

Helen Deeming and Samantha Blickhan

Songs in Circulation, Texts in Transmission: English Sources and the Dublin Troper

Once thought to have produced no more than the occasional gem (such as *Sumer is icumen in*), 13th-century English musicians are now beginning to achieve recognition for their involvement—as composers and transmitters—in a vibrant and tri-lingual culture of song-making.¹ Their work has gone unnoticed because their songs were written down in *ad hoc* fashion, often one or two at a time within the pages of otherwise unrelated books; once reassembled, however, a sizeable corpus of some 125 surviving songs testifies to the scale and importance of this English musical tradition. Latin songs dominate a landscape in which Middle English and Anglo-Norman French songs also play a significant part, and among the Latin songs, a high proportion employ a musical form based on progressive repetition (AABBCC, and so on, in its simplest manifestation).² This form is closely associated with several medieval genres, most especially the liturgical sequence, though the songs of this structure among the English song repertory are only occasionally known to have had a liturgical usage. Where they do appear in liturgical contexts, it is mostly in ‘supplements’ to sequentaries or missals, apparently later additions to the ‘core’ repertory, among pieces whose relatively generic texts evidently suited them for use in multiple regular or occasional liturgical situations.

One such liturgical book is the so-called Dublin Troper, Cambridge University Library, Add. Ms. 710, a 14th-century manuscript from St Patrick’s Cathedral in Dublin. The contents of the manuscript include a Sarum consuetudinary, a troper and sequentiary (use of which at the cathedral has been dated to *c.*1360), additional Latin songs and troped Kyries, and documents relating to the cathedral.³ The additional Latin songs and Kyries are written towards the back of the manuscript, in a section René-Jean Hesbert referred to in his

facsimile edition as the ‘Appendix’ (fols.126–30).⁴ These songs include the well-known *Angelus ad virginem*, which is written twice in the Appendix in versions both for three voices but not entirely identical: once with (incomplete) text, and once without any text at all. Both are written in black mensural notation, perhaps as much as fifty years later than that of the troper and sequentiary. A monophonic version of *Angelus ad virginem* is also found in the sequentiary, on f.127.

A total of seventeen songs from 13th-century English sources are found again in the 14th-century Dublin Troper, a number that makes this source by far the most significant witness to the continuing and wider transmission of the songs found in English sources. This circulation of songs took place within a political situation that saw Dublin (and much of Ireland) under the control of the English kings, via their local representatives, the Lords Lieutenant of Ireland. The Sarum rite was adopted as widely in these Irish territories as it was in England, and in this sense much of the liturgical (and hence musical) culture of England and Ireland was shared. Though the English sources of the seventeen shared songs are all earlier than the Dublin Troper, it need not necessarily be assumed that the direction of travel was only one-way: the likelihood that many further manuscripts of song from both England and Ireland are now lost means that we should be wary of sketching transmission patterns based on incomplete evidence. Nevertheless, a general trend for Latin devotional songs to appear first in non-liturgical contexts, later apparently acquiring a more formalised liturgical function and beginning to appear in liturgical books, may perhaps be borne out by the transmission of these particular songs.⁵ To test this hypothesis, however, would require a separate study devoted to these concordances and to their circulation both in England and Ireland, and on the Continent.

The present article addresses a small—and quite distinct—subset of these songs, in the form of two whose melodies were shared whilst their texts were substituted for alternative

ones. The case studies below take a closer look at *Ave spes angelico*, the melody of which is found with the alternative words *Salve celi ianua* in an earlier English manuscript, and *Celum Deus inclinavit*, whose melody likewise appears in an older source, there accompanied by the text *Salve virgo virginum*. As with the ‘full’ concordances (those songs whose texts as well as melodies are shared between the English sources and the Dublin Troper), we cannot be certain which version came first, and therefore may not speak confidently of an ‘original’ text and its ‘contrafactum’. Without advancing this question of the priority of different versions, however, much is still to be gained from the study and comparison of these alternative song-texts and their shared melodic frameworks, since they raise important questions about the oral, mnemonic and written processes involved in the fluid transmission of song.

Case study 1: *Salve celi ianua* and *Ave spes angelico*

Ave spes angelico, found in the sequentiary section of the Dublin Troper (fols.118v–119r; illus.1), was singled out by both David Hiley and René-Jean Hesbert for its modal characteristics: both considered it an example of a distinctive kind of sequence with F finals and B flats, which Hiley tentatively described as ‘a type of lyricism well-known in English song repertories’, and Hesbert (less favourably) as creating ‘an atmosphere of sopiness’.⁶ Hiley’s comparison of the modal style of this piece with that of English non-liturgical song was apt: though his own study limited itself to sequences found in liturgical sources, more recent exploration of the songs found outside liturgical contexts supports his finding that there was a distinct preference for F modes with B flats in England.⁷ Noting that *Ave spes angelico* was unique to the Dublin Troper, Hesbert regarded the piece as an Irish composition, and its modality as representative of those pieces of local origin.⁸ But Hesbert’s assumption of its Irish authorship may be called into question by a recently-discovered

alternative text for this melody, *Salve celi ianua*, which appears to be considerably older and probably of English, rather than Irish, origin.

