

Observations on an Early Twelfth-Century Antiphoner Fragment at Toledo

Kathleen E. Nelson

SOME TWENTY years ago, in his article, "La irrupción del canto gregoriano en España: Bases para un replanteamiento,"¹ Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta put forward many thought-provoking questions and observations concerning the introduction of new chant repertory during the decisive period of the change from the Old-Hispanic rite in the late eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth centuries. With its emphasis on practical problems associated with the changes in musical practice, his article continues to be relevant to scholars considering this transitional era of Iberian musical and liturgical history. Seeking to honor Fernández de la Cuesta's contribution to our understanding of the era, I have chosen to present some observations on an antiphoner fragment identifiable as a product of the transition to the Roman rite through its combination of the local Visigothic script and the recently imported Aquitanian musical notation. This unusual combination of script and notation styles seems to represent the practical needs of the era, and the use of Visigothic script suggests local preparation rather than importation. In preparing new books for the Roman rite to be used in Spain, the

old script would have been preferred by some local scribes, even when following a model written in Carolingian script.² On the other hand, as Fernández de la Cuesta points out, to copy the melodies of the incoming practice into the local Hispanic notation while using a model with Aquitanian notation would have presented considerable difficulties, but copying and reading of the more straightforward Aquitanian notation could have been readily learnt.³ In some situations during this early period of employment of the Roman rite in Spain, it is likely to have been simpler and more pragmatic to prepare chant manuscripts in the local script, but with the imported Aquitanian notation.

The fragment to be discussed is dated to the beginning of the twelfth century and consists of just two folios. It is part of the later binding of a thirteenth-century hook, the *Historia scholastica* by Petrus Comestor, held in the Biblioteca Capitular of Toledo. Both the book and the earlier fragment share the

¹ Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, "La irrupción del canto gregoriano en España: Bases para un replanteamiento," *Revista de Musicología* 8 (1985): 239–48. On this topic, see also his *Historia de la música española 1. Desde los orígenes hasta el "ars nova,"* 2nd edition (Madrid: Alianza Musical, 1988), especially chapter 11; and his commentary to the facsimile *Antiphonale silense: British Library Mss. Add. 30.850* (Madrid: Sociedad Española de Musicología, 1985).

² The change from Visigothic to Carolingian script in the preparation of liturgical books, and the necessity and needs of transcription into Visigothic script from a Carolingian model were recently discussed in Rose Walker, *Views of Transition: Liturgy and Illumination in Medieval Spain* (London: British Library, 1998), 63–65.

³ Fernández de la Cuesta, "La irrupción," 247; also his *Historia*, 226–27. In "La irrupción," 247–48, he also considers the Roman rite sources in which Hispanic notation is employed and how this might have been achieved.

identification Ms. 10.5.⁴ (For the purposes of this study, the abbreviation Tol 10.5 will hereafter be used to refer to the fragment, and not to the main book.) Janini suggests that the fragment was copied in Toledo and viewed it as being rare evidence of the early copying of books for the Roman rite in that center.⁵ It is understood that the fragment was bound with the book in the sixteenth century in Toledo.⁶ Thus, with its Visigothic text hand and connection with Toledo, the fragment attracted some limited scholarly attention and has been included in various manuscript catalogues;⁷ however, its chant content does not appear to have been studied in detail, nor its musicological significance examined. As well as discussing aspects of the chant content of the fragment, this paper will show that notation employed in the fragment offers an unusually clear representation of semitone location, more so than is apparent in other comparable manuscripts now located in Toledo and in general in Spanish manuscripts of the era.

My attention was initially drawn to the Tol 10.5 fragment by the fine facsimile of one of its pages available in volume two of the recently published *Corpus de códices visigóticos*.⁸ This collection of

350 facsimiles, representing both large codices and smaller fragmentary sources, is united by the use of Visigothic script in all its sources. Musical notations of either the early Spanish or the Aquitanian types appear in a small number of the examples in the collection. Those with Aquitanian notation present chants of the Roman rite and are dated mainly to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The facsimiles include the best known of this type of source, the important and large noted missal of San Millán de la Cogolla dated to the late eleventh century, Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, Emil. 18.⁹ The other examples with Aquitanian notation and Visigothic script in the facsimile volume of *CCV* are mostly from small fragmentary sources; they represent about half of the total number of such sources of which I am aware at present.¹⁰

