur and not interuentu quorum piissime [quorum] nunc festa ueneramur (Ockham’s razor!). On lines 41,2,5-6 printed by Marcusson qui cunctos saluat sua magna potentia neminem aliquem scilicet (...) suo merito, he is obliged to comment « aliquem est pléonastique » and to posit a lacuna: the variant of Apt 18, aliquo (cf. aliquos Pa 1084, Pa 776), makes perfectly good sense (and good theology) without any such assumptions.

There are several other objections to be made against the editor’s textual criticism. Prosula 24,2. as it stands in the edition, lends itself to ridicule: ferente (for fatente ?) domino : « Nullus maior in hac uulua » (6), alluding to Matthew 11,11 non surrexit inter natos mulierum maior Iohanne Baptistae (cf. Luke 7,28); it suggests that John the Baptist had at least one twin brother. The words in hac are certainly an error (presumably for natus) caused by hac aula in line 5. And later on (John the Baptist is apostrophized): in aethereo regno in quo nos tecum ferre studeto ut simul uultu laeto iocundemur in aluo illo lucido structo a deo (12-16). Marcusson translates: « Réjouissons-nous de ce sein pur », that is, of Elizabeth. This, however, seems to be rather poor for an object of the Beatific Vision. Even if aluo is right, it must clearly mean something else than Elisabeth’s womb, preferably « a dwelling », since it is said to be « built by God » (cf. II Cor 5,1, aedificationem ex Deo habemus domum non manufactam aeternam in caelis). A plausible, if not certain, alternative is aulae (cf. St. Ambrose, Hexaemeron 3,1,5 ecclesiam sanctam in qua refugent aulae caelestia). Juvencus uses the word to denote the three tents that Peter wanted to raise during the Transfiguration: singula sub noctem quae vos aulae receptent (3,329).

In 33,3,4 a cuncta ablues facinora, it is not necessary to expunge the
preposition, as the editor does (cf. Analecta hymnica VII, 197,7 Domine, suscipe laudes, ut nos ablues a crimina, commented upon by L. Elfving, Étude lexicographique sur les séquences limousines (Acta universitatis Stockholmiensis, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 7), p. 45) 18. Prosula 59,3c is printed as a separate redaction of substantially the same text as in 59,3a and 3b; it is, therefore, not justifiable to consider pro nobis in dei genitrix quia sic pro nobis meruisti fieri as an interpolation. In 75,1,1, Marcusson has accepted the reading fulciti of the single MS. (A lenitate gloriae tuae fulciti decorique). This form of he participle is possible, though it has no parallels in these texts (cf. 40,3,3 fult), and fulgidi undoubtedly goes better with decori.

In the commentary, which is more rewarding than that of CT I, one searches for a reference to the striking intransitivization in 19,1,4 rete cepit sociante germano (sc. Andreas), cf. Feltenius, op. cit., p. 126. The expression carne dignatus es fieri (33,4,13-14) is qualified as « bizarre »; it is, in fact, no more bizarre than, e.g., Venantius’s words in Pange lingua: atque ventre virginali / carne factus prodiit or in his Vexilla regis: crucis mysterium / quo carne carnis conditor / suspensus est patibulo (MGH, Auct. ant., IV : 1, pp. 28 and 34, respectively). This carne is an ablativus limitationis (cf. I Pe 3,18 mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu). In 52,3,5, the expression confacta inferni tartara is not an accusative absolute but an absolute ablative of the feminine singular tartara (cf. Elfving, op. cit., p. 32). The two cases of an adnominal dative (59,3 ciuibus superis dominatrix and 62,4,3 adiutor iis) at least call for some sort of remark, especially as there is no syntactical index to the book.

Uppsala Anders Piltz.

---

18. Quite a number of neutre nouns occur in the plural in the well-supported endeavour to make words end in -a in alleluia prosulas; CT II, p. 14 (concerning the same tendency in sequence poetry, cf. Elfving, op. cit., pp. 7 ff.; Smits van Waesberghie, op. cit., p. 154). In 22,5,4 ferens pondera nec non commercia, the last word is nothing but a synonym of pretium (cf. Gregorius Turonensis, In gloria martyrum 10 : quos pretiosi sanguinis commercio reparavit); it is, accordingly, not to be translated « commerce, échange, participation ».