Illus. 1 *Ave spes angelico* (GB-Cul Add. Ms. 710, fols.118v–119r) [not licensed for Open Access]

Salve celi ianua is found uniquely in the manuscript Évreux, Bibliothèque municipale, Ms. lat. 17 (f.156r; illus.2), a 12th-century martyrology following the use of Wareham Priory, with four added 13th-century gatherings containing, *inter alia*, nine pieces of music.⁹ Six of the songs follow the formal principle of progressive repetition, and five of these use F finals with B flats; the remaining song using progressive repetition, *Spe mercedis et corone*, is a widely transmitted contrafact of the well known sequence *Hodierna lux diei*.¹⁰ Aside from *Spe mercedis et corone*, the song collection in Évreux 17 thus amply exemplifies Hiley's category of 'simple, short, song-like sequences in F tonality', with the caveat that these are 'sequences' only in the sense of formal construction and not—as far as we can tell—of liturgical usage.

Illus. 2 *Salve celi ianua* (F-EV Ms. lat. 17, fol.156r) [not licensed for Open Access]

The last of Évreux 17's songs using progressive repetition, *Gaude gloriosa*, is a reworking of another song found earlier in the same manuscript, with its musical and textual material reordered to produce three paired versicles (AABBCC) instead of two repeated strophes (ABCABC). As has been shown elsewhere, this reworking seems to have been motivated by a variety of factors, which may have included a particular enthusiasm for the AABBCC form on the part of the manuscript's compiler.¹¹ One further song, *O domina*

dominatrix, is through-composed with no musical repetition, and the remaining musical item is a polyphonic Gloria trope in two voice parts, *Spiritus et alme*. The preservation of these monophonic Latin songs within the same manuscripts as polyphonic music is a point to which we will return in the next case study, since it exemplifies a shared environment for the circulation, if not also the origin, of polyphonic and monophonic musical compositions.

Turning to the two texts that share the melody in question, *Salve celi ianua* (ex.1) is in some ways typical of Marian songs, making extensive use of floral imagery and ending with a request for the Virgin's intercession. The image in its second verse of the sunbeam passing through glass as an analogy for Mary's intact virginity in childbirth is one found in many medieval texts, including some well known English songs.¹² The text of *Ave spes angelico* (ex.2), by contrast, follows a clearer poetic scheme, with its first five versicles each outlining one of the Five Joys of the Virgin, while repeating their opening salutation (*Ave, Eya, Gaude, Salve, Vale*) at the mid-point. The poet showed an interest in poetic devices such as alliteration, at times making unconventional choices of vocabulary for the sake of such a device (as, for example, in opting for 'partrix' [literally, 'childbearer'] rather than 'mater' in versicle 1b, so as to obtain a fourfold repetition of the initial *p* sound). After its recitation of the Five Joys, *Ave spes angelico* too closes with a request for the Virgin's intercession on behalf of sinners at their deaths.¹³

Example 1 Text and translation of *Salve celi ianua*

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1a. <i>Salve celi ianua,</i> | Hail door of heaven, |
| <i>porta paradisi,</i> | gate of paradise, |
| <i>vervecis ingenua</i> | noble mother of |
| <i>genitrix occisi:</i> | the slain lamb: |
| | |
| 1b. <i>Nudis extas pallium,</i> | You extend a cloak over the naked, |
| <i>egris medicina,</i> | cure for the sick, |
| <i>flos florum convallium,</i> | flower of the valley's flowers, |

	rosa sine spina.	rose without thorn.
2a.	Vitri non integritas sole violatur, nec tua virginitas partu defloratur:	The integrity of glass is not compromised by the sun, neither is your virginity damaged by childbirth:
2b.	Nec tua preconia des oblivioni, sis pro nobis, domina, in conspectu throni.	Nor should you give your praiseworthy acts to oblivion, be for us, lady, in sight of the throne.
3a.	Castitatis lilium, O virgo Maria, interpella filium, mediatrix pia:	Chastity of lilies, O virgin Mary, intercede with your son, blessed mediator:
3b.	Ut a sordis vicio nos purget virtute, sicque celi gaudio nos donet salute.	That from the sin of uncleanness he might purge us with virtue, and thus deliver us safely to the joy of heaven.