In representing an antiphoner, the Tol 10.5 fragment is unusual as most of the known sources with Visigothic script and Aquitanian notation belong to the noted missal or noted breviary formats.¹¹ The two folios of the fragment contain parts of offices for several saints celebrated in January, as well as most of lauds and vespers for the office of *Sabbato per annum*; it is clear from the content that the folios were not consecutive. The saints' offices represented are the conclusion of that for St. Agnes, the first vespers and opening of matins for St. Vincent, and the first part of that for St. Hilary of Poitiers.¹² In general,

⁴In the catalogue by José Janini and Ramón González, the use of the two folios in the book's binding is described in the following terms: "Al encuadernarlo en Toledo, en el siglo XVI, se utilizaron, como hojas de guarda, dos folios de pergamino, procedentes de un antifonario responsorial." See *Catálogo de los manuscritos litúrgicos de la Catedral de Toledo* (Toledo: Diputación Provincial, 1977), 58. Coincidentally, two other copies of the *Historia scholastica* by Petrus Comestor are cited by scholars for associated musical content. For one in Salamanca, see Maricarmen Gómez Muntané, *La música medieval en España*, (Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 2001), 124; and for another in Madrid, see Higinio Anglés and José Subirá, *Catálogo Musical de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid*, vol. 1 (Barcelona: C.S.I.C., 1946), 89–90.

⁵Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 33–34.

⁶Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 58. See the quotation in the footnote above.

⁷These include Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, *Manuscritos y fuentes musicales en España: Edad media* (Madrid: Editorial Alpuerto, 1980), 173; Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 58; and Agustín Millares Carlo, *Corpus de códices visigóticos*, 2 vols., ed. M. C. Díaz y Díaz et al. (Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Fundación de Enseñanza Superior a Distancia de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 1999), 1: 188. The entry in the catalogue by Janini and González is the most complete, as would be expected.

⁸Millares Carlo, *Corpus de códices visigóticos*, 2: 276. (Hereafter this publication is given the abbreviation *CCV*.) The same page had already been included in Janini and González, *Catálogo*, Lámina 1. The facsimile in *CCV* is a fine color reproduction, but the top of the page has been trimmed losing the highest

notes of the first line of music. The other facsimile is complete but less clear.

⁹For detailed descriptions of this book see *CCV* 1: 126, (facsimiles in vol. 2: 166–68); and José Janini, *Manuscritos litúrgicos de las bibliotecas de España. Vol. 1 Castilla y Navarra* (Burgos: Aldecoa, 1977), 150–53.

¹⁰In addition to the fragments of this type included in *CCV*, others are described in various publications including Janini, *Manuscritos. Vol. 1*; Roger E. Reynolds, "Baptismal Rite and Paschal Vigil in Transition in Medieval Spain: A New Text in Visigothic Script," *Mediaeval Studies* 55 (1993): 257–72; and Kathleen E. Nelson, "Two Twelfth-Century Fragments in Zamora: Representatives of a Period of Transition" in *Encomium Musicae: Essays in Honor of Robert J. Snow*, ed. D. Crawford and G. G. Wagstaff (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2002), 161–74.

¹¹Two other fragments identified by scholars as being from antiphoners are now located in Portugal, one in Braga, the other in Coimbra. For description and facsimile of the first, see *CCV* 1: 38 (no. 18), 2: 25; and for description of the second (without facsimile), *CCV* 1: 43–44 (no. 37).

¹²The contents are described in Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 58. The folio numbering given in the *Catálogo* is followed in this paper. In fact that numbering is confusing as the folio

it is the part of the fragment containing matins for St. Hilary that is best preserved and therefore most readily studied. For this reason and for its interest as a relatively rare office, it will be a primary focus of discussion below. St. Hilary was a fourth-century bishop of Poitiers and theologian who also made important contributions to early hymn writing.¹³ With texts drawing from the *Vita sancti hiliarii* by Venantius Fortunatus,¹⁴ his office commences in Tol 10.5 on the folio numbered 2r and continues throughout 2v. On 2v there is a group of nine antiphons, evidently those for the three nocturns of the matins, although rubrics are provided for the first and third nocturns only. The group of antiphons is followed on the last line of the page by the beginning of the first responsory.

