



Articles from 2013 and after
are now only accessible on
the Chicago Journals website at
JOURNALS.UCHICAGO.EDU

The Gregorian Antiphonary of Silos and the Spanish Melody of the Lamentations

Author(s): R. P. Casiano Rojo

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Jul., 1930), pp. 306-324

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2848747>

Accessed: 04-04-2016 14:47 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*

THE GREGORIAN ANTIPHONARY OF SILOS AND THE SPANISH MELODY OF THE LAMENTATIONS¹

R. P. CASIANO ROJO, O.S.B.

THE practical difficulty brought about in Spain in the eleventh and twelfth centuries by the substitution of the Roman for the Mozarabic liturgy was great and embarrassing; for, as it was necessary to shelve the manuscripts of the Spanish rite, the churches found themselves without the indispensable instruments for celebrating the various sacraments and offices of the new use. It is clear that the change was not brought about in a day, nor made simultaneously in all parts of Spain; for it could be accomplished only by the acquisition of new books, and this was difficult because of the comparative scarcity of manuscripts and the time and expense involved in the transcription of copies. Some churches acquired foreign texts; others had copies made with a rapidity remarkable for that time. In general these copies reproduced the script and musical notation of the original manuscript, but there were a few exceptions to the rule. The monks of Silos, although they adopted the Romano-Monastic rite, continued to use Visigothic script and notation for a time, as is proved by two eleventh-century *Breviaries*, now preserved in the British Museum, in which the whole of the Divine Office according to the new use is written in the old manner.² In certain Catalan manuscripts, among them an eleventh-century antiphonary now preserved in the ex-Colegiata of San Feliu in Gerona, although French minuscule is used for the text, the musical notation still conserves certain Visigothic elements.³ All the other manuscripts

¹ Translated from Spanish by Walter Muir Whitehill, Jr.

² B. M. *Add. 30848, Breuiarium de toto (anni) circulo* and *Add. 30850, Breuiarium seu Antiphonale Silense*. *Add. 30850* contains the office of Santo Domingo de Silos, added in an appendix a few years after his death in 1073.

³ Cf. reproduction in Miguel Rué y Rubió, *Canto Gregoriano. Cooperación á la Edición Vaticana de Libros de Canto Liturgico* (Gerona, 1905), pp. 70, 71.

of the period that I have seen are written in French minuscule with the Aquitanian notation that originated in the south of France and spread to Spain, where it soon took the place of the older Visigothic notation.

Ordinarily the new copies reproduced the text of the original, with the omission of feasts not celebrated in Spain, but without the addition of proper offices for Spanish saints. The reason is obvious: it was not an auspicious period for the composition of new offices and the new Roman rite was not easily accepted by the people. For Spanish feasts the *Commune Sanctorum* was used, with lessons read from the *Passiones* that had been used up to that time. In the administration of the sacraments and in other rites the Mozarabic tradition persisted with more or less stubbornness, as is witnessed by the presence of various older prayers and ceremonies in the manuscripts of that period.¹

In the *Liber Ordinum* from San Millán de la Cogolla² the Visigothic notation of nearly the whole of the *Agenda mortuorum*, the burial office, has been erased and Aquitanian neums substituted. There are two possible explanations for the change: either that a Cluniac cantor, obliged to use the manuscript when the Mozarabic liturgy was still current, wished to read the music in a notation better known to him; or that the Mozarabic office for the burial of the dead was used for some time after the general suppression of the liturgy, so that it was necessary to replace the Visigothic neums by the then general Aquitanian notation. The first hypothesis seems hardly probable; for a similar substitution is found neither in the other pages of the *Liber Ordinum* nor in any of the other manuscripts from San Millán. The second seems more likely, for the Roman musical formula '*saeculorum. Amen*' has been added at the end of the antiphons, which would be inexplicable had the change been made before the suppression of the Mozarabic liturgy.

¹ Even today in Toledo the burial office differs considerably from the Roman use.

² Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, *MS. 56*.

CONTENTS AND ORIGIN OF THE SILOS MANUSCRIPT

The *Silos Antiphonary*¹ is a manuscript of 396 leaves, measuring 268 x 197 mm., written in double columns of about 34 lines each averaging 175 x 50 mm. It is composed of fifty gatherings of eight leaves each, with the exception of the forty fourth which is of four leaves.