Example 2 Text and translation of *Ave spes angelico*

1a.	Ave, spes, angelico More stans affata, Ave, rore celico Virgo fecundata.	Hail, hope, standing addressed in angelic manner, Hail, virgin made fruitful by a drop from heaven.
1b.	Eya, pura pueri Partrix puellaris, Eya, datrix liberi, Quem gaudento paris.	Eya, pure maidenly mother of a boy, Eya, giver of a child, whom you bear in rejoicing.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 2a. | Gaude, stans ad dexteram
In cruce pendentis,
Gaude, te puerperam
Mortui surgentis. | Rejoice, standing on the right-hand side
of the one hanging on the cross,
Rejoice, O childbearer
of the one rising from the dead. |
| 2b. | Salve, natum proprium
Videns ascendentem,
Salve, credens Filium
Cum Patre regnantem. | Hail, seeing your own child
ascending,
Hail, believing your Son
to be reigning with the Father. |
| 3a. | Vale, scandens celitus,
Ad thronum translata,
Vale, nos valere fac,
Deo desponsata. | Farewell, climbing to heaven,
carried over to the throne,
Farewell, make us to be strong,
betrothed to God. |
| 3b. | Et fac tuos servulos
Nostre mortis hora
Tecum frui gloria
In perhenni mora. | And cause your servants
at the hour of our death
to enjoy glory with you
for everlasting time. |




As may be seen by comparing *illus.1* with *illus.2*, the notation of *Salve celi ianua* is similar to that of *Ave spes angelico* in fundamental details of presentation. The songs are both laid out on four-line staves, with B flat (when present) occupying the top space in each staff. Though the progressive repetition structure of the songs results in repeated melodic material, in both sources the notation is written out in full. Red ink is used for the staff lines and initials in both songs, though the initials of *Ave spes angelico* alternate between red and blue ink, while *Salve celi ianua* has no blue ink. The melodies of *Salve celi ianua* and *Ave spes angelico*, moreover, are almost identical, differing only in minor details. One such detail is the very opening gesture, one of the only moments in either song where a single syllable is

accompanied by three notes. Where *Salve celi ianua* has FFE, returning to F for the second syllable, *Ave spes angelico* inverts the gesture to FFG, likewise then returning to F. Details such as these hardly affect the overall shape of the melody, and might even be described as ornamental. In this respect, it is telling that many of the melodic variants between the two versions occur at those points at which the usually syllabic texture opens out a little to permit two- and three-note melismas: these supplementary notes are inessential to the melodic thrust, and thus seem to have been more open to variation than were the purely syllabic passages that make up most of the song.


Despite the very high degree of overall melodic similarity between the two versions, their notation actually differs quite substantially in terms of the specific note forms used by the two notators. For example, to write single notes the notator of *Salve celi ianua* used only *virgae* (■) and no *puncta* (◆), whereas the notator of *Ave spes angelico* preferred to use both *virgae* and *puncta*, apparently interchangeably. This aspect of source comparison is easily overlooked, because editorial practice has nearly always involved first transcribing the versions into modern notation, and then comparing the resulting versions. Because modern notation makes no distinction between *virgae* and *puncta*, usually rendering both as a single, unstemmed notehead, the transcribed (or translated) melodies of *Salve celi ianua* and *Ave spes angelico* seem very close indeed, but when the versions are compared in their originally-notated form, it is clear that their notators have made a number of quite different choices over how to present broadly the same musical substance in written form. Examining these notational choices in further detail offers an additional dimension to the study of musical transmission, since it affords an opportunity not only to explore different notators' ways of conceptualizing musical sound, but also to probe the processes that could lead—as in this case—to an aurally stable but visually quite varied circulation of song.¹⁴

Returning to the single-note forms used in *Ave spes angelico*, closer examination reveals that of 121 single notes, 111 are *virgae* and only ten are *puncta*. The choice of single-note forms used throughout the song does not seem to be regulated by melody or text; passages with repeated melodic material are written using both forms interchangeably. For example, the seven-syllable melodic figure used for the phrase ‘Gaude te puerperam’ (illus.1, line 4) is written with alternating *virgae* and *puncta*, but the repeated musical phrase at ‘salve credens filium’ (line 5) is written using only *virgae*. This inconsistency is found throughout the troper and sequentiary: as with the example in *Ave spes angelico*, occasional passages of alternating *virgae* and *puncta* which at first sight may be thought to indicate rhythm turn out to be fleeting.

The three-note descending form differs between the two versions of the song as well:

the *climacus* () is used in *Salve celi ianua*, while the so-called ‘English *conjunctura*’ () is preferred in *Ave spes angelico*. Both forms are regularly found in sources of English song from the 12th and 13th centuries, as well as throughout the Dublin Troper, and notators sometimes employed both forms, apparently without distinction, within the same song.¹⁵ We have already seen one such area of notational divergence within a single version (the interchangeability of *virga* and *punctum* in *Ave spes angelico*), but both versions display further internal inconsistencies. Each of the song’s six versicles ends with the same musical phrase, and in *Ave spes angelico* a repeated note appears on the note A, four syllables from the end, in three of these phrases: FEcundata (illus.1, line 2), gauDENdo (line 3), and paTRE (line 6). Yet the equivalent point in the other versicles of the song (mortuI, line 5; DEsponsata, line 8; and perHENni, line 9) is written with a *clivis* () A–G, without the initial doubling of the A.