This office for St. Hilary of Poitiers appears to have had a relatively small distribution.¹⁵ Although St. Hilary receives mention in *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, with the exception of the invitatory antiphon, the series of chants in Tol 10.5 is not included there.¹⁶ Furthermore, a search of the current indices of office books in CANTUS finds the office only in two sources, the important antiphoners, Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, Ms. 44.1 and Ms. 44.2.¹⁷ (Hereafter Tol 44.1 and Tol 44.2.) A search in other Spanish antiphoners and noted breviaries of the eleventh to thirteenth centuries accessible to me through editions, microfilms, catalogues or inventories found just one possible further instance of the same office. This is in a single folio fragment held in Tarragona, Archivo Histórico Archidocesano, ms.

labelled 2 is likely to have preceded the other in their original arrangement.

¹³ For an introduction to the work and life of St. Hilary from a musicological perspective, see Lawrence Gushee and James W. McKinnon, "Hilary of Poitiers," *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy (accessed 30 November 2005), <http://www.grovemusic.com>.

¹⁴ Ruth Steiner, Introduction to *An Aquitanian Antiphoner: Toledo, Biblioteca capitular, 44.2. Printouts from an Index in Machine-Readable Form. A CANTUS Index*, by Ronald T. Olexy, et al. (Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1992), ix. The *Vita* is available in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1850) vol. 88, cols. 441–48.

¹⁵ A similar observation was made in the study of Toledo 44.2 by Ronald Thomas Olexy, "The Responsories in the 11th Century Aquitanian Antiphonal Toledo, Bibl. Cap. 44.2" (Ph.D. diss. Catholic University of America, 1980), 54.

¹⁶ René-Jean Hesbert, *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, 6 vols. (Rome: Herder, 1963–79).

¹⁷ CANTUS <http://publish.uwo.ca/~cantus/>, accessed 1 December 2005.

20.1; regrettably, it was unable to be included in the present study. In his catalogue, Janini notes that Aquitanian notation is employed in the Tarragona fragment and dates it to the end of the tenth century.¹⁸

Although my search is certainly not complete, it is nevertheless remarkable to find that three sources of the relatively rare office for St. Hilary of Poitiers are held in the same library in Toledo. How could this coincidence have come about? Seeking an answer to that question is made difficult by the fact that none of the three sources contains definitive indications of date or provenance. The fragment, Tol 10.5, has been dated on the grounds of its script to the beginning of the twelfth century, and as already mentioned, it has been proposed that it was copied in Toledo.¹⁹ For Tol 44.1, the catalogue by Janini and González of the Toledo cathedral manuscripts gave an approximate date, "Siglo X–XI," and its place of origin as the south of France. They suggested that Tol 44.1 had been brought into Spain by Bernard, the Cluniac who had been abbot of Sahagún and was appointed archbishop of Toledo after the reconquest of the city in 1086; however, the authors also noted that the source "Merecería un detenido estudio."²⁰ Similarly, the origin of Tol 44.2 is generally thought of as French or more specifically as Aquitanian, but with a later dating to the twelfth century, or the eleventh to twelfth centuries.²¹ Further evidence for provenance has recently been sought for both antiphoners by musicologist Lila Collamore. She proposes that the origins of Tol 44.1 are associated with the monastery of Sant Sadurní de Tavèrnoles in Catalonia and its abbot, Ponç "around 1020."²² With regard to the origin of Tol 44.2, Collamore argues in support of the idea that it was copied in Toledo and places it in the late years

¹⁸ José Janini, *Manuscritos litúrgicos de las bibliotecas de España. Vol. 2 Aragón, Cataluña y Valencia* (Burgos: Aldecoa, 1980), 220.

¹⁹ Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 33–34, 58.

²⁰ Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 179.

²¹ Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 179; Pedro Romano Rocha, "Les sources languedociennes du Bréviaire de Braga," in *Liturgie et Musique (IXe–XIVe s.)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 17 (Toulouse: Privat, 1982), 185–207; Steiner, Introduction to *An Aquitanian Antiphoner*, vii; Michel Huglo and David Hiley, "Antiphoner," *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy (accessed 20 December 2005), <http://www.grovemusic.com>. See also Michel Huglo's discussion in "La pénétration des manuscrits aquitains en Espagne," *Revista de Musicología* 8 (1985), 252–53.