The scheme of the gatherings is as follows: I⁸ (i-viii); II⁸ (ix-xvi); III⁸ (xvii-xxiv); IV⁸ (xxv-xxxii); V⁸ (xxxiii-xl); VI⁸ (xli-xxlviii); VII⁸ (xlix-lvi); VIII⁸ (lvii-lxiv); IX⁸ (lxv-lxxii); X⁸ (lxxiii-lxxx); XI⁸ (lxxxi-lxxxviii); XII⁸ (lxxxix-xcvi); XIII⁸ (xcvii-civ); XIV⁸ (cv-cxii); XV⁸ (cxiii-cxx); XVI⁸ (cxxi-cxxviii); XVII⁸ (cxxxix cxxx cxxxii [cxxxii] | [cxxxiii] cxxxiv cxxxv cxxxvi); XVIII⁸ (cxxxvii-cxliv); XIX⁸ (i-viii); XX⁸ (ix-xvi); XXI⁸ (xvii-xxiv); XXII⁸ (xxv-xxxii); XXIII⁸ (xxxiii-xl); XXIV⁸ (xli-xxlviii); XXV⁸ (xlix-lvi); [XXVI⁸ (lvii-lxiv)]; XXVII⁸ (lxv-lxxii); XXVIII⁸ (lxxiii-lxxx); XXIX⁸ (lxxxi-lxxxviii); XXX⁸ (lxxxix-xcvi); XXXI⁸ (xcvii-civ); XXXII⁸ (cv-cxii); XXXIII⁸ (cxiii-cxx); XXXIV⁸ (cxxi-cxxviii); XXXV⁸ (cxxxix-cxxxvi); XXXVI⁸ (cxxxvii-cxliv); XXXVII⁸ (cxlv-clii); XXXVIII⁸ (cliii-clx); XXXIX⁸ (clxi-clxviii); XL⁸ (clxix-clxxvi); XLI⁸ (clxxvii-clxxxiv); XLII⁸ (clxxxv-cxcii); XLIII⁸ (cxciii-cc); XLIV⁸ (ccii-ccviii); XLV⁸ (ccix-ccxvi); XLVI⁴ (217-220); XLVII⁸ (221-228); XLVIII⁸ (229-236); XLIX⁸ (237-244); L⁸ (245-252); LI⁸ (253-260); LII³ (261-262, 263 bound in on stubs).

The manuscript appears to have been bound originally in two volumes, as there is an accurate foliation in red Roman numerals, contemporary with the manuscript and in two series. Gatherings I — XVIII are numbered from i to cxliv; gatherings XIX — XLV are in a separate series from i to ccxvi, while gatherings XLVI — LII are unnumbered. A few leaves are wanting at the end.²

The manuscript contains the following books — in an earlier period written separately — necessary for the recitation of a complete office: the *Antiphonarium*, composed of the antiphons and responses; the *Lectionarium*, with the selections from the Bible and

¹ MS. 9 in the Archives of Santo Domingo de Silos.

² There is no modern foliation, and accordingly, to distinguish the two series of numbers, those of the second foliation will be referred to in the following manner: *fol. xxiv*^o.

other books that are read as lessons; the *Psalterium* containing the necessary Psalms and Canticles; and, at the end, the *Hymnarium*. The months of March and April of the *Proprium Sanctorum*¹ and the end of the *Hymnarium* are wanting.

There is no colophon or subscription that gives the precise date and place of composition, but the script seems to be of the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century.² The manuscript is written in a superbly regular French minuscule that gives almost the effect of a printed page: it seems likely that it was copied directly from a French original, in so much as the punctuation and the abbreviations are entirely French and show no influence of Visigothic usage. This is confirmed by the presence in the text of a number of homilies ascribed to Dom Herico or Heyricus, a ninth century monk of St Germain d' Auxerre,³ and the offices of French saints such as St Radegonde and St Brice, Bishop of Tours.