Use of liquescence likewise varies both within and between the two sources, often coinciding with adjacent consonants (such as the opening SALlve in *Salve celi ianua*, notated

with a *virga* + liquescent *cephalicus* (). Adjacent consonants account for all except one use of liquescence in this version, the exception being at the start of the second versicle—that is, where the music for the word ‘Salve’ is repeated. On this second appearance (at ‘Nudis’), there is no consonant-pair, and the scribe may simply have recopied the musical material from the first versicle.¹⁶ In *Ave spes angelico* the *cephalicus* is found with combined consonants such as feCUNdata (illus. 1, line 2), DATrix and gauDENdo (both line 3), and SCANdens (line 7). Liquescence is also used in the initial position with GAUde (line 3), ROre (line 1), and SALve (line 5). ‘Gaude’ contains a diphthong, such as commonly carried liquescent forms, but the same diphthong in ‘gaudento’ receives no such treatment here.

The notational divergences both within and between the two versions of the song invite speculation about their possible significance. In some instances, as we have seen, the choice of a particular note form may have been prompted by a feature of the sung text. Repeated passages of music sometimes attracted identical notational presentation, as if the scribes were purposely matching the two visually; yet other musical repetitions were notated quite differently, for reasons that are not easily fathomable. There is no reason to assume that the Dublin Troper scribe was copying the melody directly from the Évreux manuscript of *Salve celi ianua* (for there could once have been any number of other manuscript sources, now lost, or the short melody could readily have been written down from memory), and indeed the high degree of notational difference between them surely renders that possibility even less likely. What remains interesting, though, is the extent to which a musical substance could be transmitted in a highly stable fashion despite written presentations that are substantially varied: a fact that casts a spotlight on the role of memory in the circulation of song, a point to which we will return below.

Case Study 2: *Salve virgo singularis* and *Celum Deus inclinavit*

Another link—only recently brought to light—between the songs employing progressive repetition preserved in English manuscripts of the 13th century and the repertory of the Dublin Troper is the melodic (but not textual) concordance between *Salve virgo singularis*, found only in London, British Library, Ms. Cotton Titus A. xxi (fol.91r; illus.3), and *Celum Deus inclinavit* (Dublin Troper, fols.106v–107r; illus.4).¹⁷ Though the Cotton manuscript is the only witness to *Salve virgo singularis* in this precise form, a very similar piece with the same incipit is found in a printed Fontevraud missal of 1514, and the two seem likely to be related.¹⁸ These texts share their poetic form (four lines per versicle, with a syllable count of 8-8-8-7 syllables, rhyming aaab) with the widely-transmitted sequence *Verbum bonum et suave*, which led the editors of *Analecta Hymnica* to suggest a musical connection between them (although the Cotton manuscript preserves a different melody for *Salve virgo singularis* from that normally associated with *Verbum bonum et suave*).¹⁹

Illus. 3 *Salve virgo singularis* (GB-Lbl Ms. Cotton Titus A. xxi, fol.91r) [not licensed for Open Access]

Illus. 4 *Celum Deus inclinavit* (GB-Cul Add. Ms. 710, fols.106v–107r) [not licensed for Open Access]

Salve virgo singularis is one of only two musical pieces in the Cotton manuscript, the other being a polyphonic trope for the Agnus Dei in three voice-parts, *Virtute numinis*.²⁰ It is an interesting coincidence that both this piece and *Salve celi ianua*, discussed above, should be preserved alongside polyphonic settings of Ordinary tropes, and in the case of *Salve virgo singularis*, the polyphonic connections go even further. The three related texts, *Salve virgo singularis*, *Celum Deus inclinavit*, and *Verbum bonum et suave*, were all set polyphonically in 13th- and 14th-century England, though only in the cases of *Celum Deus inclinavit* and

Verbum bonum et suave were the sequences' monophonic melodies incorporated into the polyphonic settings.²¹ Nevertheless, the association between these texts (and in some cases, melodies) and polyphonic composition—both in terms of musical interconnections and of source juxtaposition—is striking, since it calls into question the scholarly tendency to treat monophony and polyphony separately. While the academic study (and, by consequence, the modern performing tradition) of medieval English music has tended to focus on the dispersed and fragmentary remains of the country's polyphonic traditions, a rich musical and poetic context in the form of the monophonic songs that are musically connected to those polyphonies, and in many cases lie side-by-side with them in the manuscript sources, has been sorely neglected.