²² Lila Collamore, "Aquitanian Collections of Office Chants: A Comparative Survey" (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 2000), 301–2.

of the eleventh century, suggesting that it was prepared "under the direction of Gerald, later bishop of Braga."²³ Pedro Romano Rocha, in his 1982 article, wrote emphatically of the French origin of Tol 44.2, and also noted "Il est vrai que ce manuscrit, ou un autre de la même famille, a exercé une influence sur le bréviaire de Tolède."²⁴ Without entering further into the question of the provenance of Tol 44.2, I suggest that the ties between it and Tol 10.5 to be discussed further below, are another indicator pointing to the presence in Spain of Tol 44.2, or a closely related source, during the period of transition to the new rite.

Of the two antiphoners, Tol 44.1 and Tol 44.2, comparison of various features shows that it is the later, Tol 44.2, which has the most in common with the Tol 10.5 fragment. Looking first at size and layout, it is found that Tol 10.5 must have been smaller than the other two. Its margins have been trimmed, so it is not possible to determine the original height and width of the manuscript, but it has the smallest writing space at 220 × 160 mm.²⁵ Like the other two, the content of the fragment is laid out in a single column to the page. It has fourteen lines of chant on each page, just one more than is normal in Tol 44.2.²⁶ The ordering of the offices in Tol 10.5 is that of Tol 44.2, but not that of Tol 44.1. In Tol 10.5 and Tol 44.2, the Saturday office is followed immediately by that for St. Hilary. In Tol 44.1, St. Hilary is placed earlier, preceding the ferial offices and following from the Octave of Epiphany.

A distinctive feature shared by Tol 10.5 and Tol 44.2 is the collection together of antiphons for each nocturn. In the office for St. Hilary, both sources present all nine antiphons for the three nocturns together as a consecutive series, instead of grouping together the antiphons and responsories for each nocturn as is done for the St. Hilary office of Tol 44.1, and as is the better known practice. The incomplete matins for St. Vincent in Tol 10.5 appears to have the same arrangement for its four antiphons: three antiphons are given followed immediately by a rubric introducing the fourth as being for the second nocturn. The same office in Tol 44.2 follows this layout also; in fact, it is the normal arrangement in that

book.²⁷ This topic was discussed by John A. Emerson in his study of the early gradual and antiphoner, *Albi, Bibliothèque Municipale Rochegude, Ms. 44*. Emerson observed separation of the group of antiphons from the group of responsories in the matins of Albi 44, calling the arrangement "bipartite." He suggested that the bipartite structure might have been an older one than the "integrated" grouping of three antiphons and three responsories for each nocturn.²⁸ Perhaps the bipartite structure of matins is one that in future will give further clues to the history of Tol 44.2 and Tol 10.5.

A brief discussion of the chants of matins for St. Hilary of Poitiers and St. Vincent can represent the comparison of the chant content in the three sources, turning first to those for St. Hilary. Again Tol 10.5 and Tol 44.2 are found to be the most similar, these two sharing the same list of chants with only minor differences in texts and melodies. On the other hand, Tol 44.1 has a different invitatory chant from that of the other two sources. It has the same list of antiphons, although set out as already described, and with the addition of an incipit for an additional antiphon at the end of the first and third nocturn groups. Tol 44.1 also has the first responsory as found in the other two sources, but with another opening.²⁹ Overall the texts of the office in Tol 44.1 suggest a greater distance from St. Hilary's *Vita* by Fortunatus. For example, the phrase given in the *Vita* "inter haereticos gladios, se ingerebat" is repeated in the fourth antiphon (*Sanctus ilarius timore*) almost unchanged in Tol 10.5 and Tol 44.2, but there is significant variation in Tol 44.1.³⁰ The comparison of the St. Vincent office produces a similar finding. Again, it is Tol 10.5 and Tol 44.2 which have the most in common. Perhaps the most notable difference between the St. Vincent matins of these two and Tol

²⁷ There are a few exceptions as is discussed by Olexy, "The Responsories," 48.