The manuscript is of Spanish origin, or at least written for use in Spain, as may be seen from an examination of the Calendar, which contains two feasts for St James the Great, that of July 25, celebrated with an octave, and the Translation, observed on December 30. The *Proprium Sanctorum* contains a great number of Spanish saints, many of whom were not honored in other countries, such as SS. Fructuoso, Augurio, and Eulogio, St Ildefonso of Toledo, St Eulalia de Barcelona, St Leandro, St Rosendo, St Prudencio, St Torcuato and companions, St Pelagio, St Zoilo, St Marina, St Justa and St Rufina, St Cucufato, SS. Verisimo, Máxima, and Julia, SS. Vincente, Sabina, and Cristeta, SS. Lupercio, Claudio, and Victorino, St Millán, SS. Acisclo and Victoria, SS. Facundo and Primitivo, St Leocadia, St Eulalia de Mérida, the *Commemoratio Sanctae Mariae* of December 18, and the translation of St Isidore. The sung portions of these offices are, in general, taken from the Common of Saints,

¹ Contained in the missing gathering, foll. lvii^o-lxiv^o.

² The manuscript cannot be anterior to 1170, as it contains a commemoration of the translation of S. Rosendo, which took place in that year. Cf. Antonio de Yepes, *Coronica General de la Orden de San Benito* (Valladolid, 1615), fol. 14.

³ This Heyricus wrote some 64 homilies, the introduction to which is published in the *Patrologia Latina*, cxxiv, 1129-1132. He was later honored as a saint, but in the manuscript he is referred to only as *Dom*.

but the manuscript contains two new antiphons in honor of St James in which he is invoked with the title of *patrone singularis*. The lessons and homilies are taken from the *Passiones* that were read in Spanish churches during the Mozarabic period.¹

The offices are arranged according to the monastic use, but there is no indication that the manuscript was originally intended for use at Silos. It is true that an office is provided for St Sebastian, patron of the Silos church, but it is joined to the commemoration of St Fabian, as is the universal custom: there is no mention of Santo Domingo de Silos, the patron of the monastery, for whom an office is always provided in Silos manuscripts.² On the contrary, there are strong arguments for the monastery of San Salvador de Celanova in Galicia. The first of these is that the manuscript contains a proper office for the feast of the Transfiguration, the patronal feast of Celanova. This observance, which is of eastern origin, did not become general in the western church until 1456, and, although it was celebrated from the twelfth century on in monasteries dependent on Cluny, from which it might have spread to an independent house like Celanova, it seems that the importance given to it in this manuscript, where an octave is provided with a great number of pices for the days *infra octauam*, must be the result of a local observance. The second argument in favour of Celanova is the presence not only of the feast of St Rosendo, the founder and patron of the monastery, but also an office commemorating his translation, an observance clearly of local origin which, according to Yepes³ was celebrated in Celanova. Finally this attribution explains the presence of an office for St Giraldo, a native of southern France, at one time Precentor of Toledo, who later became Archbishop of Braga, the ecclesiastical province to which Celanova belonged.

Musically the manuscript is of considerable importance. It was one of the principal sources consulted by Dom Pothier in preparing

¹ The authors of some of these lessons are known; that of St Ildefonso was composed by Cixila, an eighth-century Archbishop of Toledo, and that of St Pelayo is the work of a Galician priest, Raguel.

² Cf. *Brit. Mus., Add. 30850*, foll. 219–221, which is of the eleventh century.

³ Antonio de Yepes, *Coronica General de la Orden de San Benito*, v, fol. 15.

the 1891 edition of the Solesmes *Antiphonary*,¹ that has more recently become the basis of the present official Vatican edition. The notation is of the Aquitanian superposed point system, written with a single red line, but with the diastematic intervals so carefully calculated that it can be read with the same rapidity as a modern musical text with a complete staff. The Gregorian tradition represented is good and lawful, although like all the manuscripts of this period there is a certain tendency toward the embellishment and elaboration of the melody and the notes.

Among the music which it contains are several unpublished pieces, worthy of being better known; not the least interesting of these are two antiphons in honor of the patron of Spain, St James, which probably date from the suppression of the Mozarabic liturgy. It is unfortunate that they have not been included in the office of St James that is at present in use.

IN NATALE S. IACOBI
I. VESP. AD MAGNIFICAT. (1).

t. 6.

O be - á - te Ia - có - be, ómni -
um cor - de, o - re, uo - ce can - tán - de:
Pa - tró - ne sin - gu - lá - ris, a - má -
bi - lis, in - ter - cé - de pro no - bis
ad Dó - mi - num .