Unlike *Salve celi ianua* and *Ave spes angelico*, both of which are unique to their manuscript sources, the two texts considered in this second case study both have later transmission histories that testify to their continued use. The text of *Salve virgo singularis*, in somewhat adapted form, appears again in the liturgical context of a 16th-century printed missal (mentioned above), and *Celum Deus inclinavit* also took on a liturgical use, since it appears in 15th- and 16th-century liturgical books (both manuscript and printed) from England and Scandinavia.²² Its polyphonic relative, a three-voice setting using the monophonic melody as the lowest voice, lacks its beginning in the fragmentary source (London, British Library, Harley Ms. 3132), with only the third strophe, *Gaude virgo mater Christi*, remaining.²³ Neither this source, nor the two 14th-century English fragments that preserve a three-part polyphonic setting of *Salve virgo singularis*, can offer specific information on the polyphonic songs' functional contexts, owing to their incomplete states. But in assembling many similar polyphonic items under the label 'cantilenae', Ernest Sanders speculated that as a group they may have 'functioned as supplements to the repertory of monophonic sequences', while perhaps also serving 'processional or similar ceremonial






purposes'.²⁴ Certainly the content of these two texts, with their generalised praise of Mary, focusing on the Incarnation (*Celum Deus inclinavit*) and Crucifixion (*Salve virgo singularis*), would seem to fit them for a variety of uses in relation both to Marian feasts in the calendar and to her weekly commemorations in later medieval devotional practice.²⁵

Notational comparison of *Salve virgo singularis* and *Celum Deus inclinavit* shows slightly more melodic variation between the sources than the previous case study, but even with this higher level of variance the broad musical substance remains intact. Examples of such trivial variation can be seen by comparing the first sixteen syllables of each piece (illus.3, line 1, 'Salve ... paris'; illus.4, lines 1 and 2, 'Celum ... intravit'). The first eight syllables display the same melodic outline, albeit with the leaps of a third in *Salve virgo singularis* filled in with passing notes in *Celum Deus inclinavit*, while the second eight syllables diverge slightly, showing contrary motion initially, but then meeting again on F and resuming their melodic likeness from there onwards. This minor variation is the largest discrepancy between the two versions.

Like the previous case study, each song is written on a four-line staff, but while *Salve virgo singularis* is written using a C clef (with B flat) throughout, *Celum Deus inclinavit* employs a variety of clefs. Clef usage here seems to relate partly to pitch and partly to melodic inflection: to shift the compass of the stave, the scribe employs F3 clefs for passages at the low end of the song's register, and either a C4 clef, or B flat in the top space (used alone, as a clef) for higher passages (see illus.4, lines 6–9 and 11–12). The alternation between B flat in the top space and C on the top line has no effect on which pitches can be accommodated on the staff, however, so the use of these two clefs must instead indicate an alternation of B flats and B naturals (in other words, B solmized as *fa* or as *mi*) at these points in the song. Thus while all Bs in *Salve virgo singularis* are apparently flattened (according to

the notation, at least), those in the latter part of *Celum Deus inclinavit* alternate between naturals and flats.²⁶

Celum Deus inclinavit, in company with the other liturgical songs in the Dublin Troper, features red stave lines and alternating red and blue initials, while *Salve virgo singularis* uses brown ink for notation, text and initials. Overall, the presentation of *Salve virgo singularis* is distinctly more casual than any of the other sources discussed in this article, and at times its notational figures are not clearly differentiated. For example, it is particularly difficult to distinguish between the *clivis* () and *cephalicus* (), due in part to this notator's habit of slightly flicking the pen to the right when making downward strokes, resulting in cephalicus forms which look as if they have a *clivis*-like notehead at the bottom of the stroke (illus.3, line 1, menTEM).

Both *Salve virgo singularis* and *Celum Deus inclinavit* feature *virgae* () and *puncta* () used interchangeably. *Celum Deus inclinavit* also features the *epiphonus* (), a note form used only rarely in the Dublin Troper, and not appearing at all in *Salve virgo singularis*. This rising liquescent is formed rather like a square *punctum* with an ascender and appears only three times in the entire song (illus.4, lines 1 and 2). The English *conjunctura* () is used in both songs, although there is also a single *climacus* () written in *Celum Deus inclinavit* (illus.4, line 8).²⁷ As with the previous case study, questions of intentionality arise when considering the notation of *Salve virgo singularis* and *Celum Deus inclinavit*. The casual hand of the former exhibits some features that may have arisen by accident, rendering it still more difficult to interpret the significance of the scribe's choice of particular note-forms. The scribe's alternation of C and B flat clefs in *Celum Deus inclinavit*, however, seems too strange to be written off as inadvertent, though the wider implications of this (and

other similar cases in medieval English songs) for singers' approaches to solmization require a much more extensive study.