²⁸ John A. Emerson, *Albi, Bibliothèque Municipale Rochegude, Manuscript 44: A Complete Ninth-Century Gradual and Antiphoner from Southern France*, ed. L. Collamore (Ottawa: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 2002), lvii–lviii.

²⁹ The responsory begins in Tol 10.5 with the words "Beatus ilarius magis." Tol 44.2, fol. 37v, has the same except the saint's name is spelt "hylarius." In Tol 44.1, fol. 25r, the responsory begins "Hymo beatus hilarius."

³⁰ *Patrologia Latina* 88, col. 442. In Tol 10.5, the phrase appears as "inter hereticos gladio se ingerebat," and in Tol 44.2, fol. 37r as "inter hereticos gladios se ingereba(n)t"; but in Tol 44.1, fol. 25v, the phrase reads "intra hereticos gaudio se ingerebat."

²³ Collamore, "Aquitanian Collections," 304–7, 312.

²⁴ Rocha, "Les sources languedociennes," 193.

²⁵ Janini and González, *Catálogo*, 58, 179.

²⁶ Tol 44.1 normally has 18 lines of chant per page, and Tol 44.2 has 13 lines.

44.1 is that the latter gives only one invitational antiphon.³¹ Tol 44.2, on the other hand, gives three invitational antiphons, while Tol 10.5 gives the same three and finally adds a fourth possibility.³² It is notable that the tones for the invitatories of St. Vincent and St. Hilary present a point of marked variation from Tol 44.2, despite the fact that the antiphon melodies are shared with only minor differences.³³ None of the tones in the fragment are the same as those given for the corresponding antiphons in the Tol 44.2 antiphoner. Although there is little to base a conclusion on, the invitational tones of Tol 10.5 seem to suggest a more stable practice than those of Tol 44.2. Turning briefly to the nocturn antiphons for St. Vincent, it is found that the four in Tol 10.5 are also those found in Tol 44.2. The same order is maintained, this being important as the chants are arranged in numerical order in Tol 44.2.³⁴

Tol 10.5 also differs from Tol 44.2 in the way it specifies the psalm tone and differentia for each antiphon in the two matins discussed and the Saturday office. Tol 10.5 normally gives the notated intonation of the psalm tone above its text incipit, followed by the six-syllable differentia with an abbreviation representing "seculorum amen." For the same antiphons, Tol 44.2 notates the intonation and just a two-syllable differentia; this is a frequent practice

³¹ Tol 10.5, fol. 1v; Tol 44.1, fol. 38v; Tol 44.2, fol. 45r.

³² As given in Tol 10.5, fol. 1v, the invitational antiphons are *Laudibus egregiis, Vincentem mundum, Regem sempiternum,* and *[Ae]ternum trinunq[ue]*. (Note: the copy in use for this study does not permit certain reading of spelling.)

³³ Tol 10.5 employs the same commonly used and widespread tone for St. Hilary and three of its St. Vincent invitatories. Tol 44.2 has less repetition and more unusual tones. The tone for the second St. Vincent invitational, *Vincentem mundum*, in Tol 10.5 seems to be that in the Tol 44.2 tonary, rather than that with the office in the antiphoner itself. The unusual and varied invitational tone practice of Tol 44.2 is discussed in Ruth Steiner, "The Twenty-Two Invitational Tones of the Manuscript Toledo, Biblioteca Capitulare, 44.2," in *Music in Performance and Society: Essays in Honor of Roland Jackson*, ed. M. Cole and J. Koegel (Warren, Michigan: Harmonie Park Press, 1997), 59–79; and Collamore, "Aquitainian Collections," 207–23.

³⁴ The modes for the first three of the group in Tol 10.5 can be identified by examination of the differentiae. The fourth is difficult to read and incomplete, but appears to employ its mode 4 melody found elsewhere. Closer examination of these four antiphons is warranted as there appears to have been some alteration to the manuscript at this point with the text hand appearing to be Carolingian. The entry in the Janini and González *Catálogo*, p. 58, notes that the fragment has some lines in Carolingian script but does not identify their location.

in the manuscript.³⁵ Thus, Tol 10.5 can be seen to offer a more thorough approach to psalm tone indication. This thorough approach suggests an intention to reduce or avoid ambiguity of melodic practice. Intriguing evidence of the use of the manuscript and of a need for further clarification is given by the addition on folio 2r of short lines marking the point between the psalm tone incipit and the differentia,³⁶ something that can otherwise appear continuous. The intention of avoiding ambiguity may also be observed in the notation of the fragment, particularly as will be discussed below, in the efforts made to mark the placement of semitones.