¹ *Liber Antiphonarius pro diurnis horis juxta ritum monasticum calendario Ordinis Sancti Benedicti accomodatus* (Solesmes: Imprimerie Saint-Pierre, 1891).

II. VESP. AD MAGNIFICAT (2).

t. 4.

San - cte Ia - có - be , inter - cé -
 de pro no - bis , ut con - sor - tes gló - ri - ae
 San - ctó - rum te - cum éf - fi - ci me -
 re - á - mur .

(1) cf. fol. XCViv.* (2) fol. XCVIv.*

THE LAMENTATIONS

The manuscript contains four special tones for the Lamentations of Holy Week and one for the *Oratio Ieremiae*, which I have already published with three of the tones of the Lamentations;¹ the fourth is unpublished, and appears for the first time at the end of this article. For convenience of reference the beginning of the three other tones and the *Oratio* are also given at the end.

Various Spanish manuscripts anterior and posterior to the Silos *Antiphony* contain similar melodies of the Lamentations. Only the first and simplest formula — from which the other three and many other melodies of unequal value found in Spanish manuscripts developed — is found in the earliest manuscripts. The Visigothic Bible of San Pedro de Cardeña,² dating from the tenth or eleventh century, which is now preserved in the Universidad Pontificia in

¹ *Cantus Lamentationum apud Hispanos usurpatus quem ex codice Silensi saeculo XIII conscripto nunc primum iuris publice fecit* (Bilbao, 1917). Copies may still be had from "Orfeo Tracio" (n. d.), Génova, 19, Madrid.

² Cf. A. Andrés, *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* LX (1912), 101-146.

Burgos, contains in foll. 236 and 237 with the first two chapters of the Lamentations of Jeremiah a simple melody in Mozarabic neums that, to all appearances, is that of the first melody of the Silos manuscript. This is also found in a *Lectionary*, now preserved in the collection of D. Narciso Sambola in Gerona, written in the eleventh-century with the superposed point notation.¹ A thirteenth-century *Antiphonary* in the Archives of the Cathedral of Huesca contains two tones, still simple although slightly more elaborate than those of the Cardeña and Gerona manuscripts: one, appointed for Maundy Thursday, is similar to No. I, without the formula of the third phrase; the other, used for the Lamentations of Holy Saturday and for the *Oratio Ieremiae*, is similar to No. III, but in both the cadences are shorter and a little monotonous.

In the Archives of the Cathedral of Toledo there is a fourteenth-century *Breviary*² that contains the tones of the Lamentations. The first (Maundy Thursday) resembles No. II, but with the order of the first and second cadences interchanged: the final phrase is entirely different, and resembles the melody of the *Exultet* found in many Spanish missals. The first and second tones of Maundy Thursday somewhat resemble No. I in the general theme, but are quite different in the greater part of the cadences. The other tones of this manuscript have no resemblance to the Silos manuscript, nor are they found in older documents: their character is that of a much more modern period.

Since the sixteenth century all the Spanish cathedrals and collegiate churches have possessed beautiful, and sometimes richly decorated, *Pasionarios*³ that contained various tones for the Lamentations, the greater part of which reproduced more or less faithfully those of the previously mentioned Toledo manuscript: however, nearly all of these added some new tones, some of which, being little more than old formulas put to new uses, are of slight interest, while others are actually new and of greater importance.

¹ Three columns of this manuscript are reproduced by Rué y Rubió, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 67

² *MS.* 35.9.

³ So called because, among the other things, the account of the Passion according to the four Gospels occupied the principal place.

A fifteenth-century *Troper*, No. 23 of the Cathedral Archives of León, written in a heavy superposed point notation with a single line, concludes with a series of Lamentations, the richest in variants of any that I have seen, though many of them bear little relation to the traditional tones and date from the period in which the manuscript was written.

However, none of the other manuscripts containing the Lamentations mentioned in this study can be compared to the *Silos Antiphonary* for the combination of truly classical restraint and all the variety possible in this type of music: these melodies possess the unity and the natural flowing quality of the best Gregorian compositions. The general tone is one of serenity and resignation.