Intertextuality and musical transmission

The intertextual relationships between these song versions allude to an all but lost environment of song transmission in and between medieval England and Ireland, though the precise mechanics of how these two song melodies made their way across the Irish Sea, in one direction or another, and substituting their texts in the process, are now almost certainly irretrievable. It is possible, for instance, that the versions preserved in the 14th-century Dublin Troper may be late witnesses to much earlier originals, which could have predated the versions found in the 13th-century English sources. Equally, there may have been several further stages of transmission of the songs, involving more manuscripts and perhaps other substitute texts: the polyphonic relations of *Salve virgo singularis* and *Celum Deus inclinavit*, discussed above, certainly suggest several further fortuitously preserved links in what may once have been a much larger matrix. Though we have concentrated on just two examples here, the processes of circulation that involved song-text substitution as well as versions in different monophonic and polyphonic guises seem to have been comparatively commonplace.²⁸

Alongside the reuse of entire melodies in this way stood a related phenomenon, whereby shorter melodic passages within songs alluded to passages in others: this appears to be true of the third strophe of *Salve celi ianua* and *Ave spes angelico* (beginning on line 5 of *illus* 2 and line 6 of *illus*.1 respectively), which bears a strong resemblance to strophes 3–4 of the widely transmitted song *Ave gloriosa virginum regina*. This latter song, frequently attributed to Philip the Chancellor, is also found within the Dublin Troper (the excerpt in question is shown in *illus*.5).²⁹ *Ave gloriosa* is notated with a G final, whereas *Salve celi*

ianua and *Ave spes angelico* conclude on F, but allowing for the different pitch level, the melodic resemblance is striking. Even more telling, perhaps, is that the differences between *Salve celi ianua* and *Ave spes angelico* at this point bring the latter closer to the musical witness of *Ave gloriosa*, something that may be understandable of two songs appearing within the same manuscript and copied by the same scribe. Conscious or unconscious recall of *Ave gloriosa* on the part of the Dublin scribe may have prompted the repeated note at the start of strophe 3 of *Ave spes angelico*, and its upward leap of a 4th between the fourth and fifth syllables (both matching strophe 4 of *Ave gloriosa*), which cause *Ave spes angelico* to differ from its earlier model, though in the absence of any testimony as to the stages of transmission between these two witnesses, we cannot support this suggestion with any real confidence. Conversely, an alternative reading might posit that these shared melodic phrases all belong to a common set of stock gestures, drawn upon (by conscious or unconscious convention) by the composers and scribes of sequences across manuscript and institutional contexts.³⁰

Illus.5 Strophes 3 and 4 of *Ave gloriosa virginum regina* (GB-Cul Add. Ms. 710, fols.125r–v) [not licensed for Open Access]

The notion of shared melodic gestures permeating throughout songs in a given tradition needs no special pleading: it has been remarked upon before in relation to certain sequence families, as well as to other liturgical genres such as tracts.³¹ In the contemporaneous vernacular sphere, practices of citation and allusion were rife, particularly with regard to refrains, but for these repertories, as for the network of English and Irish sources considered here, questions of intentionality loom large.³² Can we, at our historical distance, reliably distinguish between one song's purposeful citation of another song's

melody and/or text, and the ‘accidental’ similarity of passages that might have come about unintentionally as two song writers drew on a shared stock of material? The close identity of *Salve celi ianua* with *Ave spes angelico*, and of *Salve virgo singularis* with *Celum Deus inclinavit*, across the songs’ entire lengths, ensure that these must be regarded as conscious re-engagements with models, rather than coincidental parallels. But for shorter shared passages within songs, such as the apparent allusion to *Ave gloriosa*, we must look to processes of memory and performance tradition that are only now beginning to be uncovered.³³

It is similarly difficult to determine whether resemblance of notational usage between sources is purposeful, or a matter of scribes engaging with varying visual interpretations of stock musical gestures. For example, one scribe may have used doubled *virgae* or *puncta* to indicate the length or stress of particular notes, while another scribe felt that it was unnecessary to include this information in the musical notation; a scribe’s familiarity with the gestures being used may have influenced the amount of information that they chose to inscribe in the written source. The existence of sources with close melodic relationships that nevertheless display high levels of notational variance may indicate that these melodic gestures were not inextricably linked with written forms.

While the examination of the notation of these concordances may have highlighted instances of notational variance between witnesses, these adaptations nevertheless indicate a relationship, in terms of written musical culture, which existed in parallel with the previously mentioned intertextual allusion and musical citation. The practices of these scribes, with regards to such matters as the interchangeability of single-note forms, point to a tradition which allowed for a range of musical orthographies within its boundaries. In the absence of any dedicated manuscripts of song from 12th- or 13th-century England or Ireland, it is often difficult to examine this repertoire in the context of a larger written musical culture, but the

overlapping traditions and geographic distance between sources indicate a permeative malleability of writing traditions that itself mirrors the oral heritage which both gave birth to notated music and continued to flourish alongside it.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Helen Deeming is a Reader in Music at Royal Holloway, University of London. Her research interests concern music in medieval Britain and France, especially songs and their notation. Her edition of the surviving songs from 12th- and 13th-century Britain was published in the series *Musica Britannica* in 2013 (vol.95), and she has edited, with Elizabeth Eva Leach, *Manuscripts and Medieval Song: Inscription, Performance, Context* (Cambridge, 2015).