The notation is usually neat, clearly written, and well heightened. As was common at the time in Aquitanian notation, clefs are not employed; however, the notation appears oriented around a single line, the lines being those of the page ruling and seemingly without any addition of color. *Custodes* provide additional assistance to the reading of pitch.³⁷ More or less standard conventions are employed to govern the placement of the final of each chant in relation to the line. Thus chants in authentic modes have the final placed a third below the line, while chants in plagal modes have the final on the line. This rule appears to be followed even for the mode 4 chants, so that for these *E* seems to be the pitch on the line. Mode 4 was the sole usual exception to this rule of single line staff use in Aquitanian notation. Although my observation of the mode 4 line is necessarily tentative,³⁸ it is worth noting here as sources of Aquitanian notation in Spain show that in the late eleventh and the twelfth centuries, the pitch of the line for mode 4 was not yet standardized. In some sources *F* is placed on the line for mode 4 chants, while in others, including Tol 44.2, it is the final *E* that is placed on the line. The *E* line is also used for mode 4 in two other sources

³⁵ On the other hand, Tol 44.1 is without any indication of the differentia or the intonation of the tone in the same groups of antiphons and, indeed, often throughout the book. On this topic see CANTUS "About the Manuscripts," <http://publish.uwo.ca/~cantus/aboutms4.html#tol441>. Accessed 5 December 2005.

³⁶ These occur with the antiphons for lauds and vespers of the Saturday office. In some, lines also mark the separation between the antiphon final and the psalm incipit.

³⁷ The *custos* of the fragment is a punctum with a fine line ascending diagonally on its right side. This *custos* is different from that of Tol 44.2.

³⁸ The mode 4 chants able to be examined are those for the Saturday office on folio 2r. Working only with a copy of this page, I am unable to be certain of the observation of the staff line; it may be able to be confirmed by study of the original manuscript.

written in Visigothic script and Aquitanian notation with which I am familiar.³⁹ Further observations show that from the thirteenth century, the use of the *F* line for mode 4 was standard in Spanish sources of Aquitanian notation.⁴⁰

On folio 2 of the fragment, the clearest of its folios for study, it is evident that the notator has gone beyond the largely standard and common conventions of pitch indication in Aquitanian notation at the time, taking extra care to mark the placement of the lower note of semitones.⁴¹ Two signs are in places employed as markers of the lower semitone positions of *E* and *b*. There appears also to be at least one instance of the use of a semitonal sign on *a*.⁴² One of the two semitone marking signs is the quilisma, well known in Aquitanian notation to take such a role. In this fragment, as is common, it is found as part of a three-note quilismatic group covering minor thirds or a perfect fourth with the semitone located between the top two notes of the three-note group. The second special sign is less well known and less often used in sources of Aquitanian notation generally, although it appears surprisingly frequently in Tol 10.5. This sign is a more or less diamond-shaped punctum, which I will refer to as a special punctum.⁴³ Its shape distinguishes it from the normal punctum of the fragment as the usual form lies horizontally. The special punctum occurs in Tol 10.5 mostly as a single note in isolation, but also as part of a descending pattern of

two or more notes on one syllable where the special punctum is used for the second note, being a minor second below the note immediately preceding. When part of such a two-note group, the use of the special punctum means that the standard clivis form found in many sources of Aquitanian notation, including this one, is reversed, as the standard form employs a diamond-shaped punctum for its first note.⁴⁴ One further observation on the indication of the semitone in the fragment should be made. This is that special signs are not used for every instance of the lower semitone pitch in Tol 10.5; inconsistency of usage is also to be seen in other sources in Aquitanian notation with semitonal signs. Nevertheless, in the series of nine antiphons for the St. Hilary nocturns on folio 2v of Tol 10.5, with their often syllabic motion, the special punctum is employed regularly: every time a syllable has just one note, and that note falls on the position of the lower semitone pitch, the special punctum is employed. Its use in the other two chants of the same page appears to be less systematic.