ORIGIN OF THE SILOS LAMENTATIONS

In their general nature and scale these melodies resemble fundamentally many Roman recitatives, such as the oldest melody of the Collects (*ad libitum*, No. 1 in the Vatican edition),¹ and those of the Prefaces and the *Pater Noster*: the details in which the Lamentations differ from these Roman melodies are all found in the Gregorian antiphonary.

Unfortunately it is impossible to trace a satisfactory relationship with authentic Mozarabic melodies, as so few have been deciphered, but, notwithstanding, in those that are known some of the motives of the Lamentations are found. The first part of the *Oratio Ieremiae*, *Recordare Domine quid acciderit nobis* is identical, note for note, with the beginning of the two antiphons *Si ascendero in caelum* and *Manus tua Deus deducet me* of the Mozarabic *Agenda mortuorum*.²

The *Oferencio* (Ordo Missae) given by Cisneros to the Mozarabic Chapel of Corpus Christi in Toledo Cathedral in the parts relating to music is inspired by the same fundamental themes as the Lamentations and the oldest recitatives of the Roman rite, and more

¹ *Graduale Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae de Tempore et de Sanctis* (Rome: Tipografia Vaticana, 1908), pp. 96*-97.*

² Cf. R. P. Casiano Rojo and R. P. Germán Prado, *El Canto Mozárabe, Estudio histórico-crítico de su Antigüedad y Estado actual* (Barcelona: Diputación Provincial, 1929), also R. P. Germán Prado, "Mozarabic Melodies," *SPECULUM*, III (1928), 236, 237 and IV (1929), 145. The theme of *Recordare* is also found on p. 230 applied to the text *Per gloriam nominis tui*.

particularly contains many of the formulas and cadences of the tones that we are studying. The prayer *Per gloriam nominis tui* that was solemnly sung by the celebrant on feast days at the beginning of the Mozarabic mass follows the same melodic lines as No. II, but differs from it in the final cadence and includes various formulas of No. III and No. IV. However, we are not standing on particularly firm ground with the books of Cisneros, for the Mozarabic origin of all their contents is doubtful. When he undertook his liturgical restoration at the beginning of the sixteenth century the Mozarabic tradition was already completely lost. The two great *Cantorales* of the Chapel of Corpus Christi probably contain few authentic Mozarabic melodies: the *Laudes* contain some, but in a sufficiently adulterated form. It is, in consequence, difficult to determine the exact value of the *Oferencio*, especially as we have no manuscript containing the Common melodies of the Mozarabic rite. It may be that, in spite of the decadence of the rite in the years that preceded the restoration of Cisneros, some memory of these melodies or some document, now lost, was preserved,¹ by means of which the *Oferencio* may contain, in substance at least, some of the tones used in the best period of Mozarabic music: on the other hand, it is equally possible that, wanting authentic Mozarabic melodies, Cisneros adapted various chants of the Hispano-Roman rite then in use for his new books. In any event, before his time, we find in the books of this Hispano-Roman rite some of the melodies which he included in his Mozarabic revision, for the tone of the *Per gloriam nominis tui* is exactly the same as that of the Holy Saturday *Praeconium Paschale* which is found in Spanish missals and *Pasionarios* both before and after Cisneros.

Nevertheless, in spite of this deficiency of authentic Mozarabic melodies for comparison, the question of the origin of these tones is capable of solution, for the melodies, at least in part, are found in various non-Spanish manuscripts. In reality these formulas, at least in their fundamental motives, form part of the common property of all the western liturgies. In other countries, if these tones

¹ The preservation of the melodies of the *Agenda mortuorum* in the San Millán *Liber Ordinum* makes such a notion seem possible.

were applied to the Lamentations at any early date, they were abandoned in favour of that which has recently been adopted in the Vatican edition¹ for use in the universal church, which is said to be the same tone used by the Jews in their synagogues. In Spain, to the contrary, they have been used to the almost complete exclusion of the other, and are not only found in the Gregorian manuscripts but are reproduced in modern books as well.