Samantha Blickhan received her Ph.D. in Musicology from Royal Holloway, University of London. She completed her M.St. in Musicology at the University of Oxford, and holds Bachelor's degrees in Voice Performance and English Literature from the University of Iowa.

¹ The songs in English sources are now edited in H. Deeming, *Songs in British Sources, c.1150–1300*, *Musica Britannica*, vol.95 (London, 2013) [hereafter *MB* 95].

² Further discussion of 'progressive repetition' may be found in *MB* 95, xlii.

³ J. Stevens, 'University Library, Add. MS 710', in *Cambridge Music Manuscripts, 900–1700*, ed. I. Fenlon (Cambridge, 1982), pp.79–80.

⁴ R.-J. Hesbert, *Le Trotaire-Prosaire de Dublin: Manuscrit Add. 710 de l'Université de Cambridge* (Rouen, 1966), pp.97–116.

⁵ For discussion of this kind of pattern, see *English Music for Mass and Offices (I)*, ed. E. Sanders, F.Ll. Harrison, and P.M. Lefferts, *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* (hereafter *PMFC*) xvi (Monaco, 1983), p.x.

⁶ D. Hiley, 'The Rhymed Sequence in England: a Preliminary Survey', in *Musicologie médiévale: Notations et séquences*, ed. M. Huglo (Paris, 1987), pp.227–46, at p.234; Hesbert, *Le Trotaire-Prosaire*, p.87 ('une ambiance de mièvrerie').

⁷ An impression of the preponderance of this modality may also be gained by flicking through the contents of *MB 95*.

⁸ It is included among a selection of pieces of which he writes 'These few pieces suffice, it seems, to give an idea of that which we have called the "Irish manner"' ('Ces quelques pièces suffiront, semble-t-il, pour donner une idée de ce que nous avons appelé la «manière irlandaise»'); *Le Trotaire-Prosaire*, p.95. All translations in this article are by the authors.

⁹ Further information on this manuscript may be found in H. Deeming, 'The song and the page: Experiments with form and layout in manuscripts of medieval Latin song', *Plainsong & Medieval Music*, 15/1 (2006), pp.1–27, at pp.16–17; also *MB 95*, p.190.

¹⁰ For editions of the songs and individual commentaries see *MB 95*, nos 49–56.

¹¹ Deeming, 'The Song and the Page', pp.16–22.

¹² See the examples collected in A. Breeze, 'The blessed virgin and the sunbeam through glass', *Bells: Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies*, 1 (1988), 53–64. For an edition of *Salve celi ianua* see *MB 95*, no.52.

¹³ Music and text of *Ave spes angelico* (without English translation) are edited in Hesbert, *Le Trotaire-Prosaire*, p.86 and Hiley, 'The Rhymed Sequence', p.245.

¹⁴ The methodology for the comparison of notations in this article is based upon that expounded much more fully in S. Blickhan, 'Translating Sound, Then and Now: The

Palaeography and Notation of Insular Song, 1150–1300’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2016).

¹⁵ This remark is based on an examination of 115 songs found in insular miscellany sources between 1150 and 1300. A breakdown of individual note forms and discussion of their usage throughout these songs is available in Blickhan, ‘Translating Sound’.

¹⁶ It is also possible that the liquescence on NUdis was prompted by the voiced consonant [d], though if so this would be the only example of this principle being applied in *Salve celi ianua*. David Hiley has written further about the subject of liquescence, and classifies three categories of liquescent neumes, based on the existing work of Mocquereau and Freistedt. These categories are diphthongs, sonant and surd consonants; see Hiley, ‘The Plica and Liquescence’, in *Gordon Athol Anderson: In Memoriam*, 2 vols (Musicological Studies, 49; Henryville-Ottawa-Binningen, 1984), vol. ii, pp.379–91. For further information on the use of liquescence within the insular song repertory see Blickhan, ‘Translating Sound’.

¹⁷ For an edition of *Salve virgo singularis* with English translation and commentary, see *MB* 95, no.28; for the text and English translation of *Celum Deus inclinavit*, see *English Music of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries*, ed. E. Sanders, *PMFC*, xiv (Monaco, 1979), p.198. *Celum Deus inclinavit* is also transmitted in a 15th-century English manuscript missal, and two printed liturgical books from 15th- and 16th-century Scandinavia; see Hesbert, *Le Trotaire-Prosaire*, p.30, n.3. His view that this piece was ‘very probably composed in Dublin, even in the mid-14th century’ (‘Très probablement composée à Dublin même au milieu du XIV^e siècle’) is, however, questionable in the light of the new discovery of its relationship to the earlier *Salve virgo singularis*.