The use of a special punctum in Aquitanian notation to mark the lower semitone position does not appear to have been common, and its use is another feature differentiating Tol 10.5 from Tol 44.2 and Tol 44.1. The special punctum, with a variety of forms, has been observed in some southern French sources associated with the region of Limoges and with Moissac, and also in some sources in Portugal dating from the twelfth century and later.⁴⁵ The earliest of the sources appears to be Paris 1139, its oldest sections possibly dating from the end of the eleventh century.⁴⁶ The current dating of the Tol 10.5 fragment to the beginning of the twelfth century therefore places it as an early example of the use of the semitonal special punctum, and the earliest so far known in a source located in the Iberian Peninsula, being earlier than the Missal of Mateus (Braga, Biblioteca Pública, Ms. 1000). The latter source is thought to have been prepared in Limoges in the "second

³⁹ Kathleen E. Nelson, *Medieval Liturgical Music of Zamora* (Ottawa: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1996), 84.

⁴⁰ I discuss this topic further in my article "Semitone Indication in a Twelfth-Century Source of Aquitanian Notation in Zamora," *Revista Portuguesa de Musicologia* 14 (in press); also Nelson, *Medieval Liturgical Music*, 84.

⁴¹ Folio 1 appears less well preserved and is more difficult to read, a problem exacerbated when working with a copy. My comments on notation therefore principally relate to folio 2 although features described probably appear on folio 1. There may be some alteration to the original notation of folio 1.

⁴² The use of pitch names here assumes that the chants use the standard final of each mode and are not transposed. Apparent use of the semitonal sign on *a* occurs in a mode 1 antiphon on folio 2v, *Crescebat in eo cotidie*. The melodic movement at this point would be a *b-flat a*.

⁴³ The term used here for the sign, "special punctum," draws on Marie-Noël Colette's expression "forme spéciale de point." See her "La notation du demi-ton dans le manuscrit Paris, B. N. Lat. 1139 et dans quelques manuscrits du Sud de la France" in *La tradizione dei tropi liturgici*, ed. C. Leonardi and E. Menestò (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 1990), 301.

⁴⁴ Clivis forms employed in a collection of manuscript fragments notated in Aquitanian notation are shown in Nelson, *Medieval Liturgical Music*, 93–95.

⁴⁵ Solange Corbin identified the special punctum with its role in marking the lower note of the semitone in Portuguese sources in *Essai sur la musique religieuse portugaise au moyen âge (1100–1385)* (Paris: Société D'Édition «Les Belles Lettres», 1952), see especially 251–58. Marie-Noël Colette has made its presence in southern French sources known more recently in her "La notation du demi-ton."

⁴⁶ Colette, "La notation du demi-ton," 298, 308.

quarter of the twelfth century⁴⁷ and brought to Braga after the middle of the same century.⁴⁸

Among Spanish sources with Aquitanian notation—some of which may have been imported into Spain from southern France and others copied in Spain—the use of a special punctum to mark the semitone position is very rare. It has to my knowledge been observed in only one or two other Spanish sources. One of these, and the more clearly comparable to Tol 10.5, consists of several bifolios from a noted breviary thought to date from the second half of the twelfth century and located in western Spain, in Zamora.⁴⁹ It is also noteworthy that the Zamora source, while written in a pregothic text hand, shows the influence of Visigothic script through employment of a style of decoration for abbreviations characteristic of Visigothic script manuscripts.⁵⁰ The same decorations are however not to be found in Tol 10.5. The Zamora fragment is further differentiated from Tol 10.5 in employing a third sign for the lower semitone position.

The presence of the special punctum in Tol 10.5 may eventually help us understand the origin of the fragment. Further research into transitional sources such as this one is needed. Such research may bring us closer to understanding why this unusual sign was employed in some sources but not others. For now, however, we can only speculate on the reasons behind its inclusion in Tol 10.5; various ideas arise,

⁴⁷ Joaquim O. Bragança, "L'influence de la liturgie languedocienne au Portugal (missel, pontifical, rituel)" in *Liturgie et Musique (IXe–XIVe s.)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 17 (Toulouse: Privat, 1982), 174–75.