The following illustrations give the beginning and the end of the melodies as found in the Silos manuscript with the defects found in the original. The first defect is that quite without necessity the notes of the melody are frequently doubled in the vocalizations and in the syllabic parts.² The second defect is the use of the liquescent note in circumstances in which it has neither reason nor effect. The copyist of the manuscript seems to have regarded the liquescent as a device for tying together, an ascending note, by means of which in the syllabic chants the voice passes from one note to the following, giving a sort of anticipation of the following note before actually reaching it. This is not the function of the liquescent, which is properly employed only with two consecutive consonants or two vowels forming a diphthong, when, to pronounce the second properly, it is necessary to pass to the note of the syllable following: by this means sonority and clear articulation are lost, but the time value is preserved.³ The copyist has used the small note that expresses the liquescent in places in which it is unnecessary, as there are neither two consonants nor diphthongs. In No. iv, with the word *candidiores* the liquescent is well placed; in *rubicundiores* and *denigrata* and in the *Ierusalem* of the other pieces it has no object.

The reader will note that in the word *manuum*, toward the end of No. III, the notes are arranged as if it were a word of two syllables only, *ma-num*. This procedure is correct, and was used in all

¹ *Officium Maioris Hebdomadae et Octavae Paschae a Dominicis in Palmis usque ad Sabbatum in Albis cum cantu. Editio Typica Vaticana* (Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1922), pp. 283–289, 366–372, 437–443.

² Cf. the formula that accompanies the letter *Jod* in No. II and the final words of each strophe: cf. also the words *ingressus*, *praeceptas*, *Ierusalem*. In the other melodies there are unnecessary notes that hinder the presentation of the text.

³ For a more complete explanation of this vocal effect see my *Metodo de Canto Gregoriano* (Santo Domingo de Silos, 1906), pp. 66, 67.

manuscripts. When a vowel is repeated, and the first accompanies a group of notes, the second repeated vowel is not pronounced separately, but is considered to have been dealt with sufficiently in the vocalization of the first.

CANTUS LAMENTATIONUM

CANTUS I

Feria v. in Caena Domini. (1)

t. 2.

A - leph. Quó - mo - do se - det
so - la cí - ui - tas ple - na pó - pu - lo :
fa - cta est qua - si uí - du - a dó - mi -
na Gé - nti - um : prin - cept pro - uin - ci -
á - rum fa - cta est sub tri - bu - to .
Ie - rú - sa - lem, Ie - rú - sa - lem, conuér -
te - re ad Dó - mi num De - um tu - um.

(1) cf. fol. LXIIIr and v.

CANTUS II
Feria vi. in Parasceue. (1).

t. 2.

Iod. Ma - num su - am mi -
sit ho - stis ad ó - mni - a de - si - de -
ra - bí - li - a e - ius: qui - a ui - dit
Gé - ntes in - grés - sas San - ctu - á - ri - um
su - um, de qui - bus prae - cé - pe - ras ne
in - trá - rent in ec - clé - si - am tu - am .
Ie - rú - sa - lem, Ie - rú - sa - lem,
con - uér - te - re ad Dómi - num De - um tu -
um.

(1) cf. fol. LXVv.

CANTUS III
Sabbato Sancto. (1).

t. 2.

A - leph Quó - mo - do ob -
scu - rá - tum est au - rum, mu - tá - tus
est co - lor ó - pti - mus, dis - pér - si
sunt lá - pi - des sanctu - á - ri - i in
cá - pi - te ómni - um pla - te - á - rum.
Fi - li - i Si - on ín - cly - ti, et a -
mí - cti au - ro pri - mo: Quó - mo - do
re - pu - tá - ti sunt in ua - sa té - ste - a,
o - pus ma - num fí - gu - li. Ie - rú -
sa - lem, Ie - rú - sa - lem, conuér - te - re ad
Dó - mi - num De - um tu - un.

(1) cf. fol. LXVII.

li - gnum Teth . Mé - li - us
 fu - it oc - cí - sis glá - di - o quam in -
 ter - fé - ctis fa - me : quó - ni - am is -
 ti ex - ta - bu - é - runt con - sump - ti a ste -
 ri - li - tá - te ter - rae . Ie - rú - sa -
 lem , Ie - rú - sa - lem , con - uér - te - re ad
 Dó - mi - num De - um tu - um.