¹⁸ See *Analecta hymnica medii aevi* (hereafter *AH*), vol.39, ed. G.M. Dreyes and C. Blume (Leipzig, 1902), pp.47–8, where the Fontevraud missal text is printed as no.41a and the Cotton manuscript text as no.41b.

¹⁹ *AH* 39, p.47; *AH* 54, ed. C. Blume and H.M. Bannister (Leipzig, 1915), p.407; for discussion of *Verbum bonum et suave*, see M. Fassler, *Gothic Song: Victorine Sequences and Augustinian Reform in Twelfth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.313–15.

²⁰ *Virtute numinis* is edited in *PMFC*, xiv, no.20.

²¹ For the polyphonic *Salve virgo singularis*, see *English Music for Mass and Offices (II) and Music for Other Ceremonies*, ed. F.Ll. Harrison, E.Sanders and P.M. Lefferts, *PMFC*, xvii, no.40; the polyphonic setting of *Celum Deus inclinavit* is incomplete, with only its third strophe, *Gaude virgo mater Christi*, surviving: see *PMFC*, xvii, no.16. *Verbum bonum et suave* is edited from a fragmentary English source in *MB* 95, no.26; for its setting in the St Andrews manuscript W1, see B. Gillingham, *The Polyphonic Sequences in Codex Wolfenbuettel 677* (Henryville, PA, 1982), no.14; the W1 setting is compared to that of the fragmentary English source in I. Bent, ‘A New Polyphonic “Verbum bonum et suave”’, *Music & Letters*, li/3 (1970), pp.227–41, at pp.238–40.

²² P. M. Lefferts, ‘Cantilena and Antiphon: Music for Marian Services in Late Medieval England’, in *Studies in Medieval Music: Festschrift for Ernest H. Sanders*, ed. P.M. Lefferts and B. Seirup, *Current Musicology*, 45–47 (1990), pp.247–82, at p.278.

²³ This is a correction to the information Helen Deeming provided in *MB* 95, p.180, which incorrectly stated that this polyphonic setting was musically independent of its monophonic ancestor; see M. Bent, *Five Sequences for the Virgin Mary* (London, 1973), pp.6, 8.

²⁴ *PMFC* xvii, p.ix.

²⁵ See Lefferts, ‘Cantilena and Antiphon’.

²⁶ This practice of alternating C and B flats is found in a number of other songs in *MB* 95: see nos.12, 14, 42, 60b, 88, 90, 95, and 110.

²⁷ The *climacus* form is found regularly in the Dublin Troper, but an initial examination of the manuscript has shown that its use is confined to the section between folios 32 and 43,

after which the English *conjunctura* is used almost exclusively until the Appendix section between folios 126 and 130. An updated palaeographic examination of the Dublin Troper is long overdue; these reflections are centred on individual note forms, pending a more detailed study of the manuscript as a whole.

²⁸ See, for example, the extensive list of contrafacta in *MB 95*, p.xxxix, and the remarks on *Ave gloriosa mater salvatoris / Duce creature* (*MB 95*, nos 83a–d; commentary on pp.205–6) and on *Mellis stilla, maris stella* (*MB 95*, no.109; commentary on p.219).

²⁹ *Ave gloriosa virginum* is edited from one of its English witnesses in *MB 95*, no. 82.

³⁰ Within a single institution, this sort of situation has been amply demonstrated for the sequences at St Victor in Fassler, *Gothic Song*, especially at pp.58–82 and 290–320.

³¹ E. Hornby, *Medieval Liturgical Chant and Patristic Exegesis: Words and Music in the Second-Mode Tracts* (Boydell, 2009), esp. pp.41–78.

³² See, for example, Y. Plumley, *The Art of Grafted Song: Citation and Allusion in the Age of Machaut* (Oxford, 2013).

³³ Recent work on this subject includes A.-M. Busse Berger, *Medieval Music and the Art of Memory* (University of California Press, 2005); H. Deeming, ‘Music, Memory and Mobility: Citation and Contrafactum in Thirteenth-Century Sequence Repertories’, in *Citation, Intertextuality and Memory in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, Vol. 2: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Culture*, eds. G. Di Bacco and Y. Plumley (Exeter, 2013), pp.69–85, and Deeming, ‘Multilingual Networks in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Song’, in *Language in Medieval Britain: Networks and Exchanges*, ed. M. Carruthers, Harlaxton Medieval Studies, vol.25 (Donington, 2015), pp.127–43; see also the essays in *Manuscripts and Medieval Song: Inscription, Performance, Context*, ed. H. Deeming and E.E. Leach (Cambridge, 2015).