⁴⁸ Marie-Noël Colette has suggested that the use of the special punctum may have been introduced into Portugal with the Missal of Mateus. See Colette, "La notation du demi-ton," 306.

⁴⁹ Zamora, Archivo Histórico Provincial, Pergaminos musicales 196, 199 and 200. This source is described in Nelson, *Medieval Liturgical Music*, especially 86–87, and 232. The special punctum in the Zamora source is discussed in Nelson, "Semitone Indication." The second source was noted by Suñol who found a sign he described as "une sorte d'apostrophe," employed for the lower semitone position in a source from La Massana, Andorra (Montserrat, Biblioteca del Monasterio, ms. 790/111). He pointed out that the notation of this source mixes Aquitanian and Catalan methods. See Grégoire M. Suñol, *Introduction à la paléographie musicale grégorienne* (Tournai, 1935), 264, 269, and 279.

⁵⁰ This is most evident in the abbreviations of the word "antiphona." On these see Nelson, *Medieval Liturgical Music*, 232; Nelson, "Semitone Indication"; and for a table of such abbreviations in Silos sources now in London, see Walker, *Views of Transition*, 61–62.

the full exploration of which lies beyond the scope of this paper. Perhaps relevant are the associations known between Toledo, the Cluniac monastery of Moissac, and Braga.⁵¹ Could the fragment's notation have been influenced by a now lost southern French source brought into Spain, perhaps one which had originated in Moissac, or could it have been prepared with advice from someone associated with Moissac? Could evidence of special interest in semitone indication represent a network of connections between notators who may have worked in quite widespread locations? Could it have been felt that extra effort must be put into semitone indication to assist those new to the Roman chant repertoire?

The information to be gleaned from this small source is intriguing, as are the questions arising from its study. It is tempting to accept that it was copied in Toledo as proposed by Janini and González; however, although some evidence seems to point this way, there is still no clear proof. The connections of its chant content with the probably slightly earlier Tol 44.2 raise the possibility that the fragment was copied with reference to Tol 44.2, or that the two shared a similar ancestry. Might Tol 10.5 represent another stage, perhaps the next stage, in the development of practices found in Tol 44.2? Or might it have been prepared with reference to Tol 44.2 but for another church? Whatever its place of origin and destination, the preparation of the Tol 10.5 fragment appears to have been governed by the necessities of the transition to the new rite and its associated scribal practices, so the local scribe still wrote in Visigothic script, but the imported notation was needed. As I have suggested above, the choice to employ the special punctum may have been a deliberate attempt to be more specific of pitch and less ambiguous than was common, with further clarity for the practitioner

⁵¹ A frequently cited connection during the transitional era between these three centers is the presence of St. Gerald of Braga. Gerald had been a monk of Moissac, and was in the church of Toledo prior to his appointment as bishop of Braga in 1099. For discussion of Gerald and other connections between the centers often in relation to Tol 44.2, some secondary sources which can be consulted are Pedro Romano Rocha, *L'office divin au moyen âge dans l'église de Braga* (Paris: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1980), and also his "Les sources languedociennes"; Steiner, Introduction to *An Aquitanian Antiphoner*; Collamore, "Aquitanian Collections"; and Manuel Pedro Ferreira, "Braga, Toledo and Sahagún: The Testimony of a Sixteenth-Century Liturgical Manuscript," in *Fuentes Musicales en la Península Ibérica (ca. 1250–ca. 1550)*, ed. M. Gómez and M. Bernadó (Lleida: Universitat de Lleida, 2001), 11–33.

made available in the way psalm tones were notated. The presence of the special punctum, being rare among the sources of Aquitanian notation, has also suggested connections. As research continues, further Spanish sources may be found to use the special punctum for semitone indication. The sign may eventually prove to be a useful key in advancing our understanding, not only of the background of the Tol 10.5 fragment, but also our understanding of the

transmission of notation and chant practices in twelfth-century Iberia.

Acknowledgements: For the provision of copies of manuscripts employed in this study I wish to thank the Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota. I am grateful to the University of Sydney for research funding which has supported this study.