AN UNPUBLISHED MELODY OF THE LAMENTATIONS

In the Silos manuscript in the office for Holy Saturday, after the *Oratio Ieremiae* and with no other title than *Alia*,¹ is a lesson, the text of which is not found in the modern Breviary, apparently intended to be used *ad libitum* as the third lesson of the first nocturn in place of the *Oratio Ieremiae*. It is taken from the fourth chapter of the Lamentations, and is composed of the verses that follow those of the second lesson of this nocturn.

ALIUS CANTUS LAMENTATIONIS
SABBATO SANCTO. (1).

t. 1.
Za - in. Can - di - di - ó - res
Na - za - raé - i e - ius ni - ue, ni - ti - di -
ó res la - cte, ru - bi - cun - di - ó - res
é - bo - re an - ti - quo, sa - phí - ro
pul - chri - ó - res . Heth. De -
ni - grá - ta est fá - ci - es e - ó - rum su -
per car - bó - nes, et non sunt cóg - ni - ti
in pla - té - is : ad - haé - sit cu -
tis e - ó - rum ós - si - bus : á -
ru - it, et fa - cta est qua - si

(1) cf. fol. LVIIv.

The melody in no way resembles the preceding tones, neither is it similar to anything in the Mozarabic or Gregorian repertoires. Its closest relationship seems to be with the following antiphon for *Sabbato in Parasceve* in the Ambrosian Antiphony.² The fact that both pieces are destined for use in Mattins of the same day, the one as a lesson, the other as an antiphon, is a coincidence worth noting.

SABBATO IN PARASCEVE
AD MATUTINUM. ANT. (1)

t. 1.

The musical score consists of ten staves of music. Each staff begins with a treble clef and a common time signature (C). The melody is written on a five-line staff with square neumes. The lyrics are written below the staves, with hyphens indicating syllables that span across multiple notes. The text is: Pó - su - i ue - sti - mén - tum me - um ci - lí - ci - um, et fa - ctus sum il - lis in pa - rá - bo - lam. . . A - d - uér - sum me ex - er - ce - bán - tur qui se - dé - bant in por - ta, et in me psal - lé - bant qui bi - bé - bant. ui - num: e - go ue - ro o - ra - ti - ó - nem me - am ad te, Dó - mi - ne.

Pó - su - i ue - sti - mén - tum me - um

ci - lí - ci - um, et fa - ctus sum il - lis

in pa - rá - bo - lam. . . A - d - uér - sum me

ex - er - ce - bán - tur qui se - dé - bant

in por - ta, et in me psal - lé - bant

qui bi - bé - bant. ui - num: e - go ue -

ro o - ra - ti - ó - nem me - am ad

te, Dó - mi - ne.

(1) cf. *Paléographie musicale*, VI, 302.

The melody is in the first mode, and is of an expansive character that is in sharp contrast to the other tones in the manuscript: it appears to have been inspired by the first strophe of the text, *Candidiores Nazaraei eius niue, nitidiores lacte, rubicundiores ebore antiquo, saphiro pulchrioris*. It is probably of the period of the manuscript, although it may possibly be a little older: the use of the first mode scale with the constant introduction of *si-natural*, and the elaborate vocalizations at the ends of the strophes are characteristic of this period. Although this text is not contained in the present day Breviary, the melody could easily be applied to the second lesson of Holy Saturday, *Quomodo obscuratum est aurum*, as the strophes of both texts are of similar character.

¹ F. lvij^b.

² British Museum, *Add. 34209*, reproduced in facsimile in *Paléographie Musicale* (Solesmes, 1), v, 253, 254. Cf. the text, vi, 302.

REAL ABADÍA DE SANTO DOMINGO DE SILOS,
BURGOS, SPAIN

CANTUS IV

Sabbato Sancto. (1).

t. 2.

O - rá - ti - o le - re - mí - ae Prophé -
tae. Re - cor - dá - re, Dó - mi - ne, quid ac - cí -
de - rit no - bis: in - tu - é - re, et
ré - spi - ce op - pró - bri - um no - strum.
He - ré - di - tas no - stra uer - sa est
ad a - li - é - nos: do - mus no - strae
ad ex - trá - ne - os. Ie - rú - sa - lem,
Ie - rú - sa - lem, con - uér - te - re ad
Dó - mi - num De - um tu - um.

(1) cf. fol. LVIIr